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Analysis and Commentary
The Unfortunate Misinterpretation of Miss Follett
Margaret Stout and Jeannine M. Love

Mary Follett was both a woman in public service in myriad roles from social worker to presidential advisor and a female public intellectual giving voice to what would later be called a feminist perspective. Based on a forthcoming book, this paper summarizes the fullness of Follett’s thinking and discusses the manner in which she is frequently misinterpreted in the literature, arguing that these misunderstandings are due to a lack of awareness of, or ability to grasp, her underlying relational process ontology. Misinterpretations in both the management and public administration literature are considered, ending with a call for scholars in both specializations to reconsider their interpretations from a more in-depth understanding of her work.
Pink Tape: A Feminist Theory of Red Tape

Lauren Bock Mullins

This article links literature on the glass ceiling to literature on red tape by analyzing how red tape fits into a larger discussion of substantive and formal equality and offers three propositions toward forming a theory of pink tape, as a stepping-stone for future exploratory research to advance the agenda of women in public administration. The theory of pink tape has implications for organizational training, psychological/social health of women, effective management of the public sector, and representative bureaucracy.

Gendered Organizations, Care Ethics, and Active Representation

Beth Rauhaus

A number of public agencies have a hand in providing protection and assistance to victims through provisions of domestic violence programs. This qualitative study examines regulatory and redistributive agencies in three states to determine if active representation, through the provision of domestic violence services, can be achieved in public agencies that are gendered. Using the theoretical framework of representative bureaucracy, this case study examines the importance of gender representation and the effect of gender dynamics in organizations on achieving active representation. This study links passive representation to active representation using care ethics in redistributive agencies due to the organizational mission, feminine culture, the predominance of female clientele, and the need for feminine traits, such as care and emotions, to be exhibited by public administrators.

Engaging Women in Public Leadership in West Virginia

Karen Kunz and Carrie Staton

As the 113th Congress begins to tackle the issues of the day, men and women alike celebrate the inclusion of a record number of women representatives. The historic numbers indicate progress, but the reality is that women compose slightly more than half of the national population but less than twenty percent of the national legislative representatives. Women fare slightly better at the state level, holding just under a quarter of state legislative seats and executive offices. In this study we explore the challenges faced and advances made by women in attaining statewide executive office in rural states by examining how they have fared in Appalachia and particularly West Virginia. We integrate theoretical understandings and statistical data with lived experiences gleaned from personal interviews conducted with the women who have held executive office in West Virginia.

Advancing Women in Local Government: The Case of Illinois

Rachel Lange and Kimberly Nelson

Despite gains by women in many professional fields, the top level of local government management ranks continues to be populated primarily by man. The percentage of females serving as local government chief administrators has not increased since the 1980s. Little empirical research exists that attempts to uncover the reason for the gender gap.
The purpose of this research is to identify some of the obstacles and barriers that affect a woman’s decision to advance her career in local government. Utilizing an online survey, the authors surveyed female chief administrative officers (CAOs), assistant CAOs, assistant to the CAOs, and deputy CAOs in Illinois. The survey results show that barriers such as a male dominated culture and time commitment to work life and family life are preventing females from achieving higher authority. Mentoring proves to be a positive solution to many of the barriers facing women in local government.

In Their Own Words:
The Experiences of Mothers in the Federal Civil Service........................................107
Marissa Martino Golden

It is generally agreed that women’s mass entry into the labor force has been accompanied by high levels of stress for working mothers (Becker 2013; Hochshild 1989; Slaughter 2012). Family-friendly workplace policies are often touted as one means to mitigate such stress. This article examines the use of these policies by mothers employed in the federal civil service. It employs a qualitative interview-based approach to document the impact these policies have on the lives of public service women. It finds that the policies play a significant and positive role in enabling civil service mothers to balance their work and family obligations. It further finds that the 40-hour work week culture of the federal government also plays a positive role in supporting the work/life balance these women seek. However, the article finds that the only way to penetrate the glass ceiling is to forego the very policies and work hours that these women find so helpful. This limits the career advancement of the civil service mothers studied here.

Book Reviews

Maternity Leave: Policy and Practice.................................................................123
By Victoria Gordon

Reviewed by Lorenda A. Naylor

Professor Mommy: Finding Work-Family Balance in Academia .....................126
By Rachel Connelly and Kristen Ghodsee

Reviewed by Patricia M. Alt

Women, Wealth and Giving: The Virtuous Legacy of the Boom Generation ....129
By Margaret May Damen and Niki Nicastro McCuistion

Reviewed by Shannon Vaughan

Women and Public Service: Barriers, Challenges, and Opportunities ...............132
By Mohamad G. Alkadry and Leslie E. Tower

Reviewed by Sharon Mastracci
Star Trek began as a 1960s television series led by a swashbuckling starship Captain, an intellectual off-world first officer, and a multicultural, heart-of-gold crew. In the third of a century since its appearance on our home screens, the series Gene Roddenberry created has become a world-wide phenomenon.

Star Trek is also a rich treasure trove of administrative literature: The setting — usually a starship, sometimes a planetary government organization. The characters are clearly delineated, colorful, share common goals, distinguish between their personal and professional roles and concerns, and serve well as archetypes for distinct organizational personalities. And the missions are clear, benevolent, in the public interest, and frequently controversial.

As you watch an episode of one of the four Star Trek series, how many of these facets can you observe?

That’s public administration, all right, but in a very different wrapper.

“Bartleby” is the name of the principal character in Herman Melville’s short story about the relationship between a manager and an employee. Bartleby is the employee. His job is to be a scrivener, or a copyist.

The setting is a small law firm on Wall Street a century and a half ago — long before computers and photocopy machines, or even typewriters and carbon paper. A scrivener’s job was to copy a document clearly and accurately using the information technology of the day: paper, a bottle of ink, and a sharpened quill.

You’ll find that the office technology may be different now than it was in Bartleby’s time, but people are much the same as ever. As you read this story, ask yourself what
kind of employee Bartleby is. What kind of boss does the attorney make? Does the story have to end the way it does?

Dear Public Voices Readers,
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Public Voices Symposium

Deconstructing the Government/Hip-Hop Nexus

Valerie L. Patterson, Ph.D., Guest Editor
Clinical Associate Professor, Public Administration
School of International and Public Affairs
Florida International University

Call for Manuscripts, Poems, Fiction, and Book Reviews

The government/hip-hop nexus can be located in the following examples - the strategies used by the earliest deejays in the 70s that violated city codes and became the catalyst for subsequent national and international clashes with property laws; the unsolved murders of Tupak Shakur and the Notorious B-I-G and revelations concerning the existence of a RAP COINTELPRO; the 2009 lawsuit against the United States government for the use of music from the genre to torture prisoners detained at Guantanamo Bay; and the recently reported 6 million dollar tax lien faced by artist Nas. Hip-Hop as a cultural phenomenon and a multi-billion dollar industry continues to confront, consternate, and challenge the policies, rules, regulations and structure of government (for example the creation of local government ordinances that “ban” the wearing of sagging pants).

In the spirit of the mission of Public Voices to publish unorthodox and controversial perspectives on bureaucracy in particular and the public sector in general, this is a call for papers that interrogate and examine the government/hip-hop nexus. Clearly, the relationship between “government” and hip-hop culture is nuanced and complex (collection of tax revenues on one end of the spectrum to the increased criminalization of the behavior of minority youth at the other end). This symposium aims to locate and situate the multiple connections (should government organizations and those who lead them develop an awareness of the culture?), linkages (will the next generation of leaders of government organizations possess hip-hop sensibilities?), constraints, and sources of conflict (hip-hop artists have been heavily involved in articulating the sentiments of the Occupy Wall Street movement) that have developed and evolved from the early days of the culture to its current 21st century impact. The symposium also aims to identify lessons-learned and to theorize and predict future trends.

To be considered for the symposium, submit an electronic copy of your work, with the author’s name and affiliation provided separately, to Iryna Illiash, Managing Editor of Public Voices, to the following email address: illiash@pegasus.rutgers.edu.
The cover photograph for this issue of Public Voices was taken sometime in the summer of 1929 (probably June) somewhere in Sunflower County, Mississippi. Very probably the photo was taken in Indianola but, perhaps, it was Ruleville. It is one of three such photos, one of which does have the annotation on the reverse “Ruleville Midwives Club 1929.” The young woman wearing a tie in this and in one of the other photos was Ann Reid Brown, R.N., then a single woman having only arrived in the United States from Scotland a few years before, in 1923. Full disclosure: This commentary on the photo combines professional research interests in public administration and public policy with personal interests—family interests—for that young nurse later married and became the author’s mother. From the scholarly perspective, such photographs have been seen as “instrumental in establishing midwives’ credentials and cultural identity at a key transitional moment in the history of the midwife and of public health” (Keith, Brennan, & Reynolds 2012). There is also deep irony if we see these photographs as being a fragment of the American dream, of a recent immigrant’s hope for and success at achieving that dream; but that fragment of the vision is understood quite differently when we see that she began a hopeful career working with a Black population forcibly segregated by law under the incongruously named “separate but equal” legal doctrine. That doctrine, derived from the United States Supreme Court’s 1896 decision, Plessy v. Ferguson, would remain the foundation for legally enforced segregation throughout the South for another quarter century. The options open to the young, white, immigrant nurse were almost entirely closed off for the population with which she then worked. The remaining parts of this overview are meant to provide the following: (1) some biographical information on the nurse; (2) a description, in so far as we know it, of why she was in Mississippi; and (3) some indication of areas for future research on this and related topics.

**Biographical Information**

Ann Reid Phillips\(^1\) (née Brown) R.N., was born on April 21, 1903, in Mossend (Lanarkshire), Scotland. She attended the Mossend and Motherwell municipal schools until, at age fourteen, she
reached what was then Scotland’s official “school-leaving age” (Woodin, McCulloch, & Cowan 2013). During the last years of the Great War (1914-1918), she worked in one of the munitions factories of the Clyde Valley, a major steel and shipbuilding center of the country. She then worked as a “shop assistant” (according to her British Passport) until the decision was taken to emigrate. In 1923 she, her parents, and fifteen other members of the immediate family (i.e., her seven siblings and, for the married ones, their spouses and children) left Scotland for the United States, settling in Western Kentucky where the men of the family could get work in the coal mines. The following year she entered nurses’ training at the Henderson (Kentucky) Hospital Training School for Nurses, graduating three years later on May 31, 1927. It is worth noting that twenty-nine single women enrolled in the Hospital’s training program in 1924. Married women could not enroll and enrolled students who later married had to withdraw from their studies. Thirteen of the twenty-nine students just quit; another eight married; a note indicates that one “worked 3 hrs and quit” (Brown 1927, 6); and so it went. By 1927 only Ann R. Brown and one other student had stayed the course through the entire three years to graduate and receive their diplomas. A week after graduating, she passed the state licensure examination and on June 6th was issued the Kentucky Board of Nurse Examiners’ “Registered Nurse” certificate number 2657.

**Miss Ann and the Mississippi Midwives, 1929**

Once licensed as a registered nurse, Ann R. Brown held positions at hospitals in Henderson, Kentucky, and Saint Elizabeth, Tennessee, before going to Sunflower County in the Mississippi Delta. The United States Public Health Service, with financial support from the Rockefeller Foundation (Roberts & Reeb 1994), had established a midwifery program in Mississippi to which she was assigned. There, in Indianola and Ruleville, she worked in the Public Health Service’s training program to teach black women to be midwives and to upgrade the qualifications of those midwives already practicing. Those midwives not only provided pre-natal, delivery, and post-natal care; they also provided general health care to their local communities (Roberts & Reeb 1994; Smith 1994). In addition to teaching, Miss Ann went into the cotton fields to treat the field hands, black and white, and organized general health-care clinics for black children. One of the other photographs in the set shows her surrounded by black children in front of what appears to be a rural school building, but such clinics were quite often conducted in the open fields.

As time removes us ever more distantly from the “separate but equal” era of segregation, one should from time to time restate the obvious: the midwifery program was necessary for more than the superficial fact that there were few physicians in rural Mississippi counties with a majority black population. Regardless of the availability of physicians, there were some white doctors of the time who simply would not treat black patients. Without midwives to provide broad, general medical care, in addition to delivering babies, the availability of medical care for the population of the Mississippi Delta would have been far more limited (Smith 1995).
The Dream Disturbed, McCarthyism and the Communist Hysteria

Ann Brown Phillips’s nursing career extended across some five decades after she left Mississippi. That period of her life is beyond the scope of this essay. In that career she was successful in achieving the American Dream, but her life as an immigrant was not untouched by the Communist witch-hunt led by Senator Joseph McCarthy in the late 1940s and early 1950s. In the early 1950s she worried greatly about the possibility of deportation. There was, in fact, some basis for that worry, for her father David Brown (b. 1860) was much influenced by the Utopian socialism of Robert Owen. In early adulthood he became a well-known leader of the Co-operative Movement in Scotland and remained deeply involved in its activities until the family came to the United States in 1923. He understood himself to be a socialist in the Owenite tradition.

The last of her family to become a naturalized citizen, Ann Phillips misguidedly thought that citizenship would protect her from deportation. While, in the end, her worries turned out to be unfounded, there is real irony in the coincidence of her becoming a naturalized citizen in 1954, the same year in which the United States Senate censured Senator McCarthy. After more than sixty years in the practice of nursing, Ann Brown Phillips, R.N., retired in the early 1980s. She died in 2001 at the age of 98 in Springfield, Illinois.

Unanswered Questions: An Agenda for the Future

The study of midwifery in the United States has not been neglected (Ettinger 2006; Smith 1995; Swain, Payne, & Spruill 2010). The same can be said for the study of midwifery in Mississippi (Reeb 1992; Roberts & Reeb 1994; Smith 1994, 1995; Swain et al. 2010). Those are broader research studies, however, and they do not focus specifically on a particular locale and the possibility of developing a repertoire of oral histories, the life stories and memories of midwife practitioners, local women rooted in a particular time, place, and culture. The overview provided in this essay cannot tell us very much about the history and significance of the Mississippi midwifery program in Sunflower and its surrounding counties. The purpose of the essay is but to stimulate interest in what might be done rather than an attempt to portray the topic in any degree of fullness. Very likely, too, the particulars of this story as they relate to one white nurse, only recently arrived in the United States, working in the legally segregated South, will get no broader exposure than what is here provided. If these broad outlines do get filled in at some future date, the filling in will be done, the author hopes, by an energetic scholar more capable of undertaking field research than he is. More than a single case-study, however, there is clearly enough work to be done on the history of midwifery in Sunflower County to occupy the time and talents of several such researchers. The topics listed below are merely suggestive of what might be done:

(1) Oral history. While the time is short, it has not yet passed, when an energetic scholar with ethnographic training or more specific training in the collection of oral histories, could gather, record, and preserve a collection of such histories as a contribution to the local history of Sunflower County and its surrounding areas.

(2) The non-profit question: Why was the Rockefeller foundation involved in funding midwifery, and why was it doing so locally and internationally, in Mississippi and in India, but particularly in Sunflower County?
(3) How was the foundation connected to the US Public Health Service, and how did the two entities handle the administration of that program?
(4) How was the internal medical administration handled locally, regionally, and with the national offices of the Public Health Service and the Foundation?
(5) How was the program perceived and received by local Sunflower county elites, black and white, in an era of segregation and white supremacy?
(6) How long did the Rockefeller supported program last: when did it begin (and why); when did it end (and why)?
(7) What were the outcomes in terms of improved health care (reduced infant and maternal mortality, general improvement in pre-natal through post-natal health conditions, etc.) both for the short term and the long term for the people of Indianola, Ruleville, and Sunflower County?

References


**Notes**

1 Ann Brown’s married name was Phillips. During the author’s lifetime his mother consistently spelt her given name Ann, without a terminal e; in the early part of her career, however, she used the spelling Anne. Her birth certificate and British passport use the spelling Annie. Family and friends knew her as Ann B. Phillips, the name as it is recorded on her 1954 United States Naturalization Certificate.

2 The three photos, from the author’s family photo collection, are also available on the website of the Virtual Museum of Public Service, Rutgers University, School of Public Affairs and Administration; http://www.vmps.us/node/456. The value of such photographs to historians of visual culture and specifically for ethnographic research on midwifery is discussed in Keith, Brennan & Reynolds (2012).

3 See the works of Smith (1994; 1995) and Roberts & Reeb (1994) for more information on the history of midwifery in Mississippi and in the United States.

4 In another context, the author (Phillips 2013) has made a plea for the immediate recording and preservation of individual life histories while there is still time to do so. As we move ever farther from the era of legally enforced segregation, we lose at a very rapid rate both the living knowledge of that era as well as the individual and community histories in which that knowledge is embedded. This story of Ann Brown’s work in Mississippi is a case in point: Some information is known but it is now too late to recover the full extent and significance of her work. Those present at the Isaiah T. Montgomery Recognition Symposium in May 2013 were charged with recording and preserving their own histories, their own stories, so that important aspects of the individual, social, community, and political history of race relations in the United States will not be lost due to our own negligent failure to preserve that history for the future.
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Women in Public Service: An Introduction

Victoria Gordon

This issue of Public Voices contains an eclectic collection of both academic and practitioner-based research that, taken together, reminds us of the importance of Public Voices as a forum for voices that are often unheard—that of women in a variety of public sector roles and the importance of these women to public service. In our call for manuscripts for this symposium we requested papers that touched on topics such as: “contemporary and historical studies of the dynamic role of women in public service, women as leaders, overcoming obstacles and barriers faced by women in public service, women as catalysts for organizational and institutional change, priorities and perspectives of women in the workplace, the contribution and challenge of diversity and difference in the public workplace, new and evolving scholarship on emotional labor and the care perspective in public organizations, and the future of women in public service” and amazingly that is exactly what we received. Individually, each piece has value and warrants careful examination. Collectively, the overarching theme that emerges is that women, and their passion to serve, are absolutely crucial to the advancement of public administration—past, present and future.

To begin the collection, Margaret Stout and Jeannine Love in their article entitled “The Unfortunate Misinterpretation of Miss Follett” reflect upon the seminal work of Mary Parker Follett and the all too common misinterpretation of her contribution to public administration and administrative theory. The authors recount some of her theoretical contributions, discuss how her critics and supporters fell short of correctly interpreting what she had to say both at the time of her writings and still today, and they call for scholars to embrace her in their current research. In their paper, Stout and Love describe Follett’s discussion of knowledge production and state that “knowledge is constantly being co-created and recreated anew through active experimentation and integration….She allows for a synthesis of internal and external sources of validation, along with the use of evidence, individual interpretation, and perception in analysis. For Follett truth is not something “out there” to be discovered or verified, but is something that is co-created through the social process, involving the experience of all.” We believe that this symposium answers this call from Follett as presented by Stout and Love to “open ourselves to integrating mul-
multiple perspectives” and by so doing we can come to a greater understanding of the experiences of women in public service by listening to the voices of women with multiple and diverse perspectives.

Next in the collection, Lauren Bock Mullins, in her piece entitled “Pink Tape: A Feminist Theory of Red Tape,” offers a fascinating explanation of how the proverbial but ubiquitous “red tape” of bureaucracy may reinforce the restrictions of the glass ceiling and ultimately stifle the advancement of women in public sector organizations. Mullins first discusses rules and regulations and how rules lead to substantive inequality, and second she discusses how “men and women face different organizational realities” because the misapplication or inconsistent application of rules is often “more problematic for women.” Mullins further suggests that women may become “desensitized” to the effects of red tape because they are so used to adapting to negative or difficult conditions. In so doing, women may unknowingly prevent or impede meaningful organizational change from which they might actually benefit if the proposed changes were enacted or adopted. Mullins calls for an awareness of this “invisible web of influence,” the “pink tape,” which, if directly confronted and fully addressed, might lead us ultimately to meaningful organizational change for women.

Several themes prevalent in the preceding theoretical pieces—administrative discretion, rules, glass ceilings and glass walls are drawn upon in the piece entitled “Gendered Organizations, Care Ethics, and Active Representation” by Beth Rauhaus. In a comparison across two types of state agencies (regulatory and redistributive) in three Southern states—Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina—Rauhaus examines the theory of care ethics and the theory of representative bureaucracy. She specifically looks at the links and the differences between passive and active representation within the context of those providing services to victims of domestic violence. Rauhaus reviews and analyzes agency documents and interviews persons working in corrections and in social services agencies. Her findings suggest that the role of administrative discretion is important in understanding the constraints described by corrections employees on making their own decisions. Conversely, social services employees are more likely to make statements that show they are more comfortable using their own discretion. Rauhaus concludes that there is more active representation occurring in the social service agencies than in the corrections agencies, and she suggests that the care ethic is an important factor in this. She also found evidence of more passive representation occurring at higher levels for females in the social service agencies, and that the presence of passive representation leads to active representation.

In “Engaging Women in Public Leadership in West Virginia,” authors Karen Kunz and Carrie Staton discuss the status of women in elected positions at the national, state and local level—why they are present and why they are absent—and they cite the benefits that arise when there is gender diversity within legislative bodies. The focus of their research is on the reasons for the underrepresentation of women in state executive offices in a very conservative Appalachian region of the country such as West Virginia. Drawing upon four hypotheses—situational, gender role attitudes, political gender role socialization and role model—they explore the question of underrepresentation through interviews with three West Virginia Secretaries of State. Listening to the words of these three women gives us a glimpse into what it might be like to have lived in their shoes. Each tells compelling stories of perseverance and passion for public service. Each recounts obstacles they faced—lack of female role models; balancing family and work responsi-
bilities; gender discrimination; and knowing how to raise campaign funds. They also offer meaningful advice to young women aspiring to serve in elected roles. They suggest young women need to involve themselves in professional organizations and use networking opportunities to seek out female role models and mentors.

Much of the same advice—particularly the importance of mentoring and encouragement from other women—is reinforced in the next piece in the collection which focuses on practitioners in local government management in Illinois. In “Advancing Women in Local Government: The Case of Illinois” Rachel Lange and Kimberly Nelson report the results of a survey of chief administrative officers, assistant CAOs, deputy CAOs, and assistants to the CAOs. They wanted to understand why the number of female local government CAOs in Illinois is disproportionately so low—and has remained unchanged at about 13% since the 1980s. Survey questions focused on the career paths these women took and the professional and organizational barriers they experienced. Intelligence and integrity were the two traits most readily identified by all survey respondents as critical to success in the position of CAO. One focus of the survey centered on balancing family and work responsibilities and how family might impact the goal of rising to the position of CAO. Contrary to expectations based on previous research on a national level, most survey respondents in the position of CAO were married with children—thus dispelling the idea that due to family obligations women might not seek out the top position. Survey findings did report that women working in organizations with a male-dominated culture and with male-dominated councils or governing bodies faced obstacles in achieving the CAO position and faced more challenges if they were in the CAO position.

Next in the collection is a qualitative study of female federal employees by Marissa Martino Golden. In her article entitled “In Their Own Words: The Experiences of Mothers in the Federal Civil Service” Golden also touches on the fact that women are underrepresented at the top levels of federal service, and she focuses on the importance of family-friendly workplace policies that can be utilized by federal employees—parental leave; on-site child care; flexible work hours; part-time work options; and telecommuting. From the interviews we come to a deeper understanding of how important each of these benefits is to the success of women. This study also demonstrates how important qualitative research is, as it would not be possible to get to the same level of understanding through the usual survey methods. Golden points out that family-friendly policies may not be utilized by women due to their fear of the stigma that male colleagues or supervisors often attach to the use of such policies. Or, if utilized, her results suggest that women may stay at a mid-level manager position or not seek advancement opportunities in order to keep the number of hours worked per week at a reasonable level, thereby keeping their work/family obligations in balance. Golden found, too, that women fully recognize that they are making this trade off, and yet it is this trade off that keeps women from reaching proportionate representation at the higher levels of employment in federal service. Women deliberately make this choice because they feel it is best for their children and families.

Rounding out the symposium are four book reviews. In the first book review, Lorenda Naylor reviews *Maternity Leave: Policy and Practice* by Gordon which is a qualitative study of women from the fields of higher education and the pharmaceutical industry who recently utilized maternity leave. As found in the previous article, women often do not fully use maternity leave benefits or FMLA benefits available to them because of how it will be perceived by colleagues and
supervisors. In addition to extensive interviews with women about their experiences and perceptions, this book covers relevant legislation, types of maternity leave offered as an employee benefit, an overview of women’s health care as it relates to issues of maternity leave, a comparison of maternity and paternity leave policies available in other countries, and concludes with suggestions for policy change that would include the adoption of paid maternity leave.

In the second book review, Patricia Alt reviews *Professor Mommy: Finding Work-Family Balance in Academia* by Connelly and Ghodsee. These authors discuss the challenges of combining motherhood and working in a higher education environment. Several myths are presented and dispelled, and the authors suggest meaningful ways to identify personal and professional goals, manage the choices made, and achieve what is important to the individual both as a parent and as an academician.

Shannon Vaughan reviews *Women, Wealth and Giving: The Virtuous Legacy of the Boom Generation* by Damen and McCuistion. These authors examine the role of women in philanthropy and how this giving impacts the public interest. They focus on women who are part of the baby boom generation and on their collective view of charitable giving, a view influenced in part by their financial independence and how such financial independence differs from the status of previous generations of women.

Finally, Sharon Mastracci reviews *Women and Public Service: Barriers, Challenges, and Opportunities* by Alkadry and Tower. These authors address diversity and representative bureaucracy and the legislation intended to help women in the workplace, and they explore the importance of subsequent outcomes of cases settled in the courts. In part, these authors seek to explain the impact of continued pay inequities, while also addressing the social costs that occur when women forgo work goals for family goals. The authors challenge us to consider the costs to society; to the organization; to the family; and to the individual. Most importantly, these authors identify opportunities for meaningful change.

In public administration, we often ask our students and our employees to think about why something is considered a “public” problem. We ask them to attempt to understand who and what matters in any issue that they try to analyze. We ask them to consider what is morally and legally the right thing to do. We ask them to consider their use of administrative discretion. We ask them to consider the power that government workers have over citizens they serve and the employees they manage. We challenge them to do no harm, and we ask them to consider what they owe future generations in terms of the decisions they make today. We hope you will agree that each of the pieces included in this symposium warrants a place in the discussion of women in public service because each touches on one or more of these considerations.

We hope you find value in this collection, and that you will invite others to read and discuss these topics in the classroom, in the workplace, and at home. We hope that you will find a renewed sense of passion for public service, that you will do your part to ensure that women are valued in your organization, and that where and when you can, you too will advocate for and bring about meaningful institutional and organizational change.
Dr. Victoria Gordon is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science, and she serves as the director of the Center for Local Governments and as the director of the Master of Public Administration Program at Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky. She earned her Doctor of Public Administration degree from the University of Illinois—Springfield. Her areas of research interest include municipal finance, regional economic development, and human resources management.
The Unfortunate Misinterpretation of Miss Follett

Margaret Stout and Jeannine M. Love

Mary Follett\(^1\) has enjoyed a resurgence of attention in the management professions following the reprint of some of her essays in the edited volume *Mary Parker Follett, Prophet of Management: A Celebration of Writings from the 1920s* (Graham 1995b), the reprinting of her key works *The New State: Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government* (Follett 1998) and *Creative Experience* (Follett 1924), as well as the reprinting of both collections of her papers *Dynamic Administration* (Metcalf & Urwick 2003) and *Freedom & Co-ordination* (Urwick 2013). Based on a forthcoming book (Stout, Love, & Patalon 2014), this paper will summarize her thinking\(^2\) and discuss the manner in which it is frequently misinterpreted in the literature, arguing that these misunderstandings are due to a lack of awareness of, or ability to grasp, her underlying relational process ontology—one that is distinctly “culturally ‘feminine’” (Stivers 2002, 128; 2000).

The Importance of Follett’s Feminine Public Voice

Follett was both a woman in public service in myriad roles from social worker to presidential advisor (Tonn 2003) and a female public intellectual giving voice to what would later be called a feminist perspective (Banerjee 2008; Kaag 2008; Mansbridge 1998; McLarney and Rhyno 1999; Morton and Lindquist 1997; Nickel and Eikenberry 2006; Pratt 2011; Stivers 1990; Witt 2007). However, Follett herself did not claim to be part of the women’s movement in her time. Instead, she pursued a non-gendered understanding of human being: “The essence of the woman movement is not that women as women should have the vote, but that women as individuals should have the vote. There is a fundamental distinction here” (Follett 1998, 171).

Biographer Joan Tonn (2003) shows that during her lifetime, Follett’s perspective was highly regarded and respected, particularly within philosophical circles in the academy and among management and administrative leaders in both business and government. In fact, *The New State* sold well enough to be reprinted five times in the early 1920s. Similarly, *Creative Experience* “was widely reviewed in the academic and popular press and with one exception was received very favorably” (Tonn 2003, 384). In his review, sociologist Charles A. Ellwood assessed every
chapter as “‘a vital contribution to social theory,’” calling Follett “‘the foremost woman thinker along social and political lines of our time, and perhaps one of the most philosophical thinkers in the field of social theory of all time’” (as quoted in Tonn 2003, 385). Her continued work was published posthumously in two collections of essays, *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett* (Metcalf & Urwick 1941) and *Freedom & Co-ordination: Lectures in Business Organisation by Mary Parker Follett* (Urwick 1949), both of which have enjoyed multiple reprints in the following decades.

However, in these works, Follett was unafraid to “offer audacious argument on behalf of deeply held democratic beliefs” (Barber 1998, xvi). For example, “a vivid rhetoric permeates *The New State*, and more than one reviewer would find fault with it” (Tonn 2003, 301). Thus, her “sometimes passionate prose made [political scientists] uneasy” (Tonn 2003, 307). Harold Laski wrote that *The New State* “‘suffers from being written in a hideous journalese that deprives it of no small part of its effectiveness’” (as quoted in Tonn 2003, 306). Furthermore, because she “was writing with the language of her time—a language heavily influenced by Hegelian idealism” (Mansbridge 1998, xxvi), “her declaration that the state is the ultimate group . . . could have had dangerous implications in an era that saw the rise of totalitarian governments in Europe” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 117). As a result, O’Connor (2000) reflects, “I think much of her history has to do with her political incorrectness. She was a Hegelian at a time when the power of the state, particularly the German state, was increasingly suspect” (187).

Indeed, “from the 1930s until very recently, Follett was ‘subversive’” (Drucker 1995, 1). Ideas like constructive conflict leading to integration were “unintelligible” in the 1930s and 1940s (Drucker 1995, 4). As a result, for several decades leading into, during and following World War II, Follett’s work was marginalized and discredited as unimportant. By 1950, “she had become a nonperson” (Drucker 1995, 2), or at best “a cult figure” (Bennis 1995, 177).

However, upon her rediscovery in contemporary organizational theory, renewed interest in her work blossomed. As management expert Warren Bennis puts it, her “remarkable body of writing was not only ahead of her time but was at an angle to the time she was writing about” (1995, 181). Scholars and practitioners alike marveled at her innovative brilliance and “the richness of her perceptions and the completeness of her coverage” (Lawrence 1995, 291), so much so that she was given the moniker “prophet of management” (Drucker 1995, 9).

Ahead of her time, Follett’s theorizing was Romantic, “but not all starry-eyed” (Parker 1995, 290). Indeed, management expert Rosabeth Moss Kanter believes “Mary Parker Follett was a quintessential utopian and a romantic…” (1995, xvii) but in the critical sense described by Yeats as one “who rose against the Age of Enlightenment with its overconfidence in reason and systems” (Parker 1995, 287). In his review of *The New State* in the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Harry A. Overstreet characterized it as “‘a philosophy come back to earth. The One and the Many are there; the Universal and the Particular; Monism and Pluralism; objectivism and subjectivism; real personality; unity of opposites; compenetration, and all the rest; but they do not float in the metaphysical ethers. They are tied to the homely behaviors of men and women in society’” (as quoted in Tonn 2003, 305). In his introduction to *Freedom & Co-ordination*, Lyndall Urwick warns “if any reader feels disposed to question the validity of Mary Parker Follett’s reasoning on the ground that she was not a ‘practical man’—she was a
woman who never attempted to manage a business in her life—he is urged to turn to David Lilienthal’s own account of the brilliantly successful experiment he directed [Tennessee Valley Authority]. He will find there example after example of the application in practice of every one of the principles which she had developed theoretically” (Urwick 1949, xiv). In short, Follett succeeds where so many others fail—in his review of Creative Experience, sociologist Arthur E. Wood stated that the “genius of Miss Follett’s work lies in her effective synthesis of theory and practice” (as quoted in Tonn 2003, 385).

Follett’s synthesis reflects her sentiments on the manner in which women should be understood and considered as governance actors are informed by deep philosophical study and her articulation of a cohesive understanding of ontology, psychosocial theory, belief, and epistemology, along with their application to ethics, political theory, economic theory, and administrative theory (Stout et al. 2014). Each element builds upon the others, with her relational process ontology expressing itself through all of the other theoretical layers in what she sees as a “self-creating coherence” (Follett 1924, 74-75). Through this conceptual consistency, she critiques existing frameworks based on both idealism and realism in the form of positivism and behaviorism, while promoting an alternative pragmatist framework based on her relational process ontology. As she puts it, “Idealism and realism meet in the actual” (Follett 1919, 587). She asserts that “the essence of this . . . is as important for ethics as for physiology or psychology; for sociology its value is inestimable” (Follett 1924, 88). But perhaps more importantly, it should be the basis of all types of social action—in “politics, industry and law” (Follett 1924, 74-75).

While it is quite difficult to summarize her thinking briefly due to its thoroughness and complexity, a sketch of her key principles can provide a serviceable picture of her approach against which to measure other scholars’ interpretations.

**Follett’s Thinking in Brief**

Follett draws from a plethora of academic disciplines (philosophy, political theory, sociology, psychology, biology, and physiology) and theory that “informs her thought” (Tonn 2003, 267). However, it could be argued that her principal sources are members of the group of Cambridge, Massachusetts intellectuals with whom she studied and socialized (Stout & Staton 2011): American pragmatists William James and Josiah Royce; process philosopher Alfred North Whitehead; Gestalt psychologist Gordon Allport; Freudian psychologist Edwin Holt; philosophers Richard and Ella Cabot, and legal theorist Roscoe Pound. The following subsections detail the various principles drawn from these sources that contribute to her thinking. For the sake of brevity, this paper will refrain from extensive quotation and refer instead to an explication in longer form (see Stout et al. 2014).

**Ontology**

Drawing on her metaphor of weaving, Follett’s ontology entails a number of principles that compose the warp of her philosophy, upon which the wefts of all other conceptual elements are woven: holism, dynamic becoming, relation and relativity, and co-creation. Following her oft-used term of *interweaving*, these ontological principles combine to frame a relational process on-
ology that she describes with terms like *interpenetration*, *interweaving*, *interpermeation*, *integration*, *harmonization*, *intermingle*, *interrelating*, *co-adaptation*, *inter-individual*, and *synthesis*. At all times she infers both dynamism and wholeness, and the ontological impossibility of dualisms and hierarchy (Stout 2012). In this way, she seeks to integrate the classical argument over existence as One versus Many into a quality of being that is innately sought: “Wholeness is an irresistible force compelling every member” (Follett 1998, 83). “This is the process of life, always unifying through the interpenetration of the Many—Oneness an infinite goal” (Follett 1998, 284).

Follett calls this wholeness “the total situation,” a “happy phrase showing the importance of the outer object of situation as constituent of the behavior process” (Follett 1924, 55). However, she is careful to note that this wholeness is composing rather than encompassing—a “whole a-making: . . . whole and parts in . . . active and continuous relation to each other” (Follett 1924, 102). She explains this co-creative process using “the doctrine of circular response” (Follett 1924, 116) which describes “reciprocal influence” in the “evolving situation” (Follett 1924, 57). With these relational, dynamic assumptions, Follett plays the monists against the pluralists, suggesting, “our loyalty is neither to imaginary wholes nor to chosen wholes, but is an integral part of that activity which is at the same time creating me” (Follett 1919, 579).

In sum, at the level of ontology, Follett prefigures her three primary, cross-cutting principles: integration, the situation, and the law of the situation. But to arrive at the fullness of these principles, we must add additional elements of theory. We turn first to psychosocial theory.

**Psychosocial Theory**

The first weft thread Follett weaves onto the warp of her relational process ontology is her understanding of *human* being in particular; addressing what she argues are fundamental misunderstandings of the individual and the group. Drawing from psychoanalytic and gestalt theory, Follett argues that true individuals are connected at an ontological level through circular response; however, conscious, active integration is necessary to foster a social bond. True individuals and groups are relating to one another and to their parts within the total situation. Therefore, individuals themselves, and groups of all sizes and types, are wholes a-making that are engaged in circular response as part of the situation a-making. Follett argues, “This pregnant truth . . . is the basic truth for all the social sciences” (Follett 1924, 63).

**Belief**

Follett does not explicate deeply or dwell upon matters of belief and her comments tend to be inconsistent, sometimes referring to theistic concepts and sometimes referring to humanist concepts. However, she tends toward the latter, and like Dewey (1934), Follett aims toward a public faith or a particular type of humanism that holds sacred the spiritual aspects of the socially embedded self: “We believe in the sacredness of all our life; we believe that Divinity is forever incarnating in humanity, and so we believe in Humanity and the common daily life of all men” (Follett 1998, 244). Therefore, “democracy is faith in humanity . . . a great spiritual unity which is supported by the most vital trend in philosophical thought and by the latest biologists and social psychologists” (Follett 1998, 156). As described, Follett’s source of being is decidedly not
transcendent, and while it is not theistic in the end, it is sacred, multidimensional, and inclusive of nonhuman beings in a manner that exceeds the limits of natural humanism.

**Epistemology**

Much of Follett’s epistemological explication is contained in *Creative Experience* and reflects her relational process ontology and resulting integrative psychosocial identity and condition. As such, knowledge is constantly being co-created and recreated anew through active experimentation and integration. Follett’s pragmatist epistemology rejects the foundational approaches of empiricism, rationalism, and idealism, along with any form of static truth they might produce. Instead, she allows for a synthesis of internal and external sources of validation, along with the use of evidence, individual interpretation, and perception in analysis. For Follett truth is not something “out there” to be discovered or verified, but is something that is co-created through the social process, involving the experience of all. She calls for all of us “to base our life on actual experience, of my own plus that of others” (Follett 1924, 29). In doing so we employ what she refers to as a “scientific attitude of mind” (Follett 1924, 29). We also open ourselves to the integrating of multiple perspectives, creating knowledge by “watching varying activities in their relatings to other varying activities” (Follett 1924, 68) within the total situation. Therefore, Follett’s methodology for knowledge production is applicable to any process through which integration is possible.

**Ethics**

Follett carries forward her understanding of the dynamic, relational individual into her ethics, asserting, “the essence of this psychology . . . is as important for ethics as for physiology or psychology” (Follett 1924, 88). For Follett, however, the “ethical unit” is the group, not the individual (Follett 1924, 112), and it is the social process which is the source of ethics, as opposed to an external source of any type. Thus, ethics is not the substance of the collective will but has the process of creating as its “germinating centre [sic]” (Follett 1998, 49).

Following her philosophical approach, the process of generating an ethic is integrative and relational rather than procedural and formal, and she claims, “We are evolving now a system of ethics which has three conceptions in regard to right, conscience and duty” (Follett 1998, 52). Thus, her explication is structured around the ethical concepts of right, purpose, loyalty, and obedience; all reinterpreted from her relational process perspective. In short, none of these concepts can be legitimately determined outside of inclusive group processes of dialogue and integration. Through integration, a public ethic is generated that is mutualistic and in which all share responsibility for demanding and giving obedience through a sense of loyalty that is experientially founded. This basis in subject-subject relations produces a sense of fellowship that transforms justice from a hierarchical structure of sympathy to an egalitarian foundation of empathetic understanding.

**Political Theory**

During her social work career, Follett “became interested in the intellectual justifications for the social centers movement” (Mattson 1998, xxxviii). Her experiences in the field “made Follett sure that democracy could be more than an abstract ideal. It must, she insisted, become a lived
reality, a vigorous daily practice” (Mattson 1998, liv). Thus, Follett’s primary concern is modes of association in human groups, preferring direct participation to representative forms of group governance at any scale and in any sector of society. She also believes in a deeply nested and broadly inclusive federalism that grows out of associations at the neighborhood level to maintain local autonomy, while unifying ever more inclusive groups all the way to the global scope. Follett insists “the aim and the process of the organisation [sic] of government, of industry, of international relations, should be, I think, a control not imposed from without the regular functioning of society, but one which is a co-ordinating of all those functions, that is, a collective self-control” (Follett 1949c, 89). In her view, such self-governing is the only source of true democratic legitimacy.

Follett’s political theory is unique because it stands firmly on a foundation of co-creation, refusing the notion of representation outside of a fully communicative and responsive approach that is also dynamic and changing according to the total situation. Her understanding of a relational People that can only be created through active participation fits the political theory of social anarchism, while her understanding of leadership as emergent from the situation embodies structured nonhierarchical social interaction. Thus, in what she calls “true democracy” (Follett 1998, 156), several familiar conceptual elements are fundamentally redefined: (1) politics is a creative process of integration; (2) democratic values of freedom and equality are relational power-with; (3) the People is a dynamic, relational whole composed through a deeply nested, broadly inclusive federalism; (4) representation is dynamic and determined by the law of the situation; and (5) the state is a convener and facilitator of integration.

**Economic Theory**

Follett spent the latter part of her life investigating how her principles can be applied to industry. Follett notes, “Here the ideal and the practical have joined hands” (Follett 1926, 75) and so business is a perfect venue in which to illustrate her pragmatic philosophy. “For Follett, a business was not merely an economic unity but a social agency that was a significant part of society” (Graham 1995a, 19). To her, “business and society are not discrete fields of human activity—they are so inextricably interwoven as to be conceptually and analytically inseparable. Business and society are infinitely interpenetrative, and neither can be usefully understood in isolation of the other” (Parker 1995, 283).

Follett sees “the central problem of social relations” (Follett 1924, xiii) to be the question of power; including economic power among competitors as well as between consumer and producer, capital and labor, and industry and society. In applying her relational process concepts to economics, Follett imagines a change underway: “it is significant that two ideas which so long existed together are disappearing together—namely, business as trading, and managing as manipulating” (Follett 1941b, 144). She envisions a new economic system that would have a purpose of creative production through cooperative competition and emergent self-governance. While markets would remain, they would be transformed into a functional unity with the same democratic operating principles as government.
Administrative Theory

Bringing her philosophy and theory to bear on the problem of organizational administration, Follett begins with a critique of the leading theory at the time: the scientific management of industrial engineer Frederick Taylor (1911). Whereas many see in Taylorism a technique to achieve top-down efficiency (Tonn 2003), Follett envisions scientific management not as static and hierarchical, but as dynamic and relational. This leads her to affirm a scientific management in which coordination happens through “unifying” as “a process, not as a product” (Follett 1941e, 195). This process emerges as an interweaving ofunities, the result of the relating of individuals and functions within the organization. For Follett, then, “relatedness” is identified as her “key word of organization” (1941c, 258).

This relational process approach to management leads Follett to develop two key principles of administrative theory: (1) functional unifying in which interrelated parts are mutually and dynamically influencing; and (2) authority as a group process where all follow “what the situation demands” (Follett 1949b, 22) rather than as something that “filters down to those below” (Follett 1949a, 43). In essence, these two characteristics fundamentally change the goal of scientific management and the role of the manager in pursuit of that goal, respectively.

These two concepts are cross-cutting in their implications for every aspect of administrative practice: hierarchical organizing style shifts to workplace democracy; functional division of labor under managerial control becomes an ongoing process of facilitated coordination; positional role definition must instead respond to the demands of the situation; unity of command with strict oversight is redefined as shared leadership and responsibility that are determined by the authority of the situation; and the role of managers in directing planning and decision making is guided by functional unity rather than positional power. Thus, Follett reconceives principles of administration, including: organizing style, the giving of orders, coordination, leadership, responsibility, and planning and decision-making.

In sum, Follett’s administrative theory focuses on the mechanisms through which the process of true democracy can be facilitated by administrative experts and engaged in by those experts along with all other affected people. Authority must be shared by all in regard to activities of social concern, including community and workplace issues. The methods used to know whether or not this is happening consider both process and outcomes that are proven to be collaborative, consensus derived, and making use of all capabilities and functions available in the group. The organizing style employs the form of true democracy—integrating federations of small groups—wherein participants are enabled to pursue coordinated activity with emergent and dynamic leadership based on the needs of the situation and the capacities of those involved. Thus, anyone can be a leader and an expert, and in this sense everyone is an administrator.

Cross-Cutting Concepts

Through her careful interpretation of meanings in the varied theoretical sources upon which she draws, Follett formulates a set of concepts that appear and reappear as they are developed throughout the elements of her thinking: integrative process, the situation, and the law of the sit-
Integration is arguably Follett’s foundational concept, which she applies equally to physical existence, the individual psyche, and groups of human beings in all social contexts (Follett 1924, 57). Follett describes integration as “the basic law of life” (Follett 1941a, 65). She explains that the dynamic process of circular response or the “the doctrine of circular or integrative behavior” (Follett 1924, xv) can be found in chemistry, engineering, and relativity theory in physics (Follett 1924, 73-74) and is “the psychological term for the deepest truth of life” (Follett 1924, 116). However, more often, her term integration depicts the intentional process of creating “functional unity” (Follett 1924, 256) emerging from the co-creative process of individuals actively engaging in circular behavior. Therefore, “there is a technique for integration” (Follett 1949b, 68).

For Follett, integration is both relational and a process. It is relational because it occurs between: different dimensions of the individual (physical, intellectual, emotional, spiritual, etc.); individuals and individuals in the group; individuals and the situation; the group and the situation; groups and groups; groups and groups and the situation; and so forth all the way out to what she calls “the total situation” (Follett 1924, 55). In short, there is nothing but integration among parts comprising the whole of the universe: “reality is in the relating, in the activity-between” (Follett 1924, 54). Furthermore, integration is a process because it never reaches a permanent point of stasis. Follett insists “there is no result of process but only a moment in process” (Follett 1924, 60); therefore “the process must be emphasized rather than product, that the process is continuous, and that the making of wholes and the breaking of wholes are equally important” (Follett 1924, 102). Thus, rather than describing integration, Follett often refers to integrating (1919, 576).

The Situation

For Follett, the situation is also both relational and dynamic. It is relational because it is always involved in the process of integration. Follett suggests that the phrase “total relativity” is “rather clumsy,” but she is “trying to express a total which shall include all the factors in a situation not as an additional total but as a relational total—a total where each part has been permeated by every other part” (Follett 1949c, 79). In other words, the parts “all together constitute a certain situation, but they constitute that situation through their relation to one another. They don’t form a total situation merely by existing side by side” (Follett 1949c, 79). Furthermore, the situation is dynamic because “there are ‘progressive integrations’” (Follett 1924, 146) in “what might be called the evolving situation” (Follett 1924, 55).

The Law of the Situation

Pulling together the notion of intentional integration within the total situation, Follett suggests that individual and group action should follow from what the emergent situation requires; what she calls “the law of the situation” (Follett 1941d, 104). This includes all environmental and so-
cial aspects of the total situation, with full consideration of those not actually present in the moment. As she explains, “We want to find the law of the situation in the situation and yet still be guided by law and not by personal or national whims or a narrow self-interest” (Follett 1924, 152). This method rectifies power relationships in all social contexts: “If both sides obey the law of the situation, no person has power over another” (Follett 1941d, 105). This is the foundation of Follett’s notion of shared power wherein “genuine power is power-with, pseudo power, power-over” (Follett 1924, 189).14

**Essential Misinterpretations**

While not offering analysis or detailed explanation, Tonn (2003) argues that many scholars have misinterpreted Follett’s work from the beginning of her writing career, reflecting “a fundamental misunderstanding of Follett’s argument—a misunderstanding that persists to this day” (308). Some note that this may be due to reliance on second-hand interpretations: “I would suggest reading the front matter by Barber, Mansbridge and Mattson after completing the book. While these scholars summarize accurately, their reviewing of the cold facts and opinions expressed in the text misses Follett’s passion and intensity. Read her words, for one learns through her writing” (Cunningham 2000, 91). We suggest that it is much more than careful reading—these scholars may *summarize* accurately, but they often do not *interpret* correctly. Stivers (2006) supports this assessment of key public administration scholars, noting that even Dwight Waldo (see 1952 p. 96) misunderstood Follett’s view of conflict. Due to these widespread misunderstandings, “Follett’s ideas constitute a difference that public administration has never integrated” (Stivers 2006, 475).

To support this claim, this section will offer a number of examples in which Follett’s thinking is misinterpreted. Our goal in doing so is not to make a mean-spirited critique, but rather to call for a general clarification of Follett’s thinking and an appreciation of the fullness of her contribution to political and administrative theory. Given the robust nature of Follett’s theoretical approach, selecting only elements of her thought for consideration is a practice that lends itself readily to misinterpretation. This is because Follett’s administrative theory is the *culmination* of her body of thought; the level of analysis at which both her philosophical (ontology, psychosocial theory, belief, and epistemology) and practice-oriented theories (ethics, political theory, and economic theory) all move into action as an integrated whole.

Further, Ryan and Rutherford (2000) note that Follett’s statements are often misconstrued when taken individually and when interpreted from the dichotomous perspective typically held in social science. Follett herself noted this trend: “A very able political scientist writing of leadership treats it as a tropism and discusses why men obey or do not obey, why they tend to lead or follow, as if leading and following were the essence of leadership. Yet this very man has made valuable studies in leadership and the whole trend of his thinking on this subject seems away from this stereotype, yet at that moment, when talking directly of leadership, he reverts to the old idea and speaks of the leadership situation as one of command and obedience” (Follett 1941f, 289-290). Thus, when her ideas are taken out of the context of her body of thought, her unique *feminist* voice is lost—often reinterpreted through the very dualistic lenses she is refusing. Without actively interpreting Follett’s work through the lens of her process relational ontology, there is a
danger of reverting to such dualisms. Thus, the other elements must be fully understood and considered to avoid misinterpretation.

**Misinterpretations in Management**

Like many during the Progressive Era, Follett was an active reader of the *Bulletin of the Taylor Society* (Tonn 2003, 397) and the influence of scientific management is apparent in her work. Like Taylor, Follett argues “the most fundamental ideas in business today, that which is permeating our whole thinking on business organisation [sic], is that of function. Every man performs a function or part of a function. Research and scientific study determine function in scientifically managed plants” (Follett 1949d, 1). Furthermore, she asserts that “there should be no haziness in regard to employee functioning in a managerial capacity; the limits of such functioning should be frankly and sharply defined” (Follett 1941a, 88-89), and “to be honest and clear-cut in delimiting function is, I believe, essential to the success of the redistribution of function” (Follett 1941a, 89). Therefore, she calls for extending “the scientific standard” which Follett insists “must be applied to the whole of business management” (Follett 1941d, 122).

From these comments, it is clear that Follett’s administrative theory could be interpreted as a classical scientific management approach. Even Ryan and Rutherford (2000) suggest that she was an advocate of hierarchy and strong leaders, fully contradicting their assertion that her underlying philosophy eschews such dualisms. As Child (1995, 88, emphasis added) observes, “when British management writers (including Urwick) looked to synthesize the ideas of the two thinkers [Mayo and Follett] into a common managerial philosophy, they adopted a vision of *paternalistic*, top-down management that came primarily from Mayo and his colleagues and that was, in fact, intrinsically alien to Follett’s basic premises.” Stivers (2006) suggests Follett’s accommodation of hierarchy in organizational contexts was a submission to the law of the situation in order to speak across paradigms. “Yet its effect has been to encourage reading of Follett as a fellow traveler of capitalism or as a member of the human relations movement” (Stivers 2006, 476).

Perpetuating the assumption that she was aligned with scientific management, Follett has been misinterpreted by some as suggesting a means of management manipulation of subordinates and as only proposing a management technique (Child 1969). In such truncated understandings, the law of the situation is interpreted to mean only “an analysis of the situation of both management and workers” (Boje & Rosile 2001, 108). While this is certainly an aspect of integration applied to the workplace, it is a severely truncated understanding that perpetuates a vision of management and workers as static parts, rather than relating and dynamic functions.

To correct these misconceptions, while Follett supports the scientific study of administration, she believes that when organizational functions are isolated, scientific study is “applied to only one part” (Follett 1941d, 122), to the “the technical side, as it is usually called” (Follett 1941d, 123). It has not been applied “on the personnel side, a knowledge of how to deal fairly and fruitfully with one’s fellows. . . . That is, one part of business management rested on science; the other part it was thought, never could” (Follett 1941d, 123). Furthermore, “this divorcing of persons and the situation does a great deal of harm” (Follett 1941b, 60). To rectify scientific management, Follett argues that interpersonal cooperation and coordination of function are essential to func-
tional unity, which must be sought through “unifying” as “a process, not as a product” (Follett 1941e, 195). In this way, while Taylor’s “scientific management depersonalizes; the deeper philosophy of scientific management shows us personal relations within the whole setting of that thing of which they are a part” (Follett 1941b, 60). Here, Follett herself notes that without fundamental reinterpretation from a basis of relational process ontology, the concepts of scientific management are wrongheaded.

Unfortunately, such “paternalistic” misinterpretations are not limited to those who would critique Follett’s ideas. As a result, one management consultant gives a scathing critique in his review of the Graham (1995b) book’s commentaries, stating, “Most of these reveal some or all of the commentators’ lack of understanding of the material they deign to remark upon, their breathtaking self-absorption and arrogance as they condescend to express their admiration for her at the same time that they misrepresent her thinking as foreshadowing their own, and their lack of the unprepossessing forward-looking, dynamic instincts with which Follett’s work was imbued” (Stroup 2007). Although biting, Stroup’s (2007) point is well-taken—even some of her greatest proponents fail to understand her fundamental principles. For example, historian Kevin Mattson argues, “It is my contention that Follett was at her best when thinking not about private enterprise but about the nature of American politics and political life” (Mattson 1998, xxxi). In this suggestion, he has missed Follett’s vision entirely—that democracy must be a way of life in all arenas of social life.

Indeed, Follett was highly concerned about the political economy as a whole. Kanter argues, “When Follett wrote that ‘cut-throat’ competition is beginning to go out of fashion’ and that despite competition among firms, ‘the cooperation between them is coming to occupy a larger and larger place,’ she was wrong. . . . At least in America. At least then” (1995, xviii). However, it can be argued that Follett was only partially wrong. She hoped that in the form of trade unions and other business-oriented cooperatives the group-spirit would thrive. However, what occurred instead is a business-against-society trend in which businesses banded together for their shared self-interest without regard for the greater good. In short, the appearance of cooperation was merely a broadening of the “us” against a common “them” in the status quo competitive mode of association. Yet when one looks at the Mondragon region of Spain (Cheney 2001; Ormaechea 2001) as an exemplar, there exist examples of the cooperative competition Follett described.

Continuing on the point of societal power, although they have a clear understanding of Follett’s application of power-with to the workplace in her later writings (e.g., Dynamic Administration), Boje & Rosile (2001) miss the systemic manner in which she addresses power-with at the societal level of analysis in her earlier work. She is not simply focused on “the day-to-day mundane work spaces” (Boje & Rosile 2001, 107). In her body of work, Follett explores how power plays out in political, legal, and economic systems and situations as well. Nor should her admission that power-with is most difficult in industry be interpreted to mean that power-over may never be eliminated (Boje & Rosile 2001; Eylon 1998; Nohria 1995; Pratt 2011). Nohria (1995) articulates this common concern: “I fear that’s what inevitably happens to efforts to introduce a more egalitarian and participative system of authority and explains the short half-life of earlier attempts to create organizations that presented an alternative to hierarchy. . . . someone must make a tough decision, a decision that inevitably will be contested by those who lose out” (161-162). In this assertion, he is suggesting that domination is an inherent, rather than learned behavior—
thus ignoring Follett’s support from philosophy, physics, biology, and psychology that buttresses the contrary argument.

It is more accurate, based on her full body of work, to suggest that Follett believed power-with would be possible if society were to be run as a true democracy. Thus, while Boje and Rosile (2001) formulate an interesting complementarity between Follett and Clegg’s Foucauldian approach to power, it is, in a sense, superfluous. In fact, in focusing only on her notion of power-with, they miss entirely Follett’s explication of integration, arguably the precursor of win-win results they instead attribute to Clegg. They could have made their argument simply by drawing more fully from Follett. In short, one cannot pick up Dynamic Administration or Freedom & Coordination and fully grasp its meaning without having The New State, “Community as a Process,” and Creative Experience under one’s belt.

From these types of misunderstandings of power-with, Kolb (1996) demonstrates through a careful analysis of the conflict resolution literature that the manner in which most in the field apply the concept of integration is actually based on the assumption of atomistic self-interest in which any regard for the other is from an instrumental perspective. We agree: without an understanding of relational process ontology, integration appears to be some form of compromise—the meeting somewhere between two static positions through a negotiation process or worse—through pure domination. Such understandings are fundamentally mistaken. Similarly, Mattson (1998) seems to ignore the many instances in which Follett notes conflict, disruption, and disintegration as part and parcel of the social process, and acknowledges issues that cannot be integrated within the situation at hand. Other scholars argue that because of this admission, Follett provides only a partial theory (Fox 1968; Fry & Thomas 1996). This seems to be nit-picking as it is quite obvious based on her critique of the three available alternatives—integration, compromise, and domination—she clearly believes compromise is the lesser of two evils and would be preferred over domination when integration fails.

Some scholars simply disagree with or fundamentally misunderstand Follett’s relational process ontology. For example, without explanation Fry and Thomas (1996) argue that “Follett’s writings are driven by a questionable philosophical premise [sic]” (18). While they do not fully explain that grounding, a typical claim made against Follett is that she is too idealistic. For example, Stever (1986) mischaracterizes her idealism as merely “shrewdly veneered” with pragmatism (274). Mattson characterizes her ontological law of circular response as imaginary: “People cannot always achieve unity. To uphold unity as a social good and attainable ideal is fine; to believe that unity is based on an objective law ignores reality. By creating a fictional law and by ignoring the fact that political conflict may often be agonal and strained, Follett weakened her more powerful and interesting ideas on the contingency of politics” (1998, lv). He ignores that fact that her argument is made at an ontological level—principles which necessitate reality. If he understood relational process ontology, he would see that unity is never achieved; it is simply a temporary endpoint of every integration; of which the ontological process of circular response is a part.

Other scholars argue that Follett provides too little practical application. For example, after studying her body of work for a dissertation, Fox claims, “She has nothing useful to tell us about organizational structures or administrative devices” (1968, 527). He clearly missed her explana-
tions of federalism and the manner in which groups nest and interlock to form ever wider unities. Furthermore, he must have missed her many explanations of leadership, functional coordination, and the like—all of which are presented as administrative devices within networked organizational structures devised for coordinating functions. Similarly, Fry and Thomas (1996) suggest that Follett gives little concrete advice on how to transform crowds into groups. Yet, Follett’s entire explication of integration as the intentional pursuit of circular response is for that specific objective. She even presents it as a method: “Those who accept integration rather than compromise or domination as the law of social relations will seek the method” (Follett 1924, 165) and then goes on to explain its component processes. Clearly, these authors have not taken note of the myriad illustrations Follett provides using practical examples, particularly in her later works.

There are also some who argue that Follett’s practical application leads to outcomes at odds with her theoretical underpinnings. For instance, Fry and Thomas (1996) argue that her discussion of the State has authoritarian implications. In so claiming, they miss all of the caveats she explains in detail for how the New State must be configured so as not to manifest such tendencies, including her bold critique of Hegel himself: “But there is the real Hegel and the Hegel who misapplied his own doctrine, who preached the absolutism of a Prussian State” (Follett 1998, 267). Such misinterpretations suggest a commitment to dualisms on the part of the reader, not an underlying contradiction in Follett’s theory.

**Misinterpretation in Public Administration**

In the field of public administration, there is one misinterpretation in particular that must be fully explicated. A resurgence of attention to Follett in both political and management theory led to her inclusion in *Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo* (Fry & Raadschelders 2008). The publisher’s marketing materials describe the book as offering “insightful narrative the [sic] explores and analyzes the research, writing, thinking, theorizing, and long-term impact of such luminaries as . . . Mary Parker Follett…” On the book jacket, leading theorists David Rosenbloom, Richard Stillman, and Gary Wamsley embrace the book as a classroom staple. Thus, it is clearly one of the most important sources of guidance to graduate students of public administration as they establish theoretical foundations for their practice.

Unfortunately, while the chapter on Mary Follett contains a well-rounded literature review and an excellent summarization of her core principles, the organization of the material leaves something to be desired. First, Follett’s principles are divided into The Group Process, The State and Social Life, and Group Process and the Industrial Organization based on primary sources (*Creative Experience*, *The New State*, and the papers in *Dynamic Administration*, respectively). The result is that the ideas jump around and are duplicative, important bits are missing (although chapter length is an acknowledged challenge), and Follett’s message of one philosophy permeating all of social action is lost. Most importantly, the chapter’s introduction and conclusion bitterly misinterpret and thus negatively assess Follett’s contribution to administrative theory. In short, the authors’ analyses contain a number of misleading summary statements that substantively contradict the understanding demonstrated in the literature review.

For example, the assertion that “both the group and the state serve a purpose greater than individual interests” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 114) is later contradicted by the review summary’s
correct understanding of the reciprocal process of forming individual and group purpose. Follett herself was careful to insist that the group was not in some way more than individuals, insisting “to no doctrine must we make swifter or more emphatic denial” (Follett 1924, 99). Defining the law of the situation wrongly as “the objective demands of the work situation” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 114) is then correctly presented in the review as the intersubjective assessment of the situation, fully inclusive of what could be interpreted by the authors as objective and subjective elements. The assertion that “leadership is the ability to create functional unity in the organization through the proper correlation of controls” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 114) is later clarified in the review as a more participatory, dynamic process that redefines these concepts as facilitation of coordinated unifying of functions through the cooperation of all.

Furthermore, the authors assert that Follett considered “training people to become efficient instruments of organizational ends” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 116) as an integral part of administration. This echoes her critique of scientific management explicated above and is at cross purposes to her unswerving commitment to the multidimensional and holistic nature of human being. Indeed, Follett did not vacillate between any dialectical positions, dualisms, or binaries that she critiqued. Through her understanding of integration, Follett (Follett 1919, 1924, 1998) consistently promoted a “third way” that was a true synthesis—paradoxically both and neither idealist and/or realist, humanist and/or instrumental, conservative and/or liberal.

Similarly, the assertion that “organizational behavior cannot be captured in subject or object alone, but must be seen in the interaction between subject and object, since each is a function of the other” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 118) simplifies circular response so far that it is fundamentally misunderstood. This truncation appears to reveal the static ontological perspective of the authors. For Follett, reciprocal influence is based on an actual merging of subjects and environment in a manner that disallows discrete categories of any type in the dynamic process of becoming.

However, it is the conclusion of the section on Follett that is most troubling. Fry and Raadschelders assert:

The main problem with Follett’s work is that her idealism is showing. That idealism is perhaps most vividly reflected in her aversion to what she considers to be false contrasts. Thus, Follett argues that we can have collectivism as well as individualism and freedom, circular response as well as power and control, aristocracy as well as democracy, executive control as well as the supremacy of expert knowledge, centralization as well as decentralization. Even integration is defined as a solution to conflict in which everyone gets what he or she wants. In short, Follett has a tendency to say, in effect, that we can have everything at once (2008, 133).

Each and every point made in this summary demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of not only Follett’s principles, but of the notion of dialectic altogether. Each point suggests that only dialectical positions of thesis and antithesis are possible, and that synthesis is impossible. This appears to stem from a static ontological perspective. From such a perspective, one cannot understand how the core characteristics, purposes, or desires of given thesis and antithesis positions can be achieved through a truly third position of synthesis.
Taking each synthesis in turn, “collectivism as well as individualism and freedom” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 133) is achieved through the true individual, circular response, and integrative behavior. “Circular response as well as power and control” (Fry and Raadschelders 2008, 133) is possible because power-with is emergent from the situation and control is a participatory endeavor guided by the law of the situation. “Aristocracy as well as democracy” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 133) is, first of all, a misrepresentation of Follett’s actual words: “Democracy I have said is not antithetical to aristocracy, but includes aristocracy” (Follett 1998, 175). By inclusion, she means that aristocrats should be engaged in the group process just as all others in the situation—but definitively without power-over.

“Executive control as well as the supremacy of expert knowledge” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 133) is possible because, again, control is guided by the participatory law of the situation and expert knowledge is valued alongside all other forms of knowledge in Follett’s pragmatist method. Once again, it is decidedly not a matter of supremacy, but rather of a qualitatively different value. In regard to executives, Follett states, “I have found among chief executives an objection to being over others and a feeling that these words over and under are unfortunate” (Follett 1949a, 36). In regard to experts, Follett states, “Our problem is to find a way by which the specialist’s kind of knowledge and the executive’s kind of knowledge can be joined. And the method should, I think, be one I have already advocated, that of integration” (Follett 1949b, 70). Similarly, “centralization as well as decentralization” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 133) is possible through a deeply nested and broadly inclusive federalism in which authority is maintained at the lowest level possible, as guided by the law of the situation. In other words, some situations demand decentralization while others demand centralization. This is an issue of function, not an issue of institutional authority.

We argue that these misconceptions produce the very effect Follett warns of: “Our outlook is narrowed, our chances of success are largely diminished, when our thinking is constrained with the limits of an either-or situation. We should never allow ourselves to be bullied by an either-or” (Follett 1941e, 201). While the authors temper this by noting Follett’s own admittance that she was seeking a possible world as opposed to describing the actual world or an ideal world, they argue that it is not achievable because of two characteristics of human nature: (1) power-over attitudes are immune to change; and (2) irreconcilable interests and therefore conflicts exist. Here, the authors’ own objective, static, hierarchical ontology is showing, but without self-reflective declaration. The notion that anything is static—attitudes, interests, or anything else—conflicts with Follett’s relational process ontology. Therefore, this critique needs to be presented as a well-constructed challenge to all of the philosophical foundations of her argument: ontology, psychosocial theory, belief, and epistemology.

Finally, the authors assert that “Follett offers little in support of her stand other than a hope that education can alter attitudes and an implicit belief in the malleability of human nature and the will to change” (Fry & Raadschelders 2008, 134). This is a gross understatement that could easily be read as chauvinistic. First of all, it describes an assumption of change as a mere belief rather than a possible necessity, thereby belittling Follett’s carefully argued relational process ontology, along with the many philosophical and theoretical sources that both informed it and follow it. Secondly, it ignores the bulk of Follett’s argument which rests on a call for pragmatist
experimentation while pointing to numerous actual case illustrations in neighborhoods, government, and industry of these “altered” attitudes. Lastly, it dismisses her recounting of personal experiences in both community work and League of Nations efforts where both the will and actualization of changes in attitudes and interests occurred.

In sum, the chapter as a whole is quite puzzling. It is as if the introduction and conclusion to the chapter were written by one author while the interpretation of Follett’s work was written by another—they are fundamentally disconnected from one another. Unfortunately, because this is a primary source of guidance on Follett provided to graduate students of public administration, it may be doing more harm than good in the propagation of her thought.

**Conclusions**

We are quite pleased that the work of Mary Follett has enjoyed a resurgence of interest that continues today. However, based on these substantive misinterpretations of Follett’s work—many of which have been noted by other commentators during and since her time—we invite the scholars using her work to reconsider their analysis, or at least present it with clarification of the ontological position from which they are interpreting or critiquing. The summary of Follett’s thinking offered in this paper is a starting point for such reconsideration, but the book from which it is drawn offers more detailed exposition (Stout et al. 2014). Through these works, we hope to support not only the renewed interest in her work, but a clearer understanding of the relational process ontology in which it is grounded.
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Notes

1 We refer to Mary Follett, as opposed to the more conventional Mary Parker Follett, because this is what she was called before her death (Tonn 2003, p. xiv).

2 Our sources include (Follett 1919, 1924, 1926, 1998; Metcalf & Urwick 1941; Urwick 1949).

3 Indeed, O’Connor (1996) criticizes Follett’s use of “sweeping, strong claims” and superlatives, suggesting she is “almost obsessed with the concept of unity.”

4 In a content analysis of the Social Science Citation Index, Fry and Thomas (1996) found that between 1969 and 1990 Follett’s writings were cited by 129 authors in 96 different journals. However, most references were cursory in nature. The trend was dramatically increasing since 1980 due to increased interest in conflict resolution and negotiation. Her organizational theories were cited much more frequently than her political ideas.

5 Follett’s moniker “prophet of management” is often attributed to the edited volume (Graham 1995b) but it was actually George (1972) who noted she was “a prophet in the management wilderness” (139).

6 Krupp (1961) similarly notes that while Follett was normative in her theories, which was customary for her day, her theories were informed by both observation and philosophy, and so her results often differ little from subsequent empirical research.

7 Not all agree with this characterization. O’Connor (1996) is somewhat derisive: “Follett situates herself at an abstract, philosophical level in speaking about the compelling but elusive ‘law of the situation’; so there is neither a way nor a possibility of grounding her view.”

8 O’Connor (1996) also notes the breadth of disciplinary sources informing Follett’s philosophy, embodying her theme of integration. While Drucker suggests Follett “did not attempt to be a ‘systematic philosopher.’ She would, I suspect, have considered it intellectual arrogance” (1995, 8), the fact of the matter is that Follett elucidates a comprehensive system of philosophy that is evident from ontology to practice; from practice to ontology.

9 It is critical, however, to remember that Follett was influenced by, and drew her ideas from, everyone with whom she came in contact—not just the intellectual circles. Indeed, Urwick sees this as critical to understanding her depth of thought: “How is it possible that a single woman with no elaborate research technique, no team of assistants could have made a major and original contribution to our knowledge and understanding of administration? The answer is that every individual Mary Follett met—and she made it her business to meet many people—became her willing, if unconscious, research assistant . . . Whoever she met, and intellectual and social distinction made no difference—it was Lord Haldane of Cloan one minute and a maidservant or a bus conductor the next—she made them talk, from the heart as well as from the head . . . A profoundly philosophical and scientific mind, she enlisted countless other minds, which were neither, as willing, warm and enthusiastic collaborators” (Urwick 1949, xvi).
Tonn (2003) asserts that it was likely her stirring rhetoric proclaiming the virtues of creating the collective will that set her up for attack as a communist sympathizer. Apparently her emphasis on the process through which it is created was lost.

In Follett’s definition of sympathy, she better describes the term empathy that had been coined in 1909 by E. B. Titchener in the German term Einfühlungsvermögen, or “feeling into”, later revised as Empathie (Stueber 2008). Tonn (2003) also makes this point in her analysis.

Ryan and Rutherford (2000) explore whether Follett is an individualist or a collectivist, arguing that in the Hegelian sense of dialectic, she is both and neither in her own unique synthesis.

To release the creative evolution of democracy toward this end, Shapiro (2003) argues that our assumptions about human nature as atomistic and self-interested must change. Follett’s ideas of creative experience, constructive conflict, integration, and egalitarian trust along with her participatory practice offer great promise in so doing.

Pratt (2011) notes that Follett’s understanding of power is constructed using Freud’s idea of desire, James’s conception of consciousness, and Royce’s understanding of will-acts. Boje and Rosile (2001) argue that Follett’s understanding avoids the dualistic trap of “all-or-nothing” understandings of power. Her understanding of power-with has been cogently linked to feminist theory and activism (Banerjee 2008).

Here Follett’s critique of scientific management foreshadows similar critiques of rationalism such as that of Carol Gilligan (1982).

He does, however, exempt Enomoto’s (1995) essay from this excoriation and we would agree based on his demonstrated grasp of the relational process ontology perspective.

Making this same point, Urwick (1949) warns that while “Mary Follett’s lectures on business organisation [sic] are an essential text-book” for those who want to maintain freedom rather than obtain organization “at the price of liberty and equality,” her lectures are also “a text-book likely to be neglected by those with a taste for authoritarianism” (xv).
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Pink Tape: A Feminist Theory of Red Tape

Lauren Bock Mullins

Introduction

Women have always been relegated to second-class status in the United States bureaucracy, which is not surprising when you consider until the women’s movement in the 1950’s and 1960’s, most American women worked solely in the home. Today women have a strong presence in the workforce, many of whom balance work and family responsibilities. In 2006, the New York Times reported that certain researchers are wondering if the gender revolution at work has ended, while others are finding women who entered the workforce are stretching their limits, work more now than ever, and even spend more time on childcare duties than their stay-at-home peers did in mid seventies (Porter 2006). Despite burning the candle at both ends, women continue to lack equal footing at the office. According to CNN, not only will women wait until after 2050 to achieve equal pay, which is nearly 100 years after the Equal Pay Act became federal law, but according to the White House Statement of Administration Policy on Paycheck Fairness Act, “Women earn only 77 cents for every dollar men earn, with women of color at an even greater disadvantage with 64 cents on the dollar for African American women and 56 cents for Hispanic women,” (Kessler 2011). However, unequal pay is just the tip of the iceberg. Women have historically faced both overt and covert forms of sex discrimination, harassment, and segregation in the workplace that have not disappeared despite good-intentioned legislation. The combined effects of these obstacles have often been framed as causes of the glass ceiling.

Glass ceilings are barriers women, and other historically disadvantaged groups, face when striving to advance their careers and climb to the top of an organization. Glass ceilings have consistently held women back, and although the phenomenon may be lessening, they are still very much present in today’s public organizations. Cynthia Bowling studied women agency leadership levels in 50 American state governments and found women face fewer blockages in holding top positions, that the glass ceilings are cracking, “firmer floors” are forming providing access to executive positions, and “weakening walls” are allowing for more lateral career movements to traditionally male-dominated types of agency leadership positions (Bowling et al. 2006). However, empirical evidence shows glass ceilings continue to exist in the public sector. Naff (1994) distin-
guishes between two different dimensions of the glass ceiling in the federal government: barriers limiting advancement, and women’s perceptions of how they are treated in the workplace. She found that there is evidence that glass ceilings exist and that women feel they face stereotypes that second-guess their abilities. One of the challenges of management, she says, should be to find stereotypes in order to eliminate them (Naff 1994). Sneed (2007) studied bureaucracy in Michigan, finding that occupational segregation is still prevalent based on gender, and she says these glass walls compound problems such as pay equity. Bullard and Wright (1993) examine women executives in state governments and find women have gotten top executive jobs but that they have often avoided, instead of breaking, the glass ceiling by becoming heads of new agencies, gubernatorial appointment, and interagency mobility.

Despite empirical evidence showing the prevalence of glass ceilings, it is difficult to understand the particulars and piece together a complete picture of the multifarious causes of glass ceilings. What, then, creates and maintains these impermeable glass ceilings? Could red tape, an aspect of everyday experience at work, be another culprit to add to our list of oppressors?

This paper attempts to link empirical evidence of the glass ceiling to the literature on red tape and analyze how red tape fits into a larger discussion of substantive and formal equality by offering three propositions toward forming a theory of pink tape for further consideration, as a stepping-stone for future exploratory research to advance the agenda of women in public administration.

“Room” for women in public administration?

Burnier (2003) believes a “gender room” has been emerging in Public Administration but that much work still needs to be done before the discipline can be fully revamped to include women. In fact, D’Agostino and Helisse’s textbook Women in Public Administration: Theory and Practice (2011) covers a wide range of relevant issues and looks toward developing a feminist perspective of PA. It all started with Frederickson, who urges public administrators to base their definition of the public on the Constitution, the idea of a virtuous citizen, responsiveness to the public that includes protection of minority rights, and public service benevolence (Frederickson 1991) and who also says social equity (fairness, justice and equality) is the third pillar of public administration (Frederickson 2010). Camilla Stivers (2002) explains how business methods, scientific administration and efficiency are not neutral ideas, but that they have gender biases because women’s reform had to become more masculine in order to survive. She urges public administrators to consider gender and realize that the field itself is masculine from the get-go, and that women are at a disadvantage from the start because of this.

In practice, Norma Riccucci (2009) showed how clear disadvantages remain when she examined social equity in the federal government, and found women and people of color are still in lower-paying, lower level jobs with less prestige. Newman (1994) found that current literature seems to ask what variables should be manipulated to improve the status of female public administrators and says there are three categories of such variables: human capital, socio-psychological, and systemic. She then found that it was important to look at the role of the system, not just the individual, when considering this fundamental question in PA.
In theory, Eagan (2006) says gender, the body, and the citizen are realities we manufacture and that administrators should be cautious about the assumptions they make regarding citizen identities, which ties nicely into Schneider and Ingram’s (1997) discussion of social construction. Third wave feminism encourages us to celebrate the individual, but this is difficult if the political system socially constructs women in a particular way that is on the outskirts of democracy, participation and equality. Another pertinent question for our discussion is who manufactures the realities of gender, the “body”, and the “citizen”?

According to Marilyn Rubin, the answer to this question is most likely to be that mostly men are the manufacturers of norms and knowledge in the field. In a ten-year follow-up to her 1990 PAR article surveying women in ASPA, Rubin wrote that the first fifty years of ASPA, beginning in 1939, was a time of major growth of women in society but, despite even more progress throughout the 1990’s, women have still not caught up to men in terms of research production. She concludes that women must be better represented in the field’s literature and knowledge production (Rubin 2000).

**Where do rules come from?**

Rules in the workplace grow out of an informal social structure and bureaucracy that is dominated by men, discriminatory and unequal. Although there have been many advances in women’s rights, “women remain subordinate in the home, in the family, in political processes, in social sexual relations, in the enjoyment of property rights, in matters of employment, and in the marketplace,” (Damrosch et al. 2001, 675). This imbalance permeates into and is perpetuated by the laws, social relations and cultural traditions (Damrosch et al. 2001, 675). In fact, it could be argued that women were left out of the foundations of democracy all together. According to Rousseau in *The Social Contract* (1913), the foundation of a society is based on a group of people who choose a leader; the people are at the center of the society and give authority and credence to their leader. A problem for women’s equality from the start becomes a question of who entered into the social contract. Nations have always, at least on paper, been built by men. The concept of the social contract, while inherent to democracy, is problematic when thinking about how women fit into the picture.

What then, are we to make of the situation of equality in administration? Weberian rules that govern bureaucracy are far removed from concerns regarding the individual, and so they do not speak to finding a solution to issues of equality. A bureaucracy can be wonderfully efficient but heinously inequitable at the same time. In *The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy* (1984), Kathy E. Ferguson offers a feminist critique of bureaucracy toward a new theory of organization that includes women. She says women’s experience as subordinates teaches us a lot about bureaucratic domination and that if we look to their caretaker roles, women’s experience helps us envision a non-bureaucratic life. Her inclusive approach offers a diversion from Taylorism and strict goals of efficiency, and takes a look at how women’s roles as caretakers both hurt and help them in bureaucracy. Ferguson (1983) discusses how expanding bureaucracies can stifle freedom due to the requirements for survival within the bureaucracy that rely on subordination and dependency while posing as a hindrance to political autonomy.
Yet the onus of blame cannot be placed solely on problems with the foundations of democracy or
the nature of bureaucracy, because there are laws in the U.S. to protect equal rights. However, as
Catharine Mackinnon (2001) argues, treating gender in terms of a sameness and difference mod-
el, as traditional law does, masks the reality of social and power inequalities that is related mostly
to the sexual power men hold and women lack. The laws do not focus on outcomes, or sub-
stantive equality, but instead they focus on formal equality, which means treating men and women
the same.

The combination of democratic, administrative, and legal deficiencies in relation to where rules
come from leads us to our first hypothesis:

**H1: Red tape is born out of an environment of substantive inequality.**

Substantive inequality is a legal term that can be defined as follows: “In legal argument, substan-
tive inequality means that substantively unequal cases are treated the same way” (Gerards 2009).
Due to unequal cases being treated as the same, equal treatment can result in inequality; in es-
sence, the inequality is found in the outcome, not directly in the treatment or action.

Much like a river tainted by an oil spill, rules born out of an environment of substantive inequality
will tend to be inherently tainted by traces, if not glaring hallmarks, of such inequality, even if
on face value they seem to be innocuous. This can happen in at least three different possible
ways. First, rules tend to benefit the rule-makers, or in the least are created with the rule-makers’
interests in mind. For example, women did not have the right of suffrage at the Constitution’s
inception because women were not the rule-makers. Historically, American bureaucratic rule-
makers are white men. Rules created by male managers are likely to be different than rules creat-
ed by women. Second, if a manager who is instituting a new set of rules is unaware of substan-
tive inequality, he or she may institute rules that are rather different from the rules that might be
created by someone aware of the unequal circumstances, with the end result being a set of rules
that exacerbate the unequal environment. For example, if promotion is based on the amount of
time put in on the job, this favors people who
do not take a leave of absence from work to attend
to family responsibilities. Third, rules often build on precedents of previous rules, which means
that, if nobody notices a particular rule has unintended unfair consequences, a problematic rule
that increases inequality is likely to be reiterated and maintained.

**How do rules affect women?**

Despite the fact that rules are not created in a bubble, for the most part red tape literature to date
discusses red tape in a way that excludes the context of substantive social inequality, with few
exceptions. Rainey, Pandey and Bozeman (1995) tell us red tape includes “rules, regulations,
and procedures that remain in force and entail a compliance burden for the organization but have
no efficacy for the rules’ functional object” (Bozeman 1993, 283, in Rainey et al. 1995, 567). It
can be born inside or outside an organization and can have internal and external effects (Rainey
et al. 1995). Unfortunately, red tape poses a huge problem not only for bureaucrats at work but
for the clients they serve (Scott & Pandey 2000). Social scientists have tried to explain red tape;
Pandey and Kingsley (2000) find that individual alienation, sector and size are strong predictors
of red tape. Their social psychological model of red tape is cutting-edge, because it focuses on the individual in relation to red tape, as opposed to previous literature that exclusively examines the organization in relation to red tape.¹ By studying the individual within a framework of “alienation,” Pandey and Kingsley (2000) stress the importance of studying the individual in relation to red tape, which, taken out of context, provides some foundation for looking at red tape in relation to equality.

Leisha DeHart-Davis (2009a) looks at gender differences in perceptions of bureaucracy to find beneficial attributes of bureaucracy for women. To construct her argument, she presents conflicting literature: that men and women face different organizational realities (Stivers 2002), that bureaucracy privileges masculinity over femininity in relation to values (Duerst-Lahti & Kelly 1995), and that bureaucracy has often been criticized by feminist researchers (Ferguson 1984; Acker 1990) for its masculine structure and for socializing subordinates to be subservient, a role echoing women’s relationship to men in society. She cites Guy and Newman’s (2004) idea that there is a lack of value given to emotional labor provided mostly by women and much literature that favors less bureaucracy and fewer rules (Ahrens 1980; Ferguson 1984; Iannello 1992; Stivers 2002). Yet she also cites other research that shows bureaucracy has led to women’s advancement (Baron, Hannan Hsu & Kocak 2007; Bielby & Bielby 1992; Cook & Waters 1998; Elvira & Graham 2002; Reskin & McBrier 2000) despite allegations that decentralization can exclude women from informal networks (Collinson & Hearn 1996; Kanter 1977; McGuire 2002). This is in line with Roth and Sonnert (2010) who agree with DeHart-Davis’s (2009a) positive spin on bureaucracy and rules and believe reduction in bureaucracy (red tape) can harm women by forcing them to rely on informal structures, which positions them at a disadvantage.

The findings of DeHart-Davis’s (2009a) mixed methods study suggest that to a certain extent bureaucracy can legitimize women, reduce their subordination through routine, and create equity in the delivery of outputs. She confirmed that gender differences exist in terms of perceptions: that inconsistent rule application is more problematic for women but that women perceive rule volume as less excessive, and that burdensome and unnecessary rules are less problematic for women.

Given DeHart-Davis’s (2009a) research on how women experience red tape differently than men, particularly how women’s perceptions of rules are downplayed in relation to men’s perceptions, the issue of the impact of red tape on women becomes important. Additionally, Moynihan and Herd (2010) remind us that red tape has implications for individuals whose political and social rights are inherently tied to a process that involves rules. With this in mind, let us consider the following hypothesis:

**H2: Red tape contributes to an environment of substantive inequality for women.**

Not only do women experience red tape differently, they are affected by red tape differently. Red tape delays social service delivery to customers/clients, which is more problematic for women because a higher proportion of women rely on vital social services, such as Medicaid and welfare, than men. Red tape also slows organizational change for women employees who are in greater need of changing the status quo to improve the workplace environment of substantive inequality. Considering that some theorists doubt the ability of organizations to change at all, anything that slows the process of change in an organization can be detrimental to women.
How do women affect rules?

Perhaps women ignore red tape and its effects more than men due to a lack of social and organizational power. One school of feminist jurisprudence, the cultural feminists including Carol Gilligan, thinks women appreciate contexts and reduction of conflict in personal relationships while men tend to focus more on rights and logic (Wex 2011). Another possible explanation is that they might not notice red tape as much because they are desensitized to dealing with difficult or troublesome conditions and used to being the adaptive party. For example, if you are used to swimming in the ocean for two hours a day, swimming for twenty minutes in a swimming pool would seem effortless, whereas if you rarely swim in a pool and you are suddenly expected to swim for twenty minutes, it will seem much more difficult. Women become conditioned over time to do more, expect less, and maintain a smile.

As a result, women go from being victims of substantive inequality in relation to rules, to being their own worst enemies due to their inability to address or even notice red tape. Meanwhile, they manage red tape so well that the difficulty associated with red tape becomes invisible, which further embeds red tape in the organizational culture. Let us consider the following hypothesis:

**H3: By not noticing or acknowledging it, women manage red tape in such a way that further embeds substantive inequality in the organizational culture.**

By managing red tape so well and with fewer complaints, women are effectively managing red tape differently than men, which could cost them time, energy, and stress. This could also prevent or slow impetus for change. Furthermore, what happens when one woman out of many complains about red tape or has a more difficult time managing it, unlike her female counterparts? What will her co-workers or supervisors think when the other women in the office are seemingly fine with the nature of the rules? The high standard of female proficiency in managing red tape may prove to be a difficult one to hold all women to, not to mention the unfairness involved in the double standard that is established.

**A Theory of Pink Tape**

To acknowledge the three propositions set forth in this paper, we can construct a framework called Pink Tape—the color pink suggests an association with femininity, as in the breast cancer awareness pink ribbon campaign, a color theory conceptualization inspired by DeHart-Davis’s (2009b) “Green Tape” theory. Pink tape refers to the cumulative effect of how red tape is born out of a substantively unequal environment, how red tape further contributes to the substantively unequal environment by delaying or slowing change, and how women manage red tape in such a way that further embeds inequality in organizational culture.

This collective effect can be likened to Evan Stark’s (2009) theory of Coercive Control, which reframed domestic violence from an incident to a course of conduct. Red tape can also be envisaged as something other than a cumbersome rule gone wrong, in relation to women. The way these three propositions affect women, both female employees contending with the glass ceiling...
and female citizens who are more likely to suffer from delays in efficiency, is a collective effect. Like coercive control, pink tape can be thought of as an invisible web of influence that is quite expansive and powerful, as opposed to an incident with a problematic rule.

DeHart-Davis (2009b) conceptualized a theory of green tape, otherwise known as effective organizational rules, which introduced us to the possibility that there may be other types of “tape”, aside from red tape, present or active in public organizations. In a similar fashion, the theory of pink tape needs to be further explored through mixed methods research to expand upon red tape literature. One example of suggested future research is to examine rules surrounding promotion in the public sector and how specifically seniority in the merit system begs the questions: who are the rule-makers? Who stand to benefit from such rules, and who stand to lose out?

Introducing the concept of pink tape to the discussion of red tape could have implications for managerial and staff training, psychological and social health of women, effective management of the public sector, and representative bureaucracy. Best practice measures might be derived from future research, and examining pink tape could raise awareness about the ways in which red tape impacts women differently than men, which might also have implications for how red tape affects other historically disadvantaged groups.
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**Notes**

1 This is not to imply that Pandey’s model is the only organizational literature that focuses on the individual, but that thus far it is the only literature to examine the individual’s relationship to red tape, within the public administration literature on red tape.

Gendered Organizations, Care Ethics, and Active Representation

Beth Rauhaus

The reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) illustrates not only that violence against women is a persisting issue in America, but it also solidifies the role of government entities to work toward policy goals, uphold the newly passed legislation, and provide essential services to victims of violence. In this qualitative case study, I examine the missions of state redistributive agencies and regulatory agencies responsible for service provision of domestic violence programs. After examining the missions of each individual state agency, I interview public administrators in each of these agencies to determine their role in the service provision of domestic violence programs and policies, and whether or not they have a sense of care ethics in their work.

Domestic violence is often considered to be a feminine issue, because victims tend to be female, making it important to a gendered governmental response. Gender representation in democratic government is an important element of achieving true representativeness, as governmental institutions should proportionately represent the population at large. With the proportional disparity of women in public affairs, it is fitting to examine concepts of representative government in terms of gender. Theoretical research studying gender differences varies among disciplines, which is also the case when it comes to examining gender representation in government. Hutchinson and Mann write, “women writing in PA have adopted a liberal/cultural standpoint that incorporates both” liberal feminism, which views women as competitors to men for equal treatment in the workforce and cultural feminism (2006, 405), which highlights “unique physical and emotional” gender differences such as “caring, nurturing, empathizing” (Guy and Newman 2004, 289).

Therefore, it is necessary to explore theoretical notions of representative bureaucracy and apply values, such as care, to understand if public administrators are actively representing victims of domestic violence. Saltzstein (1979), who also studies theories of representative bureaucracy, offers a model that has guided many research scholars in testing the linkages between active and passive representation. Her model suggests that in order to find a linkage, “one must demonstrate linkages between social origins and values, values and behaviors or actions, and behaviors and policy outcomes” (Ricucci and Meyers 2004, 587). Another issue that highlights the need
for further study is the idea that values can be included in the model; yet, scholars cannot agree upon a value. Since public administration scholars have begun to call for the use of care and responsiveness in legitimizing government, I determine if care can be a value linking representation. If care can be valued by public officials, it is plausible that care may be an exhibited action or behavior that is useful in achieving active representation in policy outcomes.

According to Tronto, “care can serve as both a moral value and as a basis for political achievement of a good society” (1994, 9). Tronto further argues that an ethic of care can be applied to politics, especially in cases where females are public actors; she notes that, “if women argue from a moral perspective, they are likely to encounter opposition from political actors who insist that, while morality is an important part of human life, it has no place (or a limited place) in the nasty world of politics” (1994, 6).

This study is limited to an examination of gender representation in three southern state administrative agencies (Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina). Some states’ political culture may “foster female participation in politics while others do not” (Hill 1981, 160); state culture may also highlight differences in gender-roles and indicate the varying degree of a states likelihood to support female representation (Diamond 1977; Norrander and Wilcox 1998; Arceneaux 2001).

The scope of this research design is limited to three states in the south because proportional disparity is greater in this geographic location, which Ford and Dolan (1999) attribute to the political environment. The south lags behind the rest of the nation in terms of female representation in state legislative bodies, as only 13 percent of the seats in the southern legislatures were held by women in 1994, as compared to 20.4 percent of the seats nationwide (Ford and Dolan 1999). While the south is typically associated with traits of having a traditional polituc culture, where maintenance of the status quo is encouraged and female political participation may be discouraged by elites (Diamond 1977), southern states may have differing traditions and cultures. Cammisa and Reingold assert that, “one might expect the few women members and the traditionalistic culture characteristic of southern legislatures to produce a particularly hostile environment for such gendered advocacy” (2004, 200). Therefore, the selection of the three states in this study is based on the proportional representation of females in the southern state legislatures. According to the Center for American Women and Politics data, Georgia ranked 25th, Mississippi ranked 47th, and South Carolina ranked 50th in percent of females in state legislative bodies serving in 2011. Therefore, these southern states should have variation in their view of female political participation and exhibit the importance of female representation in state administrative agencies. An adaptation of Saltzstein’s model is illustrated below (Figure 1) for use in testing the linkages between passive and active representation.

**Figure 1: Linking Representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Origins (passive representation)</th>
<th>Values (Care)</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Policy Outcomes (active representation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Many theories of representation initially focus on social origins of an individual, in terms of class, race, or gender, which is a tenet of passive representation. Since gender is embedded in society and in organizations, this element of social origins is specifically important in understanding representative bureaucracy “because it shapes the social and cultural contexts in which people do their work” (Saidel and Loscocco 2005, 159). However, social origins impact individuals’ values. Although the specific type of value can differ in the model, in order for actions of a public official to actively represent a certain group in a policy outcome, there must be value congruence (Saltzstein 1979). Value congruence occurs when the public official is responsive to the interests or needs of an important social group of the constituency. However, the relationship between social origins and values is unknown, as scholars are conflicted when it comes to deciding upon which type of value is most important in terms of representation schemes. Saltzstein notes (1979, 469),

The researcher must somehow decide which values should be congruent, then measure the attitudes of the relevant group and the attitudes of their bureaucratic representatives. Further, what kind of values should be measured? Should the researcher select only those values felt most strongly by the group, generalized norms as to group goals and aspirations, values related to specific policy issues, or attitudes generally concerning the role of the bureaucracy?

For the purposes of this study, I have selected care as the value of importance for two main reasons. First, care will relate directly to the policy issue- domestic violence. Victims of domestic violence often have many needs when seeking help from public officials. All of these various needs should be met with care. Secondly, most studies focusing on policy outcomes highlight effectiveness and efficiency. Yet, contemporary work has argued that focusing on care may be instrumental in explaining policy outcomes. For example, “Caring as a value has not moved into the mainstream of public administration discourses”, but by examining emotional labor and elements of care, theories can be strengthened as well as the outcomes of policy and administration in practice (Guy et al. 2008, 39).

Therefore, passive representation, which is having representativeness in government, is a prerequisite of achieving active representation. When values of the public official and the constituency are congruent, active representation should occur. The use of care should lead public officials to exhibit attitudes or behaviors that will lead to caring actions, such as responding to needs of the constituency group. For the purposes of the adapted model (Figure 1), policy outcomes that benefit constituents seeking help from domestic violence will exist when public officials exhibit care and use care in making policy decisions, which is termed actions. This model implies a linkage between passive representation and care, care and actions, such as responsiveness, and results in behavior that promotes policy outcomes beneficial to women.

**Importance of Understanding Active Representation**

Although research focusing on gender representation in government has become more prevalent, there are still a few issues that need to be addressed in how active representation may be achieved. First, passive and active representation links in regards to gender have only been found
in feminine agencies, which are organizations dominated by female administrators and that focus on policies that strictly benefit women. Passive representation is linked to active representation in public agencies that are considered feminine and where policies directly benefit women as a class in case studies by scholars such as Wilkins and Keiser, and Riccucci and Meyers (2004). For example, their research explores feminine agencies, such as welfare and child support programs. Meier and Nicholson-Crotty explore gender representation in law enforcement, a regulatory agency; yet, the scholars argue that further research should be undergoing because it is important to discover the “right combination of institutional structures, types of issues, and extent of discretion” in public administration (2006, 858). This narrow focus, in the scope of previous research, leaves room for further research in linking representation in agencies that are not dominated by female public officials, but have a responsibility in providing services to women.

In addition to the first problem, examinations of gender representation typically occur in governmental areas with a high concentration of females, such as agencies employing a majority female workforce and having a mission of redistributive policy provisions. Although few studies have found linkages between passive and active representation for women in regulatory agencies, scholars urge further research to “reconsider the importance of passive representation”, which proposes the need to examine the presence of women in governmental agencies (Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006, 858). My study is unique in that it seeks to include a masculine agency type, Corrections, in addition to a feminine agency type, Human or Social Services, in linking active and passive representation. Recent scholarship has only focused on gender representation occurring actively in feminine policy areas, with female public officials playing an active role in representation; however, Corrections, a masculine policy area has an important role in developing domestic violence policies, administering programs and regulating laws.

Finally, most studies incorporating theories of representative bureaucracy fail to acknowledge that an individual public official’s values have an effect on the likelihood of being an active representative. Saltzstein explains, “more generally, analysis of representative bureaucracy which examine the distribution of representation only in terms of class, race, sex and so on have been criticized because they substitute secondary measures (socioeconomic characteristics) for the desired primary measures (values), when very little is known about the relationship between the two” (1979, 468). Using the theory of care ethics developed by Gilligan (1993) and further pursued by scholars in public administration as well as other disciplines, my study seeks to incorporate a scale to test how individuals’ levels of care, an important value for public officials to have, can affect their ability to be active representatives.

**Research Design**

In this qualitative case study, I seek to determine if passive representation can lead to active representation in three states’ regulatory and redistributive agencies associated with domestic violence service provisions. A total of six agencies were studied. This approach is different from other studies, as it examines how values, particularly care, may affect the ability to achieve active representation. This study also examines two types of agencies that have a gendered organizational culture. Regulatory agencies tend to have masculine traits throughout the organization.
According to previous studies conducted on representation as well as theories of representative bureaucracy, passive representation is a necessary component of achieving active representation. However, passive representation is not an absolute variable that indicates active representation, as operational conditions and intervening conditions may affect the ability for active representation to occur, as illustrated in Figure 2. Operational conditions, such as the agency function and mission, which are discovered in agency mission statements, provide guidelines for organizational norms. These operational conditions may also indicate socialization is occurring, which means individual administrators adapt or conform to organizational missions to fit into the agency. Since it is not possible to discover whether or not socialization or operational conditions impact individuals through document analysis, qualitative interviews were used to explore intervening conditions. Intervening conditions discovered through conversations in the interviews highlight the major themes and theories driving this research. Values or the use of emotions and care is an important element in connecting passive to active representation. As previously noted, a variety of values may be used in making the connections, but in order to determine if values found in the mission statement are carried out and how values are carried out, interview data will be useful.

Due to the number and wide scope of my research inquiries, a number of theories will be used in this analysis. The literature has previously asserted that feminine or redistributive agencies actively represent women’s concerns; however, research has not explored active representation of women’s issues in regulatory agencies at the state level (Wilkins and Keiser 2004; Keiser et al. 2002). Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006) initiate the need for such research in their analysis of gender and representative bureaucracy in local law enforcement and responses to sexual assault. In their work, the scholars maintain that police forces with more women officers at the street-level are actively representing victims of sexual assault (Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006). In studies such as these, the theory of representative bureaucracy guides the research. Therefore, theories of representative bureaucracy are instrumental in this study of gender representation. Another component of representative bureaucracy theories is the existence and effects of glass walls, horizontal sex segregation. By examining diversity and particularly, passive representation, the presence of females in organizations, I am able to further explore how passive representation affects active representation. Finally, this study is also grounded in the feminist theory of care ethics, which addresses gender differences in behavior, psychology, and relationships.

**Figure 2: Theoretical Model for Qualitative Analysis**

---

**Figure 2: Theoretical Model for Qualitative Analysis**

- **Passive Representation**: Presence of Female Administrators
- **Operational Conditions**: Agency Type or Functions, Organizational Norms (found in document analysis)
- **Intervening Conditions**: Environment, Representation Duties, Values or Emotions, Perception of women’s issues (found in qualitative interviews)
- **Active Representation**
Based on the above theoretical model, this case study has three research questions.

- Is passive representation, the presence of females in government, leading to active representation?
- How do glass walls in the bureaucracy impact gender representation in the south?
- Can care ethics be used as a value in linking passive and active representation?

**Methodology**

For this case study, I conducted two forms of qualitative approaches – document analysis and interviews – to closely analyze individual employees in two types of state public agencies, a regulatory type, Department of Corrections and a redistributive type, Department of Human or Social Services. Document analysis was conducted to categorize agencies by type and develop a theoretical lens for further exploration. By analyzing mission statements, the organizations’ cultural conditions that influence administrators were found. Using categories and important themes that emerged from the analysis of organizations’ mission statements, interviews were conducted to further discover individual administrative behavior, values, and perceptions and how these relate to active representation of women’s issues, particularly domestic violence policies and programs. To obtain adequate information, interviews were conducted with personnel directors, legislative liaisons, and directors responsible for administering domestic violence services and programs within all state agencies.

Using the main theory of representative bureaucracy, this research examines if passive representation, an increased number of female public officials in a given agency, results in active representation of women’s issues, specifically concerning domestic violence.

Although interviews were semi-structured and more conversational in manner, the protocol was organized into four specific sections. The first section of the interview protocol addresses the respondents’ environment. In order to understand the environment in which the administrator must operate, I asked for the respondent to describe his or her job duties within the agency and the state government. Therefore, further inquiries of the respondents’ environment included the environment of the agency and/ or specific division within the agency. This first section of interview questions is useful in addressing the comprehensive policy process and whether or not organizational values noted in the mission were present in the organizational culture. The second section of the interview protocol addresses issues of administrative representation where respondents were asked about activities, duties, and priorities of their work in the agency and government. In asking such questions, conversations unfolded regarding policy priorities and ability to use discretion in meeting policy outcomes. Administrative discretion is a major theme in public administration, which is useful in this study due to its application to representative governance. According to Sowa and Selden, “many public administration scholars have focused their studies on the implications that exercise of administrative discretion has for the operation of democratic governance” (2003, 702). Questions such as these are instrumental in exploring theories of representative bureaucracy, particularly in connecting passive to active representation. Administrative
discretion is a key component to “strengthening the relationship between passive and active representation and has an impact on the quality of these outcomes” (Sowa and Selden 2003, 707). The third section of the interview protocol addresses emotional work or the ability to use care ethics. Respondents were asked questions regarding personal values that make them an asset in serving the public, as well as, which values are important for public officials within their agency to possess in order to provide good governance. By including such questions, I was able to assess whether or not care ethics can be a useful value in connecting passive to active representation. The final section of the interview protocol includes questions that asked respondents to use their perceptions and/ or reflections in how important women’s issues are for the government to address.

Interview data then were coded and analyzed by themes using the previously described sections of the interview protocol, which provide a deeper understanding of female representation in southern state governmental agencies.

**Document Analysis**

Document analysis was used to analyze all six organizations’ mission statements. Examining organizational mission statements is important for quite a few reasons. First, “organizational consequences flow from the peculiarities of mission”, which indicates that mission statements are important guidelines that impact organizational behavior (Newman 1995, 141). Secondly, these consequences “are manifest as structures of opportunity that impact career success, especially women’s advancement into positions of authority and power” (Newman 1995, 141). Mission statements may have an effect on organizations and the individuals within the agency, which creates cultural conditions. Therefore, it is interesting to look closely at how these overarching values effect the provision of services that affect women’s concerns.

Scholars focusing on the link between passive and active representation have noted the importance of organizational socialization. In Wilkins and Williams’ (2008) study of race representation in police departments, the authors exhibit that the socialization process of conforming to organizational norms hinders passive representation from linking to active representation in terms of race. Theories of institutional socialization suggest that police behavior, through attitudes and values, is determined by work experience and peers, and is often a “learned behavior” that occurs once an individual is hired into the organization (Wilkins and Williams 2008). Therefore, it is important to factor in the possible effect organizational socialization has on individual administrators and their ability to be active representatives of women.

After comparing the agencies’ mission statements to the typologies, it became clear that the Departments of Corrections fall into Lowi’s category of a regulatory agency. Newman’s work shows that regulatory agencies are typically masculine, which is the case in the Department of Corrections, as most mission statements included goals of protect and serve. Yet, some missions included less rigid values, such as providing opportunities for positive change, which is an important step in the rehabilitation of those convicted of crimes. For example, regulatory agencies like Corrections have masculine functions of control and providing security. These verbs (protect, serve, secure, control) clearly indicate that such organizations value integrity in the provision of safety. Newman (1995) argues that gender power is also embedded in organizations in
terms of clientele. From the demographics of those involved in crime, it is apparent that most clientele will be male in these agencies. Hence, Corrections departments may be categorized as a masculine agency for two primary reasons. The first reason Corrections departments are masculine is because of the clientele demographics, which is comprised of mainly males. Secondly, the Corrections departments can be considered a masculine agency type by the definition of regulatory functions, which is a coercive process, commonly driving regulatory agencies (Newman 1995).

Likewise, it was apparent that southern Departments of Human or Social Services reflected values similar to those of redistributive, feminine agencies. For example, common elements among these redistributive agencies’ mission statements are to empower or encourage clientele. In contrast to the Corrections’ values, the verbs used in mission statements, such as encourage and empower, are more hopeful in approaching governance, meaning the government is taking an active approach in promoting personal growth and development. In addition to these optimistic goals, redistributive agencies tend to have a female clientele. Newman argues that “women are more likely to need the service of redistributive agencies than are men” (1995, 148-149). Newman (1995) further suggests that men are more likely to be recipients of distributive policies, since they are owners or employees of companies. Newman’s gendered classifications of agency types align with the concept known as “feminization of poverty.” Feminization of poverty suggests that females tend to have lower socio-economic statuses as compared to males, which can be applied to the idea that females are more likely to be the recipients of redistributive provisions. The need to serve female clients is illustrated in the mission statements, as many organizations approach their administrative process in the provision of services to vulnerable populations, which are typically described as women, children, or abused adults. This discovery through document analysis tends to fall within the theory of care ethics, which suggests care or the use of relationships may be valuable in serving such vulnerable populations. However, in order to fully address whether or not care is being used in this type of organization, it will be necessary to further study individuals and their values through interviews.

All three redistributive agency mission statements highlighted the common theme of protecting vulnerable populations and encouraging or empowering clients. One major value that both organizations have in common is the goal of promoting self-sufficiency of those they serve. Interestingly, both types of agencies provide or administer services to individuals that are often considered vulnerable in comparison to the rest of the population, which makes promoting self-sufficiency among clientele a necessary goal. The figure below (Figure 3) depicts the variations and similarity among the agencies examined. This depiction illustrates that Departments of Corrections are bound by values and visions that are common for a regulatory agency, which is to regulate laws and punish those for non-compliance; while, on the other hand, Departments of Human and Social Services have goals that project the essence of redistributive agencies, which is to help those in need by empowering, encouraging, and ensuring stability and protection. While safety is an issue of importance to both types of organizations, redistributive agencies ensure safety, which implies the goal is to oversee the welfare of individuals or to maintain that individuals are free of harm, while regulatory agencies promote safety, which implies rules are developed and are followed in society, in an effort to ensure safety.
Keeping in mind the agency types, regulatory and redistributive, as well as the essential visions highlighted in the organizations’ mission statements, the second portion of this qualitative research approach, which was interviewing individual public officials within these agencies, began. It is important to reflect on these missions in order to frame the interviews, as organizational values may have a significant effect on employee’s behaviors, perceptions, and responsibilities. Since the organizations’ missions reflect Lowi’s typology and Newman’s gendered-typology, my analysis is grounded in theory, as these two agency types fall within each category, regulatory and redistributive, respectively. Representative bureaucracy is another theory grounding this research, as the presence of female public officials, which is termed passive representation, may indicate that active representation may occur. In Newman’s (1995) work, she acknowledges that agency type, which is categorized by functions and policy terms, has a significant effect on opportunities for public officials. Using this approach to guide my work, interviews highlight how agencies may differ in allowing discretion or the use of care in order to achieve organizational missions and perhaps, active representation of women.

Although there is one common element among these bureaucratic agencies, the missions, values and goals are clearly distinguishable, which will lead to different policy outcomes. In terms of addressing my research questions, I distinguish whether or not active representation of women’s issues is occurring and whether or not care ethics are valued for each type of organization.

**Qualitative Interviewing Analysis**

In order to address the causal relationship between passive and active representation, the four categories of interview questions (environment, representation duties and priorities, use of values and emotions, and perceptions of women’s issues) serve as a guide in discovering how administrators within state governmental agencies may or may not actively represent women’s concerns.
Analyzing the Intervening Conditions

Descriptions and qualitative evidence will highlight the theories driving the research and offer new perspectives in understanding theory and practice of gender representation in three southern state public agencies.

Analyzing Environmental Conditions

When exploring the environmental factors of one’s agency, most respondents agreed that their agency was a nice place to work and that their colleagues were friendly. On occasion, a few administrators were forthcoming with information that their environment was challenging. For example, one personnel director from the Department of Corrections said, “I’ve been in this agency for about six months and I have come directly out of private industry. They brought me into the agency because they wanted someone with a different mindset. I am getting a lot of support and I am also challenged with a lot of change. There has been some resistance coming in.” Although this comment is not representative of all respondents, it is important to mention as it clearly indicates that individual administrators most often conform to the agency norms, an example of the socialization process. Other respondents who had more experience in their agency pointed to the gender-dynamics within the organization. One administrator affirmed that she is, “comfortable with a mix of both females and males in governmental leadership because there are pros and cons on the way men and women look at things and lead.” Overall, administrators in all agencies in the three different states reported an ideal working environment.

Gendered-Dynamics

In examining the gendered dynamics of organizations, administrators discussed the gender of employees within the state agency and also commented on gendered dynamics in leadership and administration. Overall, respondents from the Departments of Human or Social Services were inclined to comment that their agency is diverse and runs by collaborative efforts. Collaboration within organizations is a trait that is common in redistributive agencies and is often considered a feminine style of management. A male legislative liaison from the Department of Human Services said, “We have a diverse agency here. There is collaboration of individuals that deal with various issues, such as child abuse, aging, neglect, and incarceration.”

Another public official from the redistributive agency asserted, “I would say the whole Division of Family and Children’s Services are mostly female. Being in child welfare in general for about nineteen years, I would say that there are more and more men today than there were twenty years ago, but still it is more predominantly women.” Of the redistributive agencies in all three states, feminine traits in the workforce were illustrated; and, most administrators in these units expressed that diversity was valued, but female public servants dominated the service area.

While administrators in the Departments of Human and Social Services clearly indicated that females are present in their organization, the responses from the Departments of Corrections varied. For example, a female respondent from the same organization responded in direct contrast, as she commented, “the Department of Corrections’ working environment is characterized by more males than females” and “domestic violence is an issue of importance in our organization.”
In terms of the service we provide, I would say it is gender-neutral.” The personnel director of one regulatory agency explains that in her agency, “We have a lot of women in different job classes, more than 50% in several job classes. I have seen an increase in diversity throughout my sixteen years of service. I think women are increasing their numbers.” Hence, there is a presence of glass walls, where regulatory agencies are masculine.

Overall, the responses from the Department of Corrections seemed to provide the inclination that females are becoming more present in the organization, but still have a void to fill. This is apparent for all three state agencies included in the study. While there were no major differences among the three states in regards to asserting that diversity is important to their agency, gender differences in opinions of the gender makeup of the organization were apparent.

**Clientele**

Pressures of socialization and the demographic makeup of clientele are often illustrative of whether or not passive representation may lead to active representation. In examining clientele of both types of agencies, most administrators in all three states asserted that services provided by their agencies are gender-neutral. However, in further discussing specific policies and issues in the organization, it became clear that the clientele differs among the agency types. The Department of Corrections’ clientele was mostly male, while the Department of Health and Human Services’ clientele was characterized by more females than males. For example, a male personnel director from a regulatory agency directed me to the annual report for his agency where facts and figures of inmates are presented. From this report, it is clear that males outnumber women in prisons, indicating that males are the clientele for these regulatory agencies. On the other side, conversations with administrators from the redistributive agencies indicated that services were mostly administered to females. When asked if the state government should address certain women’s issues, employees of the three redistributive agencies asserted that they were responsible for such issues in their agency.

From these findings of organizational and positional gendered-dynamics, it is clear that there is support for Newman’s argument of gendered agencies using Lowi’s typology, as the redistributive agency appears to be more feminine through the use of collaboration and the presence of females in the agency. The demographics of the clientele for each agency are also very telling and supportive of Newman’s typology. It is interesting to note that although the regulatory agency is classified as a masculine agency due to the function and hierarchical structure, respondents from such agencies suggested that their organizations were becoming more diverse and integrating women. At best, such agencies may be encroaching upon gender-neutrality.

**Analyzing Representation Duty Conditions**

Theories of representative bureaucracy suggest that discretion is an important element in achieving active representation. Classical approaches to administrative discretion focused on the debate of whether or not individuals’ should use traits to achieve organizational competencies or if there should be an emphasis on scientific management. According to Van Wart, “In the 1940s, articles by Finer (1940) and Leys (1943) defined the administrative discretion debate—how much discretion should public administrators have, and under what conditions” and these questions of ad-
ministrative discretion have continued (2003, 218). Previous research has shown that although legislation and politics impacts policies tremendously, administrative discretion can be used to implement public laws (Lipsky 1980). According to Sowa and Selden (2003), public officials who have a great deal of administrative discretion and perceive themselves as representing minorities are more supportive of using discretion to achieve policy outcomes that will benefit the minority group. Therefore, it is important to determine the influence of such factors when examining the link between passive and active representation for gender. In keeping with these theories, questions posed to interviewees addressed whether or not administrators viewed themselves as representing a certain group and whether or not they felt they had discretion in implementing and carrying out policy.

Discretion and Conforming to Organizational Norms

Emerging themes of discretion can be divided by the two agency types, as respondents from states’ Departments of Corrections were more likely to express constraints on their ability to make their own decisions in implementing policies and programs. As Newman and Lowi suggest, agency types have differing functions, which are previously noted in the document analysis of the mission statements. After interviewing employees in the Department of Corrections, it was evident that these administrators feel confined by the regulations and goals of the agency. For example, a respondent from a regulatory agency claimed that, “I pretty much represent the agency and demonstrate the agency policies. I try to represent both inmates and staff and make policies to secure safety of staff and the community.” This statement highlights that administrators’ work is often defined by the organizations’ mission and clientele. This response used similar terminology to what can be found in the organizations’ mission, indicating that safety and security are priorities for Corrections departments. Another respondent from the same agency commented in a similar fashion by asserting, “I am constrained by policy within the agency. A prison system is a bureaucratic body; and yes, there are policy constraints, but I think I have latitude within policies to have a little discretion.”

From the insight provided by administrators in the Department of Corrections in all three states, it is evident that the environment of the regulatory agency as well as the mission-driven values constrain administrators, leaving little or no room for discretion. This was a common element for all regulatory agencies in the three states. This minimal amount of discretion administrators reported having may also be attributed to the function of their regulatory agencies, which is to uphold and regulate laws in order to provide security. Therefore, administrators seem bound to really carry out such missions in their work and set an example for following the law.

Although it was rare for any administrator participating in the interview to admit to having a great deal of discretion, administrators associated with the redistributive agencies were more likely to provide examples of implementing policies while making their own decisions, which suggests that they may be comfortable using discretion. Two females working with vulnerable populations in the redistributive agencies were able to provide examples of using discretion. The administrator who directs programs for children and family services and oversees centralized intake of reports of vulnerable children and adults declared, “I would say that my staff and I do not have discretion because of the standardized decision making. Our intake workers should be able to listen, accurately interpret what is being said, make a decision of how to handle the call against policy and procedures, and have the ability to discern priority.” This administrator clearly
acknowledges that the agency’s policies serve as guidelines for employees to follow; yet, situations that in-take call workers are met with require some discretion. The respondent further contends, “We have a standardized decision tool that is used, but of course, even when you try to make a standardized decision, you still need a lot of skills in discerning what you are hearing and interpreting to make sure you are getting the information correctly when dealing with child and family welfare.” Another administrator from a state redistributive agency reaffirmed the importance of discretion by insisting, “I am allowed to bend the rules. Building a service array can encompass a lot of things, but I can think outside of the box of how to do that.”

Analyzing Emotional Work Conditions

In order to further examine if administrators representing victims should possess specific traits or values in serving the public, I asked participants further questions about what values are important in being a good public servant. Interestingly, administrators in all divisions within the Department of Corrections, except for those working with victims, believed that integrity was essential. One male respondent from a regulatory agency said,

The number one trait is integrity. It [Integrity] is essential in our agency because of the ability to follow policies and the ability to be upfront. It is absolutely critical. We are pretty structured in our policies. We have detailed policies to help our employees out and we welcome questions regarding policy. We want employees to raise their hand and say ‘I don’t know. What should I do?’ Policies and procedures are extremely important because we have such a serious business here.

One administrator illustrated a similar notion that regulatory agencies are chiefly responsible for maintaining security and abiding by rules, which are masculine organizational and leadership traits. A female administrator said that recruiting efforts in her agency focuses directly on a behavioral type. Personal characteristics, such as integrity, are listed on job descriptions. She noted that persons demonstrating competency and integrity were important. Another administrator asserted, “Professionalism is important when relating to the public. Image and doing the right things and following all policies at all times are important in interacting with the public.” In sum, administrators from the regulatory agencies studied seemed to focus on values described in either job descriptions or mission statements. While administrators from these agencies reported that they were conscious of their image in relating to the public, it is apparent that public officials in these regulatory agencies are primarily concerned with following structures and standards.

As previously mentioned, responses from administrators working in the victim’s unit in the regulatory agency differed a bit from the rest of the colleagues in the Department of Corrections. An administrator noted that it is important to have a “caring personality” and to be a “kind and gentle, concerned person” when serving. This administrator further noted that, “It may be easier for a female to use these [values]. In dealing with issues of domestic violence, it requires going an extra step in many cases. Safety, planning, talking with local enforcement, helping victims when the offender returns are just examples of these extra steps. Dealing with these [domestic violence] cases requires more attention than say, property theft, burglary, or shop lifting.” This statement is important in illustrating that gender can make a difference in serving those in need, particularly in matters of domestic violence. Interestingly, this extra step that the administrator is discussing is not an element of work that any other respondents within the Department of Cor-
rections noted. Her ethic of care in assisting victims may be attributed to the fact that she is a female, the gendered clientele, or may simply be an extension of her specific job duties.

Regardless, the respondents’ statements highlight the idea of glass walls, that women are often concentrated in occupations that use values necessary for service, such as care, kindness, and concern. All of these feminine traits illustrate that the employee values her job and is driven by the desire to help victims. This qualitative evidence suggests that female administrators and leaders in state regulatory agencies may be able to break the glass ceiling, but not the glass wall; and, in advancing hierarchically, female leaders are confined by the specific feminine niche in which they work or by the overarching organizational, patriarchal constraints. In continuing to discuss service and values with the same respondent, it was clear that the agency constrains or influences her abilities greatly. In our discussion, she notes that, “Domestic violence and sexual assault are unique crimes and women should be providing services;” yet, she concluded that she represents “all victim concerns, both male and female.”

In order to further understand if values of public officials are directly related to their gender, their job duties, or even the agency in which they work, it is necessary to examine public officials in the redistributive agency. After analyzing comments made by administrators in the redistributive agencies, a common theme emerged. This common theme is that feminine traits are welcome in these types of organizations and are beneficial in meeting the service needs of clientele. For example, a male administrator that works indirectly with the public and clientele focused on the concept of passion. The legislative liaison in the redistributive agency stated, “women may have a keener sense or awareness of domestic violence issues”. He further explains that those working in his agency should have “a passion for child welfare.” In sum, this respondent believed that “gender does not impact a person’s ability to represent certain concerns. It is all about passion and their past experiences. Individuals who have been in health care or education have that specific passion to serve.” Another administrator agreed with this idea that values are important in serving clientele by emphasizing that public officials in his agency should have “dependability, a foundation for relationship building, emotional intelligence, and empathy”, as the “better bureaucrats are emotionally driven, especially in social work or aging because these people have a real concern for those they serve and want to take care of their customers.” Thus, it is clear that a theme of socialization is emerging. Feedback from administrators highlighted that serving clientele with compassion and values of care is useful in the agency and not necessarily dependent on the public officials’ gender.

Expressing similar beliefs in assisting clientele and developing relationships, an administrator from a redistributive agency noted she and her associates focus on “the care and concern about how the person on the other end of the line is doing and helping them through it is a big piece of our work”. Since her job duties require an ethic of care, the conversation progressed to issues of how employees deal with their own emotions. The respondent suggested that “being in the child welfare system or working with vulnerable adults, there is a lot of concern about secondary trauma and in fact, there is a lot of training going on to help workers take care of their own needs and get what they need to continue their work”. This comment signifies the amount of emotional labor administrators exert and indicates that the theory of emotional work is also useful in practice. Speaking openly about the use of emotions on the job was a central theme emerging from
respondents in the redistributive agencies, which denotes the importance of emotional work and the use of care in serving clientele well.

In general, redistributive agency administrators reported that their job responsibilities included serving the public and extending their service provision into developing a rapport or relationship with vulnerable populations. In their quest to reach their objectives, many administrators noted particular values, such as care, passion, and empathy, beneficial to interacting with the public. On the other hand, the majority of public officials responding from the regulatory agency seemed to focus on the ability to follow rules and public law, with an emphasis on integrity. Individual administrators working more closely with victims in the Department of Corrections were more likely to exhibit signs of care, but also illustrated that the mission and culture of the organization drives behavior, a main tenet of the socialization process.

To some extent, institutional socialization has an apparent effect on public officials serving in the agency and providing governance. Public officials in the Department of Corrections perceived their individual responsibilities and values that were mirrored in the mission statement. On the other hand, respondents from the Department of Human or Social Services perceived their service roles based on values found in their mission statement and values needed to truly respond to clientele. Administrators’ responses often reflected values of the mission statement or past experiences, which indicates that socialization has an influence on public officials’ behaviors in actively representing certain groups. In order to further study the impact institutional socialization has on active representation of women’s issues, responses from questions regarding public officials’ perceptions of women’s issues are analyzed.

Analyzing Personal Preferences, Opinions, and Reflections

In order to closely examine if public officials in agencies are actively representing women’s concerns and providing services to victims of domestic violence, it is vital to understand whether or not public officials believe that women have certain issues that government should address. Similar to the concept of discretion, theorists of representative bureaucracy often argue that in order for active representation to result from passive representation, it is necessary for the certain group to advocate for their group. Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006) maintain that their “qualitative evidence indicates that some law enforcement agencies still deny the seriousness of rape,” which is inevitable when females are not present in the agency or if they are merely tokens.

In support of Meier and Nicholson-Crotty’s assertion that law enforcement agencies do not take sexual assault seriously, administrators from the Department of Corrections in the three states seemed to downplay their roles in providing protection against domestic violence. Administrators from these agencies also maintained that women’s issues were either indefinable or not a priority for the government to address. When asked if certain units within the agency exist to address victims of domestic violence, most respondents could not pinpoint such an area of focus. One respondent likened women’s issues to the same concerns of minority groups. He implied, “I can’t think of any certain women’s issues that the government should address. Over time, women’s issues have not made it to the forefront yet. Minorities also have concerns that the government needs to address too.” One female administrator seemed to be neutral and bound by her idea that gender should not matter in serving women’s concerns. The socialization process in the
Department of Corrections may have had a toll on her attitude toward gender representation. She noted, “I don’t think that [the gender of the public official] should matter. If you have selected a role as a public servant, you should be able to address issues of both males and females”. This example highlights that even though females have integrated into leadership roles in regulatory agencies, they are not actively representing women’s concerns, nor do they believe the government has a substantial task in addressing women’s concerns. One female respondent working in the regulatory agency, but in a feminine position that serves victims, showed conflicting signs of actively representing women while also being restricted by institutional norms of protecting the public and abiding by laws. She stated, “accomplishing something that helps bring a peace of mind to a victim is important to me, and as a female, I am better able to portray a caring and kind personality.” The respondent also noted that her agency was largely male dominated, which may suggest that she is an ‘outsider’ or her attitude is not the norm within the agency.

In contrast to the findings in the regulatory agencies, respondents in the redistributive agencies were more inclined to believe that women have specific concerns that their state government should address. Most administrators believed that they were working on women’s issues. Administrators in these institutions also reported high levels of importance in matters of domestic violence and were more willing to discuss what their agencies are doing in providing care for victims. For example, a male administrator indicated, “Domestic violence is a serious problem, especially with the economic times and the rise of conflict.”

To further justify the critical need for domestic violence to be fully addressed, another respondent further mentioned her previous experience at the street level in another state and explains, “In the past, I worked in the field in the 1980s and 1990s and there was certainly domestic violence, but not at the level it is today that we talk about it so much”. This response highlights the importance of domestic violence becoming a public problem and being discussed openly. Still, some individuals and public agencies are less inclined to believe the seriousness of domestic violence.

In sum, public officials from the redistributive agencies offered more emotionally descriptive explanations of women’s issues and were able to explain the importance of working towards women’s issues, such as domestic violence. It is apparent that while the public officials in the Department of Corrections recognized women’s issues and domestic violence, the public officials in the Department of Human and Social Sciences were proactive in regards to improving the status of women and families.

**Conclusion**

After analyzing public officials’ comments and mission statements from the two distinct agencies included in this study, it is apparent that active representation of women’s issues, primarily through the provision of domestic violence programs, is not occurring in the regulatory agency, but is occurring in redistributive agencies. Among these agencies, there are a few common themes, which were the mission to provide self-sufficiency and the presence of glass walls. Differences in environmental factors, representation duties, values and emotions, and personal re-
flections of women’s issues varied greatly. Another main theme that arose from analysis was the differences in agency clientele.

Qualitative analysis of regulatory public officials illustrate that being female in the Department of Corrections does not necessarily translate into greater service provision or protections of female victims of domestic violence. Reasons for the inability to achieve active representation of women’s issues vary. First, the lack of females present in administrative decision making in the regulatory agencies may also set the tone for abiding by the status-quo of organizational norms. Although Department of Corrections’ public officials reported that diversity was valued in their agency, it was apparent that representativeness was not a priority in hiring, but integrity and competence were. Secondly, values stemming from the organizations’ mission statements, such as being noble, are masculine traits that either do not appeal to females searching for public service work or hinder women from exhibiting feminine values of care or emotional attachment. Therefore, the lack of passive representation in the agency allows for organizational norms to continually be followed and for socialization to occur. Finally, even when women do manage to integrate and advance in the agency, they are either neutral or a leader of a glass wall division, typically dealing with victims. Public officials’ representation duties in these agencies stemmed from each organization’s mission, which is to protect and abide by laws. Even females in the agency exhibited effects of socialization, reporting that they serve everyone and their duty is to abide by laws. Administrators in this capacity did not mention the use of feminine values, such as care or emotions, in providing governance, as such traits do not conform to organizational values. In sum, after analyzing responses from the Department of Corrections’ participants and organizational mission statements, it is evident that active representation is not occurring. Reflecting on the clientele of these agencies, it may be suggested that active representation for women’s issues is not a priority since most incarcerates are male; however, crimes committed by females are increasingly occurring.

In contrast, passive representation is linked to active representation in the redistributive agencies studied. First, public officials in the Departments of Human or Social Service were more likely to be female, as compared to the Departments of Corrections. Public officials noted that their agencies were mostly feminine. Hence, passive representation is occurring at higher levels for females in the redistributive agencies, even in administrative decisions, signifying the glass ceiling being shattered. Environmental factors, coupled with organizational missions, proved to highlight feminine skills and abilities that encouraged specific values, such as passion and empathy for the vulnerable. For example, public officials in the agencies tended to note collaborative efforts that are undertaken in the quest to serve the needs of vulnerable populations. In serving these needs, public officials were able to exert empathy, passion, and compassion in their efforts. Administrators’ responsibilities and duties allowed them to display their values and personal traits as they were assisting families, children, women and the aging populations. The perception of legitimate women’s issues and the need to address those adequately also link passive representation to active representation, as many respondents in the redistributive agencies believed they were working on feminine issues. Another indication that public officials in these redistributive agencies are working in feminine areas is the demographics of their clientele. Vulnerable populations, ones that usually need care, include abused or neglected children, aging, or vulnerable adults and families. Therefore, active representation is occurring as a major function of redistrib-
utive agencies, which is seen in mission statements, environmental factors, values and administrative duties and responsibilities.

In conclusion, passive representation can be linked to active representation and values such as care can be incorporated in redistributive agencies. However, the link between passive and active representation is not always met for a few reasons. The lack of females present in the regulatory agencies, the existence of glass walls within the agency, the limitations of use of values and emotions through job duties, and the perceptions of women’s issues all hinder active representation to occur from passive representation. Glass walls are an important theoretical lens in examining how sex segregation occurs in public agencies. The common theme in this study indicates that redistributive agencies are dominated by females, and feminine traits such as passion, compassion and empathy are valued; whereas, masculine agencies have traits that constrain employees from exerting emotions and feminine values of care. Interestingly, glass walls are apparent in both types of agencies. In general, the redistributive agency has more females in administration and throughout the agencies at all levels. The regulatory agencies seem to lack a high number of female administrators, but the females present are working in positions that require outreach to victims. Therefore, the inclusion of care as an important value in linking passive to active representation proves true. Redistributive agency administrators listed caring values in their descriptions of how they can help vulnerable populations and represent women’s concerns. A few female administrators in the regulatory agency, working in a traditionally feminine area, helping victims, showed signs of using care, such as bringing victims comfort and listening to concerns; but, this exertion of care seemed to be hindered or limited by the lack of passive representation and stringent organizational norms.
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4 Other scholars who examine the relationship between discretion and representative bureaucracy include: Dodd and Schott 1979; Frederickson 1993; Keiser 1999; Selden 1997; Selden, Brudney, and Kellough 1998; Wood and Waterman 1991.

Dr. Beth M. Rauhaus is an assistant professor of political science at the University of North Georgia. She has a Ph.D. in public policy and administration from Mississippi State University. Her research interests include gender issues in governance, southern politics and policy, gendered institutional theories, and state and local government.
Engaging Women in Public Leadership in West Virginia

Karen Kunz and Carrie Staton

Introduction

As the 113th Congress begins to tackle the issues of the day, men and women alike celebrate the inclusion of a record number of women representatives – 98 in both chambers combined, plus three female nonvoting members (Parker 2013). Since the election in 2012, major media outlets have covered the increase in women in the U.S. and state legislatures and speculated on the policy implications of this historic election (Blackwill 2013; Foley 2013; Helderman 2013; Houser 2013; Welch 2013). Many, including several among the women legislators themselves, believe this milestone will have positive implications for the nation; Representative Tammy Duckworth told the New York Times, “The women, I think, are going to reach across the aisle a lot more” (as quoted in Parker 2013, 1).

The consensus in popular media is that this, the most diverse Congress in U.S. history, is a major achievement for American women. While the historic numbers indicate progress, the reality is that they are still low compared to the U.S. population. Although women compose slightly more than half of the national population, the record numbers of women in the Senate and House of Representatives – twenty and seventy-seven (not including three non-voting delegates), respectively (18 percent in total) – still comprise a minority of national legislative representatives (Lucey 2013; Howden & Meyer 2011). The historical numbers are even more dismal: “Of the nearly 2,000 senators in the history of Congress, only 44 have been female” (Foley 2013).

The apparent gender diversity in Congress comes at a time when the role of women in politics is increasingly at the forefront of discussions at the state, national, and international levels. Former U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton has been integral in the push for more women in public service around the globe. Beginning with her high profile and sometimes criticized work during her time as First Lady, and throughout her own campaigns for the U.S. Senate and the White House, Clinton has worked to educate women on the importance of engagement in public life. Her leadership of multiple gender-oriented projects continued throughout her tenure as Secretary of State and culminated in the 2011 launch of the Women in Public Service Project.
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(WPSP), a partnership with the U.S. Department of State and five leading women’s colleges. This initiative works “to advance women to positions of influence in governments and civic organizations” (Women in Public Service Project, 2013). Since its creation, the WPSP has held multiple summits and conferences, offering training and support to women to encourage and increase their participation in public service positions in many capacities. These outreach and educational efforts are having positive effects in training women on the roles they can play in elected office.

Women have fared slightly better in the states than in federal service; however, women also hold a minority stake in elected positions of state governance. On average, 24 percent of legislative seats and 23 percent of statewide executive offices are occupied by women (Rutgers 2013a; Rutgers 2013b). While organizations similar to the WPSP exist at state levels, efforts to increase women’s representation in public office are often not coordinated across states, or even between similar organizations within states. Similarly, research on women in public office tends to focus more on national endeavors and issues than on statewide efforts.

This study endeavors to advance our understanding of the challenges faced and advances made by women in attaining state-level public office, and particularly state executive office, by examining how women have fared in Appalachia and particularly West Virginia. Appalachia has long been characterized as being the most impoverished area of the country, with greater health disparities and higher mortality rates that are exacerbated by isolation and adherence to regional traditions. While other Appalachian states benefit from external and often urban influences, West Virginia is unique in that it is the only state in the region that is entirely contained within Appalachia. The purpose of this research is to determine whether the distinctive characteristics of the region and West Virginia have inhibited women from attaining statewide executive office. We examine how those women in West Virginia who have achieved elected leadership positions perceive the challenges and accomplishments they experienced during their campaigns and then during their time in office. We also explore the challenges they anticipate for women seeking executive office in the future.

We begin with a review of the factors that inhibit women in their efforts to achieve representative and leadership roles within elected office and the importance of increased women’s participation. Then our attention shifts to Appalachia and the status of women in executive office in the Appalachian states in order to set the stage for a close examination of West Virginia. A discussion of relevant theory and available data are supplemented by the perceptions and insights, obtained through personal interviews, of the women who have achieved statewide executive office. This integration of theory and lived experience offers a greater understanding of the challenges faced by women who seek to attain state executive offices within a rural context.

Theoretical Understandings of Women’s Absence from Public Office

That efforts such as the WPSP are even needed in the United States, where women received the right to vote almost a century ago, is perplexing. The reasons for continued under-representation can be organized into four hypotheses: the situational hypothesis, the gender role attitudes hy-
pothesis, the political gender role socialization hypothesis, and the role model hypothesis (Elder 2004).

The situational hypothesis posits that women are under-represented as a result of “the very practical restrictions imposed by women's additional roles of taking care of the home and the children, duties that still are placed disproportionately on women” (Elder 2004, 30). In fact, women tend to run for public office early in their career, prior to starting a family, and then leave public life once their children are born, or they defer political careers until past their primary years of child-rearing and family responsibilities (Emily’s List 2013; Marshall & Mayhead 2000; Rosenthal 1998).

In an interview with Wendy Gruel, a candidate in the 2013 election for mayor of Los Angeles, Nagourney (2013) notes

Ms. Greuel’s loss was also a reminder of at least lingering challenges for women running for an executive office, like governor or mayor, which can be more time-demanding and grinding than a legislative job. “There are still a lot of factors that make it difficult for women to get elected in executive positions, and we saw a lot of them play out in Los Angeles,” said Ms. Lake, the pollster. Ms. Greuel, who is the mother of a young son, said she often encountered evidence of the reluctance of voters to elect a woman, and particularly a mother. “There are still stereotypes of ‘How can women be a good elected officeholder and a good parent?’ she said. “We found that in focus groups: ‘How will you be able to do both?’ Those same questions aren’t asked of a male.”

Even as women have entered the workforce and worked toward equality outside the home, they continue to bear the bulk of the responsibility for household tasks as well, working what effectively constitutes a “second shift” (Rosenthal 1998, 39). In 2011, women spent, on average, 2.16 hours per day on household tasks, while men spent an average 1.37 hours per day on the same tasks (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2011). Further, the vast majority of single parents are single mothers: almost 83 percent of custodial parents are women, whereas just over 17 percent of single parents are men, “a statistic unchanged from 1994” (Grall 2009, 2). Not only do mothers, single or not, provide more childcare than fathers; often, “mothers provide more childcare than in earlier generations…This increase in the time demands of childcare somewhat offsets the gains that mothers experience from fathers’ greater participation” (Eagly & Carli 2007).

In a study conducted in 2003, Fox examined women’s decisions to run and to decline to run for public office. The findings of his survey research (9-10) indicated that

Women respondents are significantly less likely to be married and have children. Clearly, some women who become top-level professionals de-emphasize a traditional family life. When we consider the household division of labor, though, we see that women who live with a spouse or partner are nine times more likely than men to be responsible for more of the household tasks; the numbers are similar for childcare arrangements. Hence, from the outset, it is important to note that among members of the sample “being married” and “having children” carry different responsibilities for men and women.
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As long as women continue to be responsible for the majority of family and household responsibilities, and as importantly, continue to be viewed as such, even in addition to their work outside the home, this situational impediment to public office will remain.

According to the gender role attitudes hypothesis, expectations that politics is a man’s world discourage women from seeking public office. “Women must negotiate a liberal democratic political culture in which liberalism’s masculine control over democracy conceives of democracy as a weak and fragile entity (as feminine)” (Sheeler 2000, 15). An illustration of the continued influence of strict gender roles can be seen in the comparison of women entering the political realm through representative positions rather than the executive. In 2013, 1769 women (or 24%) of state legislators are women, while only 5 women (10%) are governors (Rutgers 2013a; 2013b). One explanation for this may be the difference in gender role expectations. “After all, leading requires aggression, initiative, expertise, and reason,” traits generally ascribed as masculine (Sheeler 2000, 16). Representation, on the other hand, requires the more traditionally feminine traits of “concern and deference to the public good, connection, and concern for humane rather than personal interests” (Sheeler 2000, 16).

Fortunately, these attitudes appear to be shifting. “Over the 20th century, the American public has become significantly more accepting of women taking an active role in the public sphere…over 90 percent of Americans now say they are willing to vote for a qualified woman candidate for Congress and the presidency” (Elder 2004, 30). Despite this increase in acceptance of women in politics, “a considerable minority of Americans continue to hold conservative gender role stereotypes” (Elder 2004, 30). Although it is a small faction, it is possible that this group of more traditional voters is perceived as larger than it actually is; women are likely to perceive the electorate as being biased against women candidates even though “when women run for office, they are just as likely as men to win their races” (Lawless & Fox 2012, 7).

The political gender role socialization hypothesis suggests that, despite the openness of the electorate to vote for women candidates, women do not seek political office because, “even though more and more people are explicitly rejecting traditional gender role stereotypes about politics, there may be more subtle socialization processes occurring, which lead to lowered levels of political interest and ambition among pre-adult women” (Elder 2004, 31). Although both men and women report that they do not consider politics to be a “man’s world,” the subtle socialization of children from a young age may still discourage girls from pursuing public service careers. Further evidence of the impacts of socialization can be seen in the results of a 2013 survey of more than 2,100 college students. In this survey, Lawless and Fox identified several contributing factors to the gender gap in political ambition, including “political socialization in the family” (2013, 6). Although both men and women appear to have been exposed to comparable patterns of political education and activities with family, the numbers change dramatically when looking at political ambition. “Overall, 40 percent of male respondents, but only 29 percent of female respondents, reported encouragement to run for office later in life from at least one parent” (Lawless et al. 2013, 7). Early political socialization and encouragement from parents has a strong and “dramatic impact on their children’s political ambition. Fifty percent of college students whose mothers regularly suggested that they run for office reported that they would definitely like to run in the future. Only 3 percent who received no such encouragement… expressed interest in a future candidacy” (Lawless et al. 2013, 7).
The lack of political interest in young women is further exacerbated by the effects of the role model hypothesis, “which suggests that with relatively few women holding highly visible political offices, girls see little reason to become interested in politics or harbor political aspirations” (Elder 2004, 31). Women are significantly more likely to seek lower-profile positions at the local level than at the state or national level (Fox 2003, 7; Marshall et al. 2000). “Women are more likely than men to report interest in a school board position. But men are approximately 40 percent more likely than women to consider running for the state legislature. And men are roughly twice as likely as women to express interest in a federal position” (Lawless et al. 2012, 6). This reluctance to seek high-profile positions leaves younger women who may be interested in entering public service without many women role models to observe and emulate, or mentors to provide personalized encouragement and guidance, further exacerbating the under-representation of women. This corresponds to studies which identify the lack of preparation, and environments that encourage preparation differently based on gender, as barriers to women’s entry into the political arena (Marshall et al. 2000, Rosenthal 1998). In describing the differing ways in which women and men develop the skills needed for political participation, Rosenthal (1998, 39) notes that women “hone their leadership ability in the classroom and community center rather than the boardroom and locker room.” The impact of these differences in experience is also noted by Lawless and Fox in their study of political ambition among college students. When exploring the extent to which young men and women engaged in school communities and extracurricular activities, the researchers found that “few gender differences in participation emerged, with one notable exception: organized sports” (Lawless et al. 2013, 10). Although the connection between sports and political ambition may not be immediately evident, “the competitiveness associated with sports appears to serve as a significant predictor of interest in running for office” (Lawless et al. 2013, 10). These results suggest that “playing organized sports either provides an opportunity to develop, or reinforces the propensity toward, a competitive spirit” (2013, 11).

For women these barriers to entry and success in elected office, and particularly those in state executive offices, are interrelated. Negative attitudes, stereotypes and sex discrimination, family demands and traditional role expectations, limited career choice and preparation, and a political structure that favors incumbents combine to make entry more challenging for women. Women find themselves having to prove their credibility again and again in a world that still perceives politics and political behaviors as male endeavors. Further, since women tend to start at lower levels, the climb to statewide office is much steeper and their ability to take on the increased responsibilities that accompany higher offices may not be taken as seriously, even if they are more qualified than male candidates (Marshall et al. 2000). Finally, though no less driven for power and status, women often advocate for “softer” policy issues such as education and social welfare and articulate motivations that champion legislation for creative problem solving with more emphasis on the goals of involving people in the policy process, building coalitions, empowering others, building consensus (Silva & Grabe 2011, Rosenthal 1998). These orientations are generally perceived as feminine and not necessarily belonging in the rough and tumble world of political management.

The Importance of Women’s Representation in Elected Office

Finding a solution to these obstacles that prevent women from seeking public office and ensuring that women are proportionately represented in government is important in democratic govern-
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ments like the United States. As women see more women representatives in public office, the government and the laws that it passes and enforces become more legitimate. However, legitimacy does not automatically require representation that mirrors the demographics of the population. For many years, even after the ratification of women’s suffrage, many believed that female representatives were not necessary to represent the interests of women. Because each man was empowered and expected “to rule his family and to represent his family’s interests in the ‘outside’ world,” many did not understand “how it could be possible for a woman to have interests separate and distinct from those of her husband” (Sapiro 1981, 701). Like supporters of any under-represented group, supporters of women’s rights have historically been asked to validate the ideas that (1) a woman’s interests are unique to her as a woman and can therefore not be represented by her husband; and (2) women, as a sub-group of the population, comprise an interest group with cohesive interests and policy preferences.

That women have a clear commonality of interest does not mean that they are a monolith, that all women are “consciously allied, or that there is a clear and obvious answer to any given problem articulated by the entire group that differs substantially from answers articulated by others” (Sapiro, 1981, p. 703). Just as men are divided on a number of issues while still sharing many common experiences and problems, so, too, are women divided by their individual experiences, race, age, or marital status. However, “research in various fields of social science provides evidence that women do have a distinct position and a shared set of problems that characterize a special interest,” legitimizing the idea that there is a need for their shared interests to be proportionately and appropriately represented in the process of the government (Sapiro 1981, 703). Even when male representatives are sympathetic to the issues important to women, research indicates that this is not as effective a form of representation for women’s interests, that “women are better representatives of women than men are” (Arceneaux 2001, 144).

In addition to representing a different demographic, women often have different policy priorities than men. Because of this difference in priorities, relying on men to fully represent the interests of their female constituents can have “serious implications for the type of policy states pursue, which in turn affects the responsiveness of the political system to more than half of U.S. citizens” (Arceneaux 2001, 144). Although women remain in the minority in all branches of government at every level, enough women have served to provide information on their policy priorities. When asked to list their priority bills, women list “more legislation pertaining to children and the family” (Thomas & Welch 1991, 450). Women are also more likely to sit on health and welfare committees than men and less likely to be on business or economics committees (Rosenthal 1998; Thomas et al. 1991). These tendencies tend to match expectations of many, as the realm of children and family has long been considered the purview of women. Palley points to the “increasing number of women within the public sector” as having called “attention to the importance of issues that center on family, children, and women” (as referenced in Silva & Grave 2011, 31). Despite their importance to women both in and outside of government, “these issues have been largely ignored by male legislators;” only with the influence of “special interest auxiliary organizations [have] women legislators in the United States…generated greater attention” to them (Seipel 2010, 353). Though they appear to be more important to women, these policies do not only affect women: “In those places where women enjoy greater gender equality, government policies and practices have benefited not only women but the whole of society” (Seipel 2010, 351).
In addition to focusing on different issues than their male counterparts, women in public service often approach their roles differently. “In a study of roll-call voting behaviors on the issue of economic and regulatory policy in the United States, female legislators from 28 states (particularly members of the Democratic party) paid more attention to their constituency than to party position as compared to their male counterparts. While men tend to operate from an individualistic approach or party politics, women tend to operate from socially-oriented political views” (Seipel 2010, 351). This experience of a difference in working styles seems to be shared by the women currently serving in Congress. Several women interviewed in the days following their taking the oaths of office mentioned the capacity of women to work together. Senator Kay Hagan told the Huffington Post that “women have a tendency to work in partnerships, and that’s something I think the American public would really appreciate us doing, working across the aisle” (quoted in Foley 2013).

Research in social psychology appears to validate differences in how women and men interact, indicating that “men and women use different communication styles and strategies, and studies of group interaction show that men can effectively – even if unintentionally – freeze women out of conversations and debates, or simply render their communication ineffective” (Sapiro 1981, 711). This matches the research of Kanter, who “suggests that when a minority of 15 percent or less exists within an organization, members of that minority feel constrained in their behavior” (as cited in Thomas & Welch 1991, 447). If this is the case, an increase in female representation will help to mitigate the effects of these differing communication styles, allowing women to interact more effectively and freely, even in groups that are predominantly male.

**Women in Constitutional Offices in Appalachia**

Appalchia has distinct cultural characteristics that differentiate it from the remainder of the nation. It is a 205,000-square-mile area and constitutes approximately eight percent of the nation’s population with just over 25 million people. Boundaries stretch from southern New York to northeastern Mississippi and include portions of thirteen states: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, as well as the entire state of West Virginia. The region’s economy has shifted from dependence on mining, forestry, agriculture, chemical, and heavy industry to manufacturing and service industries. Six of the nation’s top ten poorest states are in Appalachia. Mississippi leads the pack with a poverty rate of 22 percent and West Virginia is a close second at 19 percent, compared to the national average of just over 13 percent (U.S. Census 2012). Significant health disparities and disproportionately high mortality rates, due in large part to coal mining activity, also distinguish the region (Borak et al. 2012).

The characteristics that make the Appalachian region unique also influence the roles of women in executive office in the member states. Since ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920, only 5 of the 34 women elected to the state’s highest office during the past 93 years have been in Appalachia (Rutgers 2012a). That said, one of the first woman governors in the country was Emma Guy Cromwell (D), Governor of Kentucky from 1926-1929 (Rutgers 2012).
Table 1. Women in State Executive Office in the Appalachian States, 1920-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Lieutenant Governor</th>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Comptroller</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Attorney General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Appalachia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/levels_of_office/Statewide-HistoricalListing.php

To date, 387 women have been elected to executive offices in states within the Appalachian region. Although Appalachia accounts for only eight percent of the national population (U.S. Census Bureau 2012), Table 1 shows that the region has elected 15 percent of the nation’s women governors, 25 percent of the women lieutenant governors, 18 percent of the women secretaries of state, 25 percent of the women treasurers, 37 percent of the women auditors and 22 percent of the women attorneys general. In total, of the women elected to constitutional offices since 1920, 85, or 22 percent, were elected to offices within Appalachia. Admittedly, however, the majority were not for the primary leadership positions of governor or lieutenant governor.
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Correspondingly, women in West Virginia tend to be conservative yet strong and assertive, and with a history as pioneers and protestors. “The same woman who is perfectly capable of running the tractor and does, of making decisions about whether we're going to plant wheat or corn, of building a house or deciding to build a house, that same woman is the one that's more than likely to voice an anti-ERA attitude on the grounds that the Bible did not mean for women to play a dominant role” (Hall 1979). A more recent study of cultural factors in West Virginia (Coyne et al. 2006, 4) indicated the decline of patriarchal prevalence. “Some women in the groups reported erosion of patriarchal roles in their communities that has resulted in women being expected to be decision makers in what were traditionally men’s roles. According to participants, role changes sometimes occurred because men worked long hours and passed their responsibilities on to women.” Another remark, that appeared to be more in keeping with the tone of the interviews, noted that women were no longer told what to cook by their husbands; they could decide what they were going to cook.

These characteristics correspond to the descriptive and geographic models of political culture developed by Elazar (1972). In the traditional political culture,1 which he attributes to the South, including Appalachia, government is seen as “an actor with a positive role in the community, but the role is largely limited to securing the maintenance of the existing social order” (Elazar 1972). Political leaders are expected to maintain conservative and custodial responsibilities, including class and gender stratifications, and are not looked to for innovation.

A more recent study by Brisbin Jr., Dilger, Hammock and Plein (2009) debunked some of the stereotypical characteristics of West Virginia’s political culture, including the perceptions of an Appalachian regional consciousness and backcountry orientation, as well as economic dependency and labor-management conflict theories. The authors noted, however, that the state and local governments are hampered by the state’s inability to generate the necessary revenues for more and better public services and local government’s inability to self-direct policy matters or to raise the revenues essential for support of the public school systems. “The consequence is a politics of making do and scraping by” (Brisbin Jr. et al. 2009, 9).

It is no surprise then that women hold only 16 percent of elected offices in West Virginia. Of the 134 members of the state’s General Assembly, only 22 women are in representative offices: 20 women have been elected as state delegates and two as state senators (see Table 2). In line with national trends, there are more women, numerically and proportionally, in representative office than in executive leadership roles. As noted earlier, representation differs from leadership; developmental roles for women and men differ significantly in that women are directed toward service-oriented endeavors that prize organization skills and emotional labor2 (Guy, Newman & Mastracci 2008), whereas men are expected to take on leadership activities that prize rationality and strategic thinking (Sheeler 2000). This helps explain why women are making more headway in the state’s House of Delegates and Senate than in executive offices.

Of West Virginia’s executive offices, women have never been appointed or elected governor – the epitome of state leadership – or to any other leadership role, for that matter, other than Secretary of State. It took thirty-seven years after women won the right to vote for the first woman to
be appointed to the ranks of the state’s constitutional officers and almost another fifty years before the first woman was elected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Women in Representative and Leadership Offices in West Virginia, 2013</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Virginia Legislature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV House of Delegates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV Senate</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Virginia Constitutional Offices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Secretary of State’s office has been described in the literature as being “traditionally a woman’s office” (Sheeler 2000, 24). In examining leadership roles for women through interviews with state governors, Sheeler (2000) identifies four clusters of metaphors in media that characterize female leaders and undermine their work. Pioneering women are trailblazers, more symbolic than serious leaders; puppet leaders are perceived as manipulated and/or controlled by men, usually husbands or partners; unruly women challenge traditional gender roles and boundaries; and beauty queens reinscribe traditional hierarchical roles, particularly those found within the family structure. She associates beauty queens with the office of the Secretary of State, noting that women in this office generally start out as school teachers, homemakers or former first ladies prior to entering public service.
Nationally, in the last decade, the Secretary of State’s office has been one of the two state offices most occupied by women. It was second only to the Lieutenant Governor’s office, sometimes considered an irrelevant office (Long 2013) and for which candidates are often paired with the Governor in state elections. Table 3 illustrates the number of women elected to statewide executive office between 2000 and 2012. The Secretary of State’s office has been consistently occupied by approximately twelve women (with men in the other 38), while the number of women in most of the other executive offices has been slowly declining.

Table 3. Women in State Executive Offices, 2002-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptroller</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data missing for 2006
Source: Rutgers, Center for American Women and Politics, Fact Sheet Archive
http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/resources/FactSheetArchive.php#statewide

Conversations with West Virginia’s Secretaries of State

Interviews with the three women who have held the office of Secretary of State in West Virginia validate the literature and models presented here in many ways, but in many others they illustrate strong, pioneering women who have given their all for the betterment of the state through the performance of their duties while in office. In all instances they have encouraged and continue to encourage women’s participation in state governance.

Helen Holt (R), 1957-1959

At nearly one hundred years old, Helen Holt reflected on her career in public service. When Helen was appointed to the office of Secretary of State in 1957 she became the first woman to hold a statewide office. Helen was appointed to the office by Governor Cecil Underwood to fill the vacancy left by the death of D. Pitt O’Brien. Prior to her appointment, she served as a member of the House of Delegates, fulfilling her late husband’s term from 1955 to 1957. Helen did not seek re-election at the end of her term as a state Delegate; rather, she chose to run for delegate to the Republican National Convention, leading the ticket as delegate-at-large. Her popularity in that capacity prompted her appointment to Secretary of State. Strategically, her appointment also reduced the Democratic majority on the Board of Public Works, the state’s initial ex-
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Executive authority (replaced with the chief executive structure via constitutional amendment in 1968). At the time of her appointment, Helen was a single mother, teaching Biology and Chemistry at Greenbrier Women’s College (WV Division of Culture and History 2012).

Helen’s entry into public service came about because of her work with her husband, who had been elected to the legislature. Of his time in the legislature, she notes: “We were a team.” Such a trajectory into politics is not uncommon, and was the same for many of the first women to serve at the state level. The first three women elected governor in the United States were elected to replace or serve as surrogates for their husbands, while the first person elected governor in her own right didn’t take office until the mid-1980s (Carroll 2004). When the Secretary of State died, the Governor pushed her to take the appointment, saying “Helen, you have to do this and the people want you and I need you and the state needs you.” After some consideration, she agreed. As Helen notes, “that was the beginning…”

Helen subsequently ran for reelection but did not win. That may have been because she never campaigned but, as Secretary of State, she spoke all over the state. “As a woman it was a novelty so every place wanted me to speak…. Women weren’t serving in politics.” At a time when gender roles were even more strictly observed than they are now, it was difficult to find the right balance between femininity and politics. “Back then even I thought that a women who did something like that was a little bit crude, so I was determined to prove that one could be a lady and serve in politics, … in a public office, too.” She never thought about being a trailblazer: “I was just doing a job that was given to me to do and I felt that the Lord put me there and I had to do it….Of course it was my nature to do the best possible job that I could do.”

She had to learn the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary of State. No one at the state knew what the job entailed. She started out writing a weekly column, and her first topic was election law; she wanted people to know what it was that the Secretary of State was responsible for. She spoke to a local Rotary Club about the state seal – the Secretary of State is the keeper of the state seal and is responsible for its use on state documents – and the men in attendance (apparently there were no women) found it very interesting. Like most women, Helen had to “hone [her] leadership ability in the classroom” (Rosenthal 1998). In her time in office Helen used her teaching skills to learn everything she could about the office and to educate the public about its role and responsibilities. She also continued to advocate for general education, arguing that one couldn’t be effective as a citizen or in life without an education.

As for women’s roles in executive offices, she stresses that “women can do anything men can…I think in some ways women are better executives. Just like anybody can do a job if he works at it and tries to learn – because I learned by doing – there’s no reason why a woman can’t do it just as well as a man.” Asked if attitudes toward women in office have changed in the state, Helen responded, “Just look at Natalie [Tennant]….She led in the University as well as then being elected Secretary of State. I think women respect her and I know they respected me, because I commanded respect. The Secretary of State is an important office in the state.” The officeholder serves all the people of the state and “can set an example for others on how to be genteel and courteous and be an example of what a state officer should be.”

When Helen took the position of Secretary of State, she was a single mother with three children. She felt the Lord put her there for a reason; “I wanted him to take charge of my life; I had to do
what he said because I didn’t know what to do.” In the interview with Secretary Tennant (2009), she stated,

I never looked for a job….I always felt the Lord put me in a position, and once he put me in a position he would help me. I never campaigned. I didn’t know how to. I didn’t ask people to vote for me. I felt if they liked what I was saying they would vote for me. And I never thought of myself as a trailblazer. It’s only until recently I began to look at what I did in that way.

Helen continued in public service after her tenure as Secretary of State, accepting a presidential appointment to start a nursing home program, working with the Federal Housing Administration and state and local governments to see creation and development of the program through to completion and paving the way for others to duplicate her efforts.³

In taking on the Secretary of State position, as well as the presidential appointment, there was no prior metric, no guidelines or job description to follow. In fact, Helen developed manuals for use in duplicating the nursing home program that she created from the notes she kept as she developed the project. Helen grew up always wanting to do a good job, so taking on such complex jobs was in her nature – she liked to learn. Taking on challenges like this is not a gender issue but a character issue. She just wanted to get things done, and didn’t care about getting credit; she learned when in the state legislature that “it was better to give a man an idea and then help them carry them out. That was a good way to get things done and I enjoyed doing that.”

Finally, Helen offered her thoughts about the differences between serving as a representative in the House of Delegates and as a member of the state’s executive branch. “The executive has to be a leader and has to come up with the ideas. As a member…they would be a follower and should fit into group working….Not that an executive shouldn’t too as they have to work with other people….and there are a lot of people in the House that take leadership positions.”

**Betty Ireland (R), 2005-2009**

As the first woman ever elected to the executive branch of state government, Betty Ireland served as Secretary of State for West Virginia from 2005 to 2009. Prior to her election to statewide office, Betty taught for several years in the West Virginia public school system before moving into the private sector as an executive in the pension industry. She served on the City of Charleston Board of Zoning Appeals, as an At-Large representative of the Charleston City Council and as executive director for the WV Consolidated Public Retirement Board.

While in office Betty served on the executive board of the National Association of Secretaries of State. Her technological initiatives earned her recognition as one of America’s Top 25 Doers, Dreamers & Drivers by Government Technology Magazine. And, as an active member of the Stennis Center for Public Service, she was honored at its annual Southern Women in Public Service conference. She was named Hero of the Year in 2008 by the Charleston Public Safety Council for her advocacy for victims of domestic violence and a 2009 Honoree of the West Virginia Education Alliance for being a role model for those educated in the West Virginia public school system.
Betty is passionate about supporting women’s engagement in public service and politics. She is a founding member of the Vandalia Rotary Club in Charleston and a director of the WV Colleges and Independent Universities Board, as well as a board member of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce (Stennis Center 2008). She has been asked to speak at various meetings at the Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership and is actively involved Maggie’s List, a conservative organization that actively supports women candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

At the onset of the interview, when asked about the broader issue of women in politics, she noted that “Women aren’t represented in elective office in executive positions to the extent that we are in the general population. It’s always a challenge to get women in the top echelons because we are the ones who still have the babies and cycle in and out of the workforce…there is still a stigma for a woman being in a very powerful position.” She went on to describe her run for governor, during which she was told she was too tall to be governor, she wasn’t tough enough, it’s too hard for women, and she wasn’t conservative enough because she hadn’t taken her husband’s last name.

Betty’s interest in public service started at a young age. Her father was actively engaged in public service in Charleston, including membership on city council, so she grew up in an environment that celebrated public service. Later in college she was active in numerous committees and organizations, often in leadership positions, so it was something that “although it might not have come naturally to me, I think many times we women think ‘oh who me, am I really strong enough to do that?’” But leadership came naturally to her and during her professional life she knew she wanted to work in public service.

As noted above, a common barrier to entry for women in politics is a political system which favors incumbents. For Betty, the opportunity to enter the public realm arose when Joe Manchin left the Secretary of State’s office to become governor and a vacancy was created. “When you’re in politics, or think you’re in politics, when a spot opens up it’s rather refreshing, rather than having to run against an incumbent.” At that same time she had just left a position with a law firm in the private sector, and thought “I’ve got the skill set to do this.” She saw the Secretary of State’s office as primarily an administrative office, and she had experience managing offices and people. Prior to running for Secretary of State Betty had run the state’s retirement system so she knew state government and had worked closely with the legislature. To her “it was a natural; this is not only what I need to do, it’s what I want to do.”

Her run for governor was based on the same criteria: she had the skill set, and the governor was leaving for the U.S. Senate so there was another vacancy. It was an interesting time in West Virginia politics. But she was outspent in the primary at the very last minute by a self-funded male millionaire. She said she ran because “I knew state government, I had certainly been elected to the executive branch of government before, and I thought that it would be a good thing for me to do.”

According to Betty, even funding a campaign presents unique challenges for women. Men have more personal wealth, much more so than women. “No one likes to sit on the phone and ask for money but it is something you have to do. Women in particular are not used to doing this type of thing unless you’ve been in an executive position or a professional fund raiser… it is something
we’re not used to doing and we’re a little shy about doing it. It takes a lot of courage….” Betty is not hesitant about calling and asking for money but in that election there were many people running. She got a lot of support from women, but “traditionally, they would not write big checks. A $100 check was highly unusual for a woman not in politics to write.” She wonders what politics would look like if money and fund raising were not such a big factor in getting elected; she also spoke about Senator Rockefeller’s recent decision to leave office at the end of his term and what campaigns for that office might cost. “It all boils down to who has the most money; it’s all about money, which is unfortunate. But there is a strong woman candidate already in that race (Rep. Shelley Moore Capito) who we think will do very well.”

She also noted the lack of role models for young women interested in politics. “Younger women are desperate for women to run this state, run this country….Women feel that we are the caretakers, we are the consensus makers. We are still outnumbered, obviously, way outnumbered in U.S. Congress and many state legislatures. There is still bit of a stigma with the older generation in having a woman be the head of state.” When asked about running for governor, or U.S. Congress, she was unsure. “Timing is everything…You have to see if you have the passion for it, do you have the financial wherewithal to run in a very, very crowded primary, does your family want to do that, does your family mind that you get exposed to the things that happen, the ugly things that happen in a campaign. You have to weigh all those things.”

Politics for women in West Virginia is pretty much the same as that nationwide. There are a lot of women who get elected in the South. “What holds us back is that fact that we [West Virginia] are very small and not growing; we don’t attract many new people from other areas who bring their ideas; we don’t have an inward migration. We do get stuck in the same circles of thinking, but that’s probably not so much different from the rest of the country.”

West Virginia became a state in 1863 yet it took over 140 years to elect a woman to the executive branch. Betty wasn’t the first to run; many women ran before her but didn’t get elected. “And now it’s 2013…and now you [the authors] have only two women [who were elected] to talk to – it doesn’t make me very happy.”

Be that as it may, I didn’t run to be the first woman of anything. In fact, I did not know when I was running what the eventual outcome, how important that would be. I will tell you, the four years I spent at the Secretary’s office, we had a lot of young women and young girls who would come through and they were so happy to have a woman in that office. I felt that it was incumbent upon me to conduct myself honorably, honestly, and set some kind of role model for them.

In the future, Betty hopes women’s representation in government comes closer to their numbers in the general population. It comes down to women having the time, the inclination, the funds, and having the backing, having the encouragement to run for public office (emphasis by interviewee). “Socialization and social rules and the gendered nature of work” prepare men with what are understood to be primary leadership qualities, such as “rules, roles and controls” within a hierarchical context (Rosenthal 1998, 28) “Men typically have no qualms that they are qualified for the job [public office];” most men spend their lives in business positions or other positions where they are constantly expected to move up the corporate ladder, so it comes more naturally to consider running for public office as an outgrowth of their work. They don’t need encourage-
ment. Women, on the other hand, require a lot of hand holding and a great deal of encouragement. Women are not used to the attacks from the media; the exposure to criticism, the lies and the attacks that are part of the deal. Men have lived most of their lives in that environment. “It’s not the same for women.”

“If we had more women in leadership positions in Congress…particularly major committees – we would be able to cut through the stagnation and partisanship that is going on in Washington.” For women, the emphasis in leadership is on relationships and “connectedness without hierarchy,” on nurturing rather than controlling, and on empowering others and encouraging change (Rosenthal 1998, 28). Women get along, they talk, “because that’s what we’re used to doing, we’re used to sitting down and talking and figuring out the problem and coming back again and again until it’s solved.” Betty believes that “as we go on and get newer generations of men in Congress and the state legislatures, I think that you’ll find a smoothing out…you’ll see that they are more likely to see women as equals.”

As an afterthought, Betty noted that embracing and using power are also areas of particular weakness for women. “We women don’t always know how to use our own power, and we tend to doubt the strength of what power can do. I think this is a direct result of not having enough experience of testing and using power.” In contrast, men rarely do not recognize their own power, although “some certainly use it better than others.” Some men in powerful positions still see women as sexual beings and some women find that combination seductive. “Power is a strong aphrodisiac. If not handled properly, it can make us (men and women both) do things we would not ordinarily do, but on the other hand, it can also cripple us to the point we are not effective, if we don’t know how to use it constructively.”

Natalie Tennant (D), 2009-Present

Natalie Tennant is no stranger to breaking barriers as a woman. She received a bachelor’s degree in journalism and a master’s degree in corporate and organizational communication from West Virginia University, and while there became the first woman to represent the university as the Mountaineer Mascot. She then went on to a career in television broadcasting and reporting, and it was there, covering state government, that her passion for public service blossomed. Natalie first campaigned for Secretary of State in the 2004 elections. She never got past the primary, losing by about 1,000 votes; however that did not deter her. She ran again in 2008 and was elected; she became the first woman to be reelected to a constitutional office, and began to serve an unprecedented second term as Secretary of State after the 2012 election. During her first term, Natalie piloted an online voting initiative for West Virginia military members and overseas citizens for the primary election. She testified before Congress on the success of her program in February 2011.

Early in life Natalie discovered that “being part of it, being part of the decision-making is your first thought” of public service and public office. For Natalie, public service covers a wide variety of ways to participate, not just holding public office. Teachers and nurses are public servants because “you are doing something for the greater good….it’s an ability to help those around you….Maybe we should call everything that we do public service because it is, if we’re doing a good job then we are helping our fellow human beings.” Natalie considers being a “television reporter [as] a form of public service in that you inform and educate your community.”
Natalie chose to run for executive office because she felt she could do the job and she wanted to serve the citizens of West Virginia. Also, being in the legislature was not an option because the West Virginia legislature is a part-time legislature; she could not work part-time as a reporter and part-time as a lawmaker. The Secretary of State position was a full-time position, it was an open seat, and she had name recognition from her days as a reporter. Natalie said, “I didn’t have a whole lot of money at all, but used it very wisely and worked really hard and used the skills that I had from understanding television a little bit when I purchased commercials.” She was successful in part, because “people like to see folks who lose and come back and try again and don’t give up.”

Like Betty, Natalie ran for governor in the special election in 2011. She cited a number of reasons for deciding to run:

You look at (1) where you might fit in, (2) if the timing is right in terms of timing for the situation and in terms of timing for your personal situation, and I felt that we had done some really good things in the Secretary of State’s office and I’m a go-getter and I thought that WV was at a time period when you could really be at this crossroads and say here’s someone who has shown initiative, who’s shown bold ideas and has gone out and accomplished those. And in some respects West Virginia needs that, too…. And it was a quick race.

So why run for governor in the special election in particular? The system favors incumbents, women have a better chance when running for an open seat (Marshall & Mayhead 2000). “There was an opportunity offered by an unusual vacancy, and you never know what happens sometimes with unique situations like that,” Natalie stressed. For the first time in modern times, there was a special election for Governor, creating a unique situation in which candidates would not have to run against an incumbent, or event against the successes of a previous full-term executive.

In her campaigning, she wanted people to know you don’t have to do things the same way you’ve always done them. She wanted to focus on transparency and accountability because she had shown what they were doing at the Secretary of State’s office. As a result, other candidates started talking about accountability and transparency, too. “That’s why we need people to run for office. Not necessarily to win…because we only have one Secretary of State and one Governor. But you still have those voices and those ideas that help to shape others’ ideas.”

In considering future runs, she has looked toward 2016 and learned from her earlier campaign. In 2014 there will be an open seat in the U.S. Senate for the first time in 30 years, and in 2016 there will be an open race for Governor. “You have to look at where your skills might be best placed. I look at a big picture.” Her focus as Secretary of State has been to pull the other state agencies to work together.

How have things changed for women who want to be in executive office? One thing that hasn’t changed is the expectation that women will remain the primary care provider for children and family. “For women, some things never change…if we have children, we’re always the mother….I don’t know that things have changed much. I know there are unique situations that women go through…. My concern is the family.” Natalie arranges her travel schedule – speaking en-
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gagements, meetings, etc. – around the schedules of her young daughter and husband, who is a state senator. The challenge is that “They say they want women candidates, but women candidates come with children.”

“If I don’t have enough resources, it’s because I didn’t work hard enough to get them.” But that may not be the case for others. She doesn’t dwell on gender differences or any other reason why she can’t do something. She uses research from organizations such as the Barbara Lee Foundation5 to learn how to best position herself and her candidacy. “I have to show that I am qualified and that I am a leader.”

“I want to see more women in the legislature because I see how I as an executive am inclusive, because I think that women probably do look at the bigger picture and I think that women look at the ripple effect of something.” That would encourage good working relationships between the legislature and the executive branch. “Women are collaborative.”

Integration of Theory and Practice

There is considerable correlation between the statements made by the three Secretaries of State about their service as statewide executive officers, the theories offered to explain women’s underrepresentation in elected office, and the arguments offered for the importance of women’s participation. Helen Holt and Natalie Tennant talked about the personal challenges of trying to juggle home and family responsibilities with the responsibilities of elected office. Traditional gender role expectations, as characterized by the situational hypothesis – whether they are simply perceptions of constituent voters or real-time logistical challenges (juggling day care with speaking engagements, for example) – act as a deterrent to women when considering whether to enter a political race or take on an elected office. All three women believe that the roles for women in business, society and politics are expanding and that cultural expectations of gender roles, particularly in respect to child and family responsibilities, are becoming increasingly more equitable. They expect this to translate into increased access for women to statewide offices and, in turn, inspire constituents to more fully appreciate the unique contributions that women make to state governance.

Many of the challenges the women identified fell within the gender role attitudes hypothesis. They noted ingrained gender roles, including socialization norms that begin in childhood and extend into college and adulthood through preparation for business and family responsibilities as well as a discriminatory culture that perceives leadership qualities to be inherently masculine and women’s roles as supportive and family-oriented. The gender roles attitudes and political gender role socialization hypotheses, in which expectations that politics is a man’s world, discourage women from seeking public office and constituents from accepting women in traditionally-male leadership roles. All three women talked of taking advantage of opportunities as they present themselves, particularly the absence of an incumbent in an open seat or waiting for a similar advantage. While they did not say so directly, this would preclude them from having to compete with a man for a position that had been traditionally occupied by a man, in a male-oriented setting. They also noted other challenges to running for office and effectively performing required duties when in office, including learning to effectively ask for money, and internalizing the idea that women can do anything men can do and then conveying that awareness to constituents.
through demonstrations of qualifications, leadership, passion and commitment – all characteristics automatically attributed to men. Betty observed that women approach positions of leadership differently than men; they often focus on “softer” policy issues such as education, welfare and other social policies, and are more collaborative in their efforts to resolve ideological differences.

All three women talked in various ways about the need to encourage and mentor young women and their desire to serve as role models for young women. This fits with arguments put forth in the gender role socialization and role model hypotheses, which indicate that enculturation of young adults into traditional gender roles, combined with the role expectations placed on men and women in political office – including the scarcity of well-respected women in highly visible political office – discourage young women’s interest in a political career. Betty Ireland and Natalie Tennant specifically identified the need to provide emotional, cultural and financial support and mentoring to women interested in running for statewide elective offices. All three talked about ways in which they wanted to provide positive role models for younger women, as well as the importance of actively encouraging future leaders through involvement with national organizations created for that purpose.

Conclusion

As we celebrate West Virginia’s 150th birthday, it is important to note the state’s dismal record in electing women to executive office. Three women who held executive office all served as Secretary of State, which is perceived in the literature as a feminine office, and is the only state executive office to which women have been appointed or elected. It is equally important to note that the last two Secretaries of State have been and are currently women, with the current Secretary of State beginning her second term in office.

In this study we explored the theoretical underpinnings of women’s underrepresentation in elected office and the importance of women’s participation. We looked at the statistics on women in representative and leadership offices nationwide and in Appalachia and then specifically for women in state executive offices in West Virginia. We compared those findings to lived experiences gleaned through interviews with the three women in West Virginia who held the office of Secretary of State, noting the correspondence between the literature, data, and personal perceptions and insights. Many of the sentiments and insights shared by the three women interviewed here echoed the trends identified in the literature on women in public service. Our review of this literature, as well as the insights gathered from elected officials in West Virginia, indicates that under-representation of women is an issue at all levels of government, with a complex set of factors that may influence women in their decisions to pursue public office.

More than ninety years after the Nineteenth Amendment extended suffrage to women, it is clear that achieving parity in representation is not something that will happen on its own. Without concerted efforts to encourage women to pursue public office and to eliminate the stereotypes and other barriers to public service, women are likely to remain in the minority of representation, with their priority issues taking a backseat to others. Recommendations from the women interviewed here echo recommendations throughout literature on women in leadership. The creation of “networks that allow for higher-status women to mentor other women within the organization can help increase their presence in leadership positions” (Silva et al. 2011, 37).
Long-standing national organizations, such as the National League of Women Voters and EMILY’s List and more local organizations around the country, such as Loretta Durbin’s Illinois’ Women’s Institute for Leadership, have been encouraging women’s participation in political life. Betty Ireland described her ongoing work with the West Virginia Republican Party to encourage women to run for public office. In addition, new organizations to support and study women in politics have emerged, including Rutgers’s Center for American Women In Politics, Secretary Clinton’s Women in Public Service Project, and Emerge America, which began as a western regional organization, among a growing number of others. The insights gleaned from studies of how current female representatives have overcome the barriers noted here, renewed support for incumbents, and dedicated recruitment of new candidates may ultimately combine to allow women in West Virginia, Appalachia, and the United States to achieve leadership representation in all branches of government.
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Notes

1 Other models include the moral political culture affiliated primarily with the upper western and eastern portions of the U.S., and the individual political culture which pertains primarily to the mid-west.

2 For more information on emotional labor in public service, see the award-winning book Emotional Labor: Putting the Service in Public Service, by Mary E. Guy, Meredith A. Newman and Sharon H. Mastracci.

3 “In 1960, Helen Holt left West Virginia to accept a special assistant position with the Federal Housing Administration in Washington, D.C. She worked on initiating a program to construct nursing homes around the nation. She
served in senior capacities in the Federal Housing Administration within the Department of Housing and Urban Development throughout her career. Holt’s early research led to the first federal programs for nursing homes and care for the elderly.” http://www.sos.wv.gov/secretary-desk/Pages/SecretariesofState1901-2000.aspx.
4 Information about the Stennis Center’s Women’s Leadership Initiatives can be found at http://www.stennis.gov/programs/womens-leadership-initiatives. Information about Maggie’s List, an organization dedicated to electing fiscally conservative women, can be obtained from http://www.maggieslist.org/.
5 For more about how the Barbara Lee Family Foundation advances women’s equality and representation in American politics, please see http://www.barbaraleefoundation.org/.
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Advancing Women in Local Government: The Case of Illinois

Rachel Lange and Kimberly Nelson

Introduction

While the proportion of women in many professions today approaches that of men, at the highest levels of the local government management field, there remains a significant gap. In 1981, women occupied only 13% of chief administrative officer (CAO) positions, and in 2012 the International City/County Managers Association (ICMA) reported that only 12.6% of their memberships were females. In Illinois, 48% of females occupy the mid-level/analyst position but only 24% of assistant to the CAOs are female. What accounts for a decrease of 50% from one management level to the next? The percentage drops even further (to only 8%) at the city manager/chief administrator level. By using survey data from female local government professionals in Illinois, this research attempts to uncover possible reasons for this continuing disparity.

Women began to work in public sector clerical positions in the mid-1800s (Guy 1993). However, they made little progress in government managerial ranks. In 1974, females made up only 1% of all local government managers (Fox and Schumann 2001). Although that number has increased to 13% today, it is still far below the proportion of males in the chief administrative officer positions.

Legislation aimed at increasing female participation in the workforce, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), the Equal Pay Act of 1963, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 have helped to address some of the barriers for working women. But these legal changes have not been sufficient for promoting women to the top local government jobs. Although there may be cases where local government leaders disregard the laws, it is more likely that other factors are dissuading or preventing women from attaining the top jobs.

Dometrius (1984) argues that it will take until the year 2040 for women to gain proportional representation among career agency leaders and to fully integrate women into top management; he suggests that this slow pace was set by the first six years following the passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. Tracing the pattern of female integration into public man-
agement shows that there was rapid progress in the middle and late 1970s, followed by a period of stagnation beginning in the mid-1980s that has continued to this day (Guy 1993). Unfortunately, there is little research that is specific to the local government sector to explain the causes of this stagnation. Therefore, we will draw on research on state government as well as local to identify some of the potential factors that have led to the discrepancy between male and female CAOs in local government.

**Career Path**

The career paths of women and men in government management differ. Research on state government managers found that women tend to be promoted at a slower pace than men for the first five to six years of their employment, and then their rate of promotion speeds up (Kelly et al., 1991). This finding indicates that women work longer to prove themselves before they are given the same opportunities as men. As women attempt to move up in the workplace, they are instead compressed into the lower levels of public agencies and concentrated into traditionally defined “female type” occupations. Newman describes this phenomenon as women being kept under glass ceilings and within glass walls (Newman 1994). This compression of women hinders their chance of advancement in their career path.

Bullard and Wright (1993) suggest that significant numbers of women have risen to the top state administrative positions by circumventing rather than breaking the glass ceiling. They argue that women tend to move up to the top job through a non-traditional path, such as entering the agency as an outsider or from the private sector. Bowling, Kelleher, Jones and Wright state that women administrators tend to have slightly more varied career paths than males (2006). These career path differences may indicate the continued existence of prejudice in state and local government among those with hiring authority.

**Female Traits**

Women bring to the table different priorities, performing more constituent services, and having different policy preferences than men (Aguado and Frederickson 2012). Men and women often bring different leadership qualities, agendas, priorities, and methods of understanding policy issues in a professional environment (Fox and Schumann 1999). In an organization that is predominately run by males it may be common for males to feel intimidated or afraid of a strong female because her management style is different. For example, Mary Guy in her article “Three Steps Forward, Two Steps Backward” cites a 1963 Wall Street Journal article that stated:

> It was advantageous to have women in management positions because they were “good listeners” and “sympathetic in nature” and thereby brought a “humanizing” influence to managerial ranks (1993, 286).

Management in local government is dependent on an individual’s leadership, commitment, and desire to serve the community. Fox and Schumann (1999) found that women and men defined public service differently. Women were more likely to define public service in terms of helping
improve the community and they were much more likely to use the words “community” and “citizen” in their definition; whereas, men were more likely to say that they wanted to “make a difference” or “get something done”, creating a feeling of personal accomplishment (Fox and Schumann 1999, 235). The survey results conclude that female managers are more likely than their male counterparts to embrace a style of management that relies on seeking citizen input and maintaining a focus on the overall health of the community.

Mary Guy (1993) observed that women and men have different perceptions of their work, the power structures in which they manage, and the degree to which they have made progress to advance to the highest decision-making positions in their organizations. Furthermore, men often see women as emotional and some men resent women who get promoted (Hale 1999), while women report that they often feel ignored and have a hard time getting their opinions heard (Hale 1999).

These traits that are attributed to females are causing a barrier as they rise through the ranks. Males may see these traits as personality conflicts. However, other research suggests that the presence of women in high-level positions may change the direction of policy outputs for the better (Reid, Kerr and Miller 2008). A diverse management team can promote better decision-making—differing personality traits in men and women can allow for varying perspectives on a decision—potentially averting groupthink and other bureaucratic pathologies.

**Work-Life Balance**

As women have struggled to have equivalent representation as men in the workplace, many argue that a primary reason for this struggle is due to the difficulty in balancing a career and family life. Married women with children are still the primary caregivers and are in charge of many of the household responsibilities (Kelly et al. 1991). Without a supportive partner, it is hard for a female to become a CAO, due to the difficulty of balancing work and family life.

Aguado and Frederickson (2012) found that women interested in city management careers face a paradox. For instance, if women are married there is a greater probability that they will become city managers; however, if women marry and have children, they usually face issues of relocation and childcare scheduling. These results indicate that a married, but childless woman has a greater probability of becoming a city manager than one who is married with children.

Kelly et al. (1991) state that housework tasks were reported as causing significant challenges for women more so than for men in all the states they surveyed. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics American Time Use Survey, in 2012 women contributed significantly more hours to childcare and household related tasks than men. Unless the workplace is family-friendly and offers flexible hours, it is often too hard for women to succeed at both work and at home. The stress and demanding hours at work may be overwhelming for those women who are also trying to raise a family and successfully become a CAO.
Personal and Organizational Barriers

Kelly et al. (1991) state that for some women, just being female continues to interfere with job advancement. Females may be eager to take the top job but those with hiring authority may have misconceptions about a woman’s ability to both have a family and successfully perform on the job.

These misconceptions may lead to an organizational culture that is unconsciously intolerant of women as managers. Culture is defined as the shared values, norms, beliefs, conforming patterns and basic assumptions that influence the behavior of organization members (Burke 1982). Women face a barrier when the organizational culture is male-dominated or when governing boards are drawn to male candidates when considering applicants for CAO positions. When the organizational culture is strongly male oriented there is little attempt to create a gender diverse organization, creating an obstacle for females in local government management.

Reid, Kerr and Miller (2008) conclude that the openness to females in leadership positions is particularly dependent on the combination of the culture and the influence of elite power within the organization. A lack of commitment to affirmative action, a lack of developmental assignments that would enhance qualifications, a gender-biased culture and stereotypes, outright discrimination, and the distribution of opportunities and power are all barriers. Mentoring young females and helping them understand some of the issues and challenges that come with a male-dominated culture is one way to help females be more successful in local government management (Fox and Schumann 2001).

Mentoring

Research has shown that mentoring is important to career success (Fox and Schumann 2001; Slack et al. 1996). Mentoring includes teaching protégés how to make decisions, guiding, advising, helping to fit events into the broad picture, serving as an advocate, role modeling, giving constructive feedback, motivating, and protecting (Kelly et al. 1991). The lack of female role models and female mentors is a barrier to female achievement in the public administration field (Fox and Schumann 2001). Women need mentors who have successfully forded the barriers that confront women, and men are not always directly aware of these barriers (Guy 1993).

A woman’s behavior influences her reputation among other members of the organization. Young women, just like young men, start out with high ambitions but may become unsure of their advancement to the chief administrative officer role (Devillard et al. 2012). Having a mentor allows women to share their feelings and gain the confidence they need to successfully fill higher level positions. Mentors are critically important for helping men and women climb career ladders (Fox and Schumann 2001; Slack et al. 1996). Kelly et al. (1991) found that men are more likely to be mentored by men than by women. When being mentored by one’s peers, women were as likely to have male mentors as they were to have female mentors; however, women reported a much smaller percentage of women directors as mentors. The reason may be that as one is promoted to high levels in the organization, the pool of potential mentors diminishes and there are fewer and fewer women above them to serve as mentors. Women in middle-
management positions who seek a CAO mentor must often pair with a male mentor because there are so few women in the top posts (Guy 1993). Unfortunately, some male managers may not want to mentor a female. Mary Hale (1999) found that men are sometimes less willing to provide mentoring experiences to women because they feel uncomfortable doing so.

Not only does mentoring provide a sense of confidence, but mentoring also has a positive effective on one’s professional career development and one’s chance of upward mobility (Fox and Schumann 2001). When females have a positive mentoring relationship and when they feel connected to someone else, they are able to feel motivated and encouraged. Unless women are mentored and encouraged they will usually stay in these middle management roles because it provides personal meaning (Devillard et al. 2012).

This research uses the perspectives of females in senior and junior local government management positions to assess the barriers to seeking upper management positions. The findings in the literature suggest that career path differences, female personality traits, the challenges of balancing work and family, and organizational characteristics may all serve as barriers to success, while a positive mentoring experience, especially from women who have achieved the top jobs, presents a potential pathway to reaching the CAO position.

Methodology

In an effort to better understand why there are so few women occupying chief administrative officer positions in Illinois, a survey was conducted of all women chief administrative officers, assistant CAOs, assistant to the CAOs, and deputy CAOs in Illinois. A list of the women in these positions was created using the Illinois City/County Managers Association website and the International City/County Managers Association directory.

In 2012, there were 33 female chief administrative officers in Illinois and 63 female assistants, assistant to the CAOs, and deputy CAOs (herein referred to as “assistants”). The survey was sent to the female CAOs and assistants via e-mail. There were 27 questions on each survey but the questions differed by position. The CAOs were asked a series of questions relating to their career path and any problems they faced rising to the CAO position. The assistants were asked a series of questions relating to their future goals, their career path, and any barriers they have overcome or that they anticipate.

The objective of the survey was to learn about the perspectives of female local government managers regarding the profession, career paths, and the barriers to the top jobs. For background purposes, the survey also asked about the respondents’ families and personal background. Of the total population of 33 female CAOs in Illinois, 24 responded to the survey, which is a 73% response rate. The response rate for assistants was 68% response rate (43 out of 63).
Findings

The findings are presented within five categories corresponding to the categories in the literature review: career paths, female traits, family/work life balance, personal and organizational barriers, and mentoring.

Career Path

In local government management, the model career path looks like this: entry level/analyst → assistant to the CAO → assistant/deputy CAO → CAO. When men and women first enter the profession of local management at the mid-level/analyst position, they are almost proportionately equal (48% female, 51% male; as shown in Figure 1). The big change occurs in the next career step. There is a steep, 50% decline in the percentage of female analysts who move up to the next higher level of assistant to the CAO. If only 24% are moving from the entry level position to the “assistant to” level job, the pool of highly trained female assistants becomes insufficient for achieving proportionality at the CAO level. Without females moving up from the entry level position there is a much smaller pool of experienced female managers qualified to compete for the CAO slots. Only 9% of local government CAOs in Illinois are women, as indicated in Figure 1. As the positions decrease in authority, the proportion of women in those jobs increases.

When talking about the career path of an individual it is also important to look at the length of service, age, internal vs. external promotion, and positions. In Illinois, we found that the largest percentage of respondent CAOs (31%, n=7) worked in local government for 6-10 years, and 22% (n=5) have been in local government for 16-20 years. Most responding CAOs have had short tenures in their positions with 39% (n=9) holding the job for less than six years and another 35% (n=8) working in their position for 6-10 years. Only four (17%) have held their position for more than 10 years. Figure 2 illustrates the ages at which women were hired as CAOs. Most are hired between the ages of 41-45. With a large proportion of Illinois’ CAOs being both new to
the profession and their role as CAOs, one might hope that the number of female CAOs will continue to rise as these women continue in the profession while mentoring young professionals to also seek the top job.

Education levels are similar among the responding CAOs and assistants. 52% (n=12) of CAOs and 73% (n=30) of assistants have a master’s in public administration (MPA) degree. Some CAO respondents have less traditional educational backgrounds, 13% (n=3) of CAOs have a law degree, 9% (n=2) have a MBA, and 9% (n=2) have only a bachelor’s degree. As for assistants, in addition to those who have a MPA; 10% (n=4) have bachelor’s degrees, and 10% (n=4) have a MBA. This data suggests that the level of education and degree is not the only factor considered for females when rising to the top job. Furthermore, 63% (n=15) of the CAOs surveyed were promoted externally; whereas, the other 38% (n=9) were promoted internally. Females are able to prove their work both inside and outside of the organization.

Of the respondents to the assistant survey, only 26 have served as an intern and only 10 of the 43 respondents have been a management analyst. A majority have served as the assistant to the CAO (21 out of 43) and assistant or deputy CAO (28 out of 43). Thus, about half of the survey respondents are following the model local government management career path. Interestingly, four of the assistants stated that they had already been a manager or administrator and then returned to the assistant position. The remaining assistants who did not follow the model career path, served previously as human resource managers, zoning administrators, financial analysts, or in the parks and recreation department. According to this survey, the path of females does not directly determine their rise to the top position.

Most current CAOs survey respondents have also followed the model career path. 52% (n=12) of CAOs were an assistant CAO before getting the top job. Consistent with the literature, the other half followed non-traditional paths to the top. The following is a list of positions that the
remaining 42% (n=12) of CAOs had right before they took their first CAO position: village attorney (3), finance director (1), assistant to the CAO (1), interim village manager (1), director of environmental health (1), planning and zoning officer (1), human resource director (1), and private sector business executive/vice president (3). This data illustrates that females can succeed in the profession through different career paths.

Some respondents reported that women struggle to move up in the public sector because of the effect of stereotypes and barriers. Women have to put more effort into earning trust and proving themselves before they are able to advance. A Village Manager in Illinois explained that it was hard for her to move up in the profession, because: “Leaders are satisfied with the status quo and don’t want to risk having it change. Women are perceived as a threat to their way of “life.”

At the first promotion stage, women experience difficulty. Certain challenges come into play and these create obstacles for women trying to advance in the profession. If women do not get promoted in sufficient number at the “assistant to” level, they are missing out on the mentoring and training experiences that they need to continue their advancement. Overcoming obstacles at the beginning of their career paths will enable more women to be potential candidates for the CAO position.

**Female Traits**

Both CAOs and assistants reported that intelligence and integrity are the most important traits for women who are or want to become a CAO. The respondents addressed two questions regarding the traits that they think are needed to be a chief administrative officer. The first question stated, “Check all of the traits that apply to you.” The second question stated, “Check the three most important traits needed to become a successful CAO.” The respondents to the CAO survey indicated that intelligence was the most important (17 respondents) and the majority of assistants responded that integrity was the most important trait (24 respondents), with 21 assistant respondents choosing intelligence. The answers between assistants and CAOs did not differ markedly (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Traits of Assistants and Chief Administrative Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAOs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check all the traits that apply to you:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.) Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) Motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAOs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top three traits that have helped you become a good CAO:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.) Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) Motivated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is the list of words the respondents chose from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introverted</th>
<th>Extroverted</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Alertness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>Emotionally Stability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motivation was the third most important trait for CAOs. The literature review discusses the difficulties that women face rising to the top job; a lack of motivation may lead to failure to achieve the top job. Assistants reported that flexibility is important to success. They were referring to the ability to be flexible with one’s schedule to accomplish both what needs to be done at work and at home.

Most women have a difficult time knowing when they are ready to advance. Females want to make sure they have mastered all the necessary skills so that they will be able to do the job to the best of their ability, but this may not be the case for males. Males are more willing to take chances and they have more confidence to step into a situation where they might not know everything that is going on.

48% (n=10) of CAOs stated that it took encouragement from others for them to realize they were ready to advance. The results presented in Table 2 reinforce the importance of mentoring and the encouragement of women in the profession. To women, encouragement from others is very important. The respondents also believe that serving in the department head/assistant role for a long period of time is beneficial to long-term success. By serving in a department head role, women are able to gain the knowledge they need and they are able to take responsibility. Only a small portion of respondents waited to advance to the top job due to education and children. Family obligations are not always the main reason women do not want to advance or take the top job, it is more often their lack of encouragement and confidence in their skills and abilities that keep them from moving up in the profession. One respondent put it this way, “Sometimes you don’t know. It is sometimes other people who see the necessary qualities.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: Advancement of Female CAOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: When did you know you were ready to advance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served in Department Head/Assistant role and took responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an advanced degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waited for children to get older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity presented itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the reasons women seek the top job, 41% (n=11) of responding assistants said that becoming a CAO was a long-time career goal and the primary reason they sought the top job was to fulfill that goal (see Table 3).
### TABLE 3: Main Reason Assistants Want to be a CAO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Goal</th>
<th>41% (N=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td>30% (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Change</td>
<td>13% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Change</td>
<td>4% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>4% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Family/Work Balance

Balancing family and work will continue to be a struggle for women in the local government profession. However, it is erroneous to assume that women do not want the top job due to family obligations. It is also unfortunate that many people retain the belief women are not capable of being successful in the CAO position while raising a family.

As shown in Figure 3, 40% (n=13) of respondents want to be a CAO and already have children while only 16% (n=6) of respondents who have children do not want to be a CAO. Also, 16% (n=6) of those who do not know if they want to be a CAO do not have children. These individuals may be unsure about becoming a CAO because of the potential challenges of a work-life balance since they do not currently have children.

### Figure 3: Career Goal and Children

![Figure 3: Career Goal and Children](image)

### TABLE 4: Career Goal and Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has Children (N=21)</th>
<th>Does Not Have Children (N=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wants to be a CAO (N=190)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Want to be a CAO (N=11)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don't Know (N=9)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given that most of the respondents who report a career goal of reaching the CAO position do have children, it would seem to indicate that having children or having a family does not directly influence their career goal. While having children may not deter a woman from having an ambitious career goal, women still struggle to be both successful leaders and mothers.

Another misconception about women managers is that they wait for their children to get older before taking a CAO position. If this phenomenon exists, it could serve as a barrier to women reaching the top because they take themselves out of the running while at the peak of their careers. In the Illinois sample, there is little evidence that women place a hold on their careers. Although 42% achieve the CAO position when their children are 10 or older, 43% have children under age 8 when they start the top job (Table 5).

### TABLE 5: Age of Youngest Child at First CAO Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Youngest Child</th>
<th>Percentage (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 3</td>
<td>32% (N=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>11% (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>16% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>42% (N=8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women report that it is easier for a female to take the top job when they are being mentored and when the organization is flexible and family-friendly. Survey respondents reported a number of challenges when moving up the ladder, including: time commitment to both family life and work life, being too overwhelmed, and the high level of work hours demanded (see Table 6).

### TABLE 6: Challenges Balancing Work and Family Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Commitment to Both</td>
<td>32% (N=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelming</td>
<td>22% (N=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding Hours at Work</td>
<td>14% (N=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are No Challenges</td>
<td>14% (N=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life is More Important to Me</td>
<td>8% (N=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Flexibility at Work</td>
<td>5% (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Scheduling</td>
<td>5% (N=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Spouse Gets Frustrated</td>
<td>3% (N=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These challenges contribute to the problem of women failing to advance to the top job. One respondent explained her challenges this way:

*This is not a job that you can walk away from at the end of the day, and I think women have to know that coming into the profession. At this level you are always thinking about how to solve a problem or communicate information in a more meaningful way to the board, the public or employees. Criticism of your performance is highly public. While “thinking ahead” helps me be an effective manager, I have a tendency to over think things and worry about the potential for something to go wrong - to the point of significant stress. This is something I have been working on and I am getting better at over time. I*
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attempt to "compartmentalize" and only allow myself to think about a work problem at certain times outside of work so that I can focus on my son's little league game or his homework, etc. I learned this technique from a male colleague. Generally, I think men do have an easier time "compartmentalizing" than women. For me at least, I have had to learn and practice it.

Although balancing the stress from a demanding career with that of raising a family is a challenge, when combined with organizational and personal barriers, it may become too much to overcome.

**Personal Barriers**

Personal barriers influence a female’s decision to rise to the top job. These barriers often steer aspiring individuals away from wanting the top job. As women confront barriers and have a hard time getting to a higher level position, the number of women in the field continues to stay low. According to the survey responses, aspiring managers are concerned about excessive stress from the job (as shown in Table 7). Consistent with the findings about the challenge of finding the appropriate work/life balance, assistant managers also named family obligations as a personal barrier to the top job. Barriers that may be specific to a particular job included too many hours in the top job, dealing with disgruntled elected officials, and residency requirements. Residency requirements, which are local ordinances that require the CAO to live within the corporate limits of the municipality, tend to be more problematic for female managers than for male managers. Many female local government managers have husbands with successful careers as well, making relocation a challenge. A residency requirement, therefore, is more likely to deter female applicants than male applicants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7: Reasons You Do Not Want to be a CAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Elected Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't want to Move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted by my husband's job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Cut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Barriers**

Although stress, family obligations, and too many hours affect how women feel about becoming a CAO, these personal barriers were not the most cited answer when asked about the primary obstacle for women today trying to become a CAO. As shown in Table 8, 53% (n=7) of CAOs and 43% (n=16) of assistants reported that a male-dominated culture is the primary obstacle for females today. This is an organizational barrier that is separate from personal and job related behaviors.
TABLE 8: Primary Obstacle for Women Today Trying to Become a CAO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>CAOs</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male-dominated Culture</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Confidence</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Work Balance</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Obstacles</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough flexibility</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much stress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The culture is different in each organization. Actions of the governing board influence the overall culture of the municipality or county. If board members use terms that are derogatory or dismissive about female employees, these attitudes may filter throughout the organization. In some organizations there is a general perception that men are more decisive and better leaders. In this type of culture, a woman may try to overcompensate to prove those stereotypes untrue.

This potential is borne out by the survey findings. Female CAOs reported that a woman’s lack of confidence is a significant obstacle to achieving the CAO position. However, assistant responses reported lack of confidence as the least important obstacle. This is a large discrepancy between the two groups, and the reason for it is not intuitively obvious. More experienced CAOs should feel more confident; but, instead, it appears that assistants are more confident or that senior managers have a better understanding of the importance of confidence, as shown in Table 8. The following statement was made by a CAO in response to why a male-dominated culture was seen as the primary obstacle:

They are not a man. It is a very hard culture to break through. A lot of the departments you deal with are male dominated occupations so the culture can lean towards ‘the good old boys’. That being said, I have worked with men who have treated me with respect and with regard to the position. It is never easy to be the CAO in any organization, but it is especially hard in the public sector as its history and policy have all been derived from men and their ideals and criteria. They tend not to take you as seriously and may ignore your plans and policy in moving the organization forward. Sometimes they just downright ignore you.

Despite the continued existence of a male-dominated culture in some organizations, women have been able to overcome people’s preconceptions and the other barriers put in the way of their success. How have some women succeeded despite all of these challenges? Research seems to point towards effective mentoring as a significant factor in public leadership success.

**Mentoring**

In exploring the reasons as to why there are so few women reaching the top of the profession, assistants were asked several questions about mentorship. Among the assistants surveyed, 58% (n=23) reported having a mentor, but only 22% (n=8) said that their mentor was female (Table 9.)
Given the small proportion of CAOs who are women, it is no surprise that it is difficult for a woman to find another woman to serve as a mentor. While a male mentor can provide valuable guidance to a woman as well as a man, young women need to be able to talk to others who have overcome some of the barriers and who can connect with them to encourage their advancement into a CAO role. Women CAOs have overcome many barriers, as shown in Table 10 and can serve as strong mentors for young professionals.

Respondents who answered that they did not have a mentor were asked why and their responses were generally the same; either they were never given a mentor or they do not really have anyone to consider a mentor. Expanding on her answer, one respondent stated, “I have some people I consider mentors, but I am not sure if they are aware they are my mentor.” This sort of response was common. All CAOs need to understand the importance of educating and mentoring young professionals but female CAOs have a more significant responsibility. They need to be aware of the lack of females in the profession and be willing to mentor and encourage young, aspiring females.

**Conclusion**

Gender proportionality in the top levels of local government management remains an elusive goal. As stated earlier, less than 20% of local government CAOs are women and in some states,
like Illinois, the proportion is less than 10%. At the junior ranks of local government management, male-female proportions are very close. However, the proportions become less equivalent at positions of greater authority. This paper explored some of the reasons for this failure to advance.

According to the survey responses, in some cases women choose not to continue the upward climb on the ladder. They may decide that the stress and responsibility are too great and are inconsistent with rearing children. They may think that there is less stability at the top and given residency requirements, may not want to risk the possibility of being fired and uprooting their children from school.

Women do not always make the choice not to continue the upward climb. In some cases, there may be barriers in place that prevent a woman from achieving higher levels of authority. Over 50% of female CAOs in Illinois have advanced to the top job through the model career path or other local government positions. Even though half of females are following the model career path, they are having a difficult time advancing through the different levels. What is not determined from this study is whether the women who took a different path to the top did so serendipitously or strategically. Was the alternate career path the reason for their success?

What is known is that many women do not make it to that top job. When women are not promoted in sufficient numbers to the next level in the career path, they lose the opportunity to be nurtured, mentored, and trained. They also lose the opportunity to mentor others.

Both assistants and CAOs classified the organizational behavior of a male-dominated culture as the primary obstacle for those women today who try to become a CAO. Male-dominated cultures are extremely difficult to change. Good leadership is needed throughout the senior level management staff in order to institute a change in culture. As leaders in the organization continue to promote a friendly and diverse agency, they will be able to lead by example and others will follow. Male board members are also drawn to personalities that are similar to theirs, thus creating better opportunities for a male candidate. Governing boards should be trained on the issues of diversity within an organization and the need for effective leadership.

Females in the local government management career path need extra encouragement and support. Almost half of the respondents in Illinois emphasized that they did not know they were ready to advance until they were encouraged by others. Females often possess the skills and abilities that they need to advance long before they even know they are ready to advance.

Respondents to the survey stated that finding the time commitment to both family life and work life is a large struggle for them when moving up the career ladder. A Village Manager in Illinois stated that she does not think of this as her work/life balance, instead she calls it her “work/life harmony.” The literature states that females usually wait until their children are older to take the top job, but then they might lose their chance. However, this research finds that CAOs are taking the job when they have children as young as three, so this is not the case for our respondents.

Females in local government are often feeling overwhelmed and stressed. To eliminate personal barriers, organizations need to focus on policy changes that can improve the productivity of fe-
males and create less stress. For instance, providing flex time and creating a flexible schedule for employees will greatly increase their productivity and will allow them to become successful at work and at home. Creating an environment that is family-friendly is important. Females do not want to have to completely separate their work from their family life. Knowing that their work environment is family-friendly allows women to eliminate some of the family/work life balance issues that they are confronting. Public administration graduate programs should more actively strive to strengthen equal-opportunity learning environments by exposing students to the way gender affects their work-lives and by better preparing students to face and overcome gender-based inequalities in organizations (Hale 1999, 420).

There is often a lack of confidence from females in the profession and this problem can be solved through more and better mentoring opportunities. As females continue to climb the career ladder, they may become unsure of their ability to advance and without the right encouragement from mentors, they may never make it to the next level. Both men and women in top positions in local government need to be actively willing and ready to mentor young female professionals. Mentors need to understand some of the barriers and obstacles that are unique to females and help them overcome these challenges. As more young women in the profession are effectively mentored, there will be a rise in the level of confidence and their ambition to advance in the profession.

Surely, in the next 30 years, a graduate student writing a thesis about female professionals in local government management should find the proportion of females attaining the CAO rank to be greater than 13%. Besides, 13 is an unlucky number. We can do better than this.

References


Rachel Lange and Kimberly Nelson


**Rachel Lange** is the management analyst for the Village of Schaumburg in Illinois. She has her Master’s in Public Administration from Northern Illinois University with a local government management specialization. Prior to her current position, she worked in various positions at the Village of Montgomery in Illinois.

**Dr. Kimberly Nelson** is an associate professor of public administration and government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Government. Her research and teaching interests include local government management, local government form and structure, and innovation. Her published work appears in *Urban Affairs Review, State and Local Government Review, The American Review of Public Administration*, and other journals.
In Their Own Words:
The Experiences of Mothers in the Federal Civil Service

Marissa Martino Golden

It is generally agreed that women’s mass entry into the labor force in the latter 20\textsuperscript{th} century has resulted in considerable work/family conflict and work/family stress for these women (Bailyn 1993; Becker 2013; Hays 1996; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Rapoport and Rapoport 1971; Williams 2000). This extra stress results from women’s continued responsibility for the care of children and for the “second shift” (Coltrane 2000; Devault 1991; Hays 1996; Hochshild 1989). It also results from the fact that the workplace continues to be organized around the “ideal worker” model and has not adapted to the “modern” family where both parents (or the sole parent) work outside the home (Becker 2013; Gerson and Jacobs 2001; Drago 2007; Williams 2000). “Working mother stress” is evident in both the psychological and sociological literatures and in the (albeit disputed) evidence that women who can afford to do so are increasingly leaving the workforce in order to reduce this source of conflict (Becker 2013; Belkin 2003; Hirshman 2006; Slaughter 2012; Stone 2007).

Family-friendly workplace policies are often touted as a means to alleviate work/family stress and to increase the workforce participation rates and career success of women who are mothers (Drago 2007; Galinsky 1992; Gerson 1985; Gornick and Meyers 2003; Warner 2005, 2007). These policies include paid parental leave following the birth or adoption of a child, on-site child care, flexible work hours, part-time work options, telecommuting, and reductions in the standard working week (Gornick and Meyers 2003). As yet, in the United States, these policies remain piecemeal and ad-hoc (Glass and Estes 1997).

There is, however, one particularly suitable laboratory within which to explore the use of family-friendly workplace policies – that is the federal government of the United States. The federal government employs approximately 2.5 million individuals and it has one of the most extensive arrays of family-friendly policies of any American employer – public or private (Patterson 2005; Daniel 1999; Jones 1994). These include not only the unpaid parental leave available under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 but also the ability to use accrued sick leave as a way to pay for such leaves, on-site child care, a part-time work option, a telecommuting option and a variety of flexible hour policies.
This study therefore uses the laboratory offered by the federal government to examine the use of these policies by working mothers employed in the federal civil service. It is concerned with the utilization of these policies (do these women actually avail themselves of the policies) and, of equal importance, the impact the policies have on the working and home lives of these public service mothers (what do these women use the policies for and do they reduce work/family conflict and diminish gender inequities at home and in the workplace?).

The study takes a qualitative, interview-based approach in its attempt to capture the impact that these policies have on the lives of public service women. It does so in order to capture the difference that these policies make in a deeper fashion than is possible statistically, to reveal the unintended as well as intended consequences of the policies, and to give voice to these women and their lives.

This study is limited to women in the mid-upper professional grades of the civil service (GS-12-SES). This population was chosen to make the study comparable to both the discourse on “opting out” (e.g., Belkin 2003; Slaughter 2012; Stone 2007) and to other studies of professional women such as those by Epstein et al. (1999) and Blair-Loy (2003a) who studied lawyers and investment bankers, respectively. It was also chosen because of the persistent gender inequities in women’s representation in the federal civil service where women are significantly over-represented in the lower ranks but remain under-represented at the top (Kettl and Fesler 2005; Riccucci 2002; Slaughter 2012). However, this focus is not intended to diminish the potential importance of these policies for women at all grade-levels and in a wider range of positions. There is obviously a need for further study of the impact these policies have on their lives as well as their lower salaries and less prestigious positions may impact their ability to utilize the policies under study here. Nonetheless, as the State Department’s recent Women in Public Service Institute demonstrated, work-family conflict is universally shared by women across race, class, and even nation and, thus, many of the findings presented below are likely generalizable to other female civil servants. Nor is this article’s focus on women intended to give short-shrift to the potential benefits these policies have for men in the civil service, clearly an important subject for future research.

In sum, this research provides a window into the lives of public service mothers, their struggles to balance work and family and the role that supportive workplace policies play in facilitating that balance. It does so in order to give voice to their experiences and to offer a point of comparison to the experiences of working mothers in the private sector. It is especially concerned with what the availability of these policies does and does not achieve with respect to work/family conflict and gender equity.

**Background**

When Betty Friedan wrote *The Feminine Mystique* fifty years ago, she was quite optimistic about women’s ability to enter the workforce without having to abandon their maternal and spousal roles (Friedan 1963). She envisioned a world of maternity leave and on-site child care but was also confident that women could “do it all” – that they could be both professionals and mothers.
Subsequent research has documented the difficulties of “doing it all.” This research shows that, contrary to Friedan’s optimism, working mothers experience considerable work/family conflict and stress associated with their dual roles and their continued responsibility for the “second shift” (Becker 2013; Hochshild 1989; Slaughter 2012). Most telling in this regard are the scholarly work of Arlie Hochshild (1989), the fictional world of Kate Reddy (Pearson 2002) and the recent autobiographical account of Anne Marie Slaughter (2012). But a vast literature underscores the stress experienced by working mothers and the strategies they employ to diminish that stress (e.g., Duxbury, Higgins and Lee 1994; Garey 1999; Hays 1996; Stone 2007).

Much of this literature ends on a prescriptive note, advocating for workplace policies to support working parents (Glass 2007; Gornick and Meyers 2003; Heymann 2006; Moen 2003; Moen and Roehling 2005; Stone and Lovejoy 2004). The argument here is that family-friendly workplace policies, such as paid parental leave and universally accessible day care, will reduce work/family conflict, maternal stress and “spillover” as well as promoting gender equity and child well-being (Gornick and Meyers 2003).

As a result, there is a growing body of literature that explores the impact of family-friendly workplace policies. This literature seeks to identify workplaces that have adopted family-friendly policies and then study policy usage at those sites. Much of this literature is highly quantitative and employs variables such as “job satisfaction” and “absenteeism” but the best of this literature is more nuanced and often qualitative in its methods (e.g., Blair-Loy and Wharton 2002, 2004; Fried 1998, Epstein et al., 1999; Hochshild 1997).

Some of this literature reaches positive conclusions about the benefits of these policies but the more qualitative and site-specific studies tend to be less so. For example, aggregate studies find that employees who use family-friendly workplace policies have greater job satisfaction and fewer missed days of work than non-users (Dalton and Mesch 1990; Grover and Crooker 1995; Hill et al., 2001; Ralston 1990; Saltzstein et al., 2001). But the more qualitative literature finds that high levels of stigma and corporate work-hour norms dampen policy use (Blair-Loy and Wharton 2002, 2004; Fried 1998; Epstein et al., 1999; Hochshild 1997; Stone 2007; Wharton and Blair-Loy 2002).

The disconnect in these findings highlights the importance of coupling aggregate, survey-based studies with more in-depth qualitative studies such as the one presented here. Moreover, the research presented below adds a further wrinkle to the debate summarized above. Using the same methods as the qualitative researchers, it nonetheless finds a workplace setting (the federal government) where policies are both available and widely used. The civil service mothers interviewed tell a much more positive story about policy usage and its impact than previous scholars have found.

Additionally, the case of the federal civil service draws our attention to the importance of both workplace policies and work-hour expectations. In other words, it’s not just the policies, it’s the workplace culture and work-hour expectations. And, in the case of the federal government, the work hour culture is both compatible with and complementary to policy usage and work/life balance.
Thus, part of this paper’s contribution lies in identifying a worksite that has successfully implemented family-friendly workplace policies. This is important both normatively and in the applied sense of offering working mothers a possible haven where they can, in fact, balance their families and their careers. However, the study also advances our understanding of family-friendly workplace policies by identifying two possible downsides to such policies: the creation of a mommy-track at work and the reinforcement of a gendered division of labor at home. This is also an important contribution because it highlights the persistence of gender inequities even in the face of policies purported to “level the playing field.”

Data and Methodology

This study is based on in-depth, semi-structured interviews with thirty (30) federal career civil servants who are also mothers. In order to identify a group of women who fit this profile, I employed an alumnae directory from an elite women’s college. This ensured that all of the interview subjects were women with college degrees. It had the further advantage of producing a random sample with regards to age, agency, GS-rank and profession. Finally, this sampling method had the advantage of ensuring a high response rate because of the added appeal to these women’s loyalty to their alma mater. In fact, the response rate was over 90%.

Once I had identified the population of alumnae employed in the federal civil service, I randomly selected names and contacted those individuals for interviews. This resulted in fourteen completed interviews.

At the end of each interview I used a snowball technique— that is I asked each interview subject if they knew any other female civil servants who they thought I should talk to. I did this to limit any possible biases that might be attributed to interviewing only graduates of a single women’s college. This resulted in an additional sixteen interviews, again providing a high response rate, as only one referral declined to be interviewed. This method yielded a more diverse group of interview subjects not only with regards to educational background but also with regards to current occupation and agency of employment. In other words, the sixteen women identified via “snowballing” shared the same access to federal work/family policies as my initial pool of interview subjects but differed with regards to their life experiences prior to joining the civil service. This increases the likelihood that findings are generalizable to professional mothers throughout the civil service.

Overall, the women interviewed ranged in age from 32-55 and ranged in GS-rank from GS-12 to GS-18 (including two members of the Senior Executive Service). Twenty-six held advanced degrees including twelve JD’s, four Ph.D.’s, four Master’s Degrees in Public Policy and an MBA. Likewise, the sample included a variety of professions including lawyers, economists, epidemiologists and conservation scientists. And finally, a wide range of agencies were represented in the study including the Departments of State, Justice, Labor, and Treasury as well as independent agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), and National Institutes of Health (NIH). One possible limitation to this sample is that attorneys are somewhat over-represented relative to other professions employed by the federal government and “hard” scientists and engineers somewhat under-represented.
I employed a semi-structured interview schedule and all but five interviews were recorded and transcribed; for the remaining five, I took copious notes. Most interviews were conducted in the employee’s office in Washington, D.C., but three were conducted in regional offices, four were conducted by phone (but still recorded) and four were conducted in restaurants or cafes. Interviews were typically about one hour but ranged from thirty minutes to two and a half hours. All interviewees were assured of confidentiality and the names used below are pseudonyms.

I asked a variety of open-ended questions about the individual’s career path, how motherhood had impacted that career path and which, if any, policies the individual had used, why, and with what effect. I also asked about spousal and supervisor support, agency culture, and work hours (before and after motherhood).

The Role of Family-Friendly Workplace Policies in Professional Mother’s Lives

The thirty professional civil service mothers interviewed for this study made widespread use of the family-friendly workplace policies available to them. Moreover, they found the policies to be highly beneficial – enabling them to better balance their work and family lives, fulfill their second shift responsibilities, and be more actively involved in their children’s lives.

Policy Utilization

Hillary Davis is typical of the women I interviewed. An analyst at the IRS with a Master’s of Public Policy degree from a top-ranked program, she used a combination of family medical (sick) and annual (vacation) leave to take four paid months off after her daughter was born. When she came back to work, she worked flex hours (7-4) so that she “could leave by 4:00 every day.” “You know I had to leave at 4:00 to get the kids, to get my baby from daycare.” She also telecommuted on an ad-hoc basis, stating, “work at home [another term for telecommuting] helped us a lot…if I had a project that I could do at home I could submit a request to work at home for that chunk of time.” And over the last year, she worked part-time, “The last year, I was 32 hours a week. So I just took Wednesdays off.”

Fully half of the thirty interviewees worked part-time (typically 32 hours a week with one day off), almost half (14) took advantage of formal or informal (ad-hoc) telecommuting arrangements, twenty worked “flex-hours,” nine utilized on-site or near-site child care facilities and all of the women who were employed by the federal government at the time of childbirth took a minimum of three months off and as much as seven months of parental leave, with at least part of the leave taken with pay through the use of accrued sick and annual/vacation leave. In short, this cohort of women appears to have made extensive use of the policies available to them.

Most used more than one policy. In the example above, Hillary Davis used four of the six policies that I asked about. Another example is equally illustrative. Mary Zin is a divorced mother of two who, over the course of her career, has worked for both the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Department of Education (where she was employed at the time of our interview). She reported relying most heavily on the Federal Employees Family Friendly Leave Act
(FEFLA), using it to take time off when her children were sick and unable to attend school; she even showed me the stack of FEFLA request forms she keeps at arms reach on her desk. But she also worked flex-hours (9-5 with one hour a day at home instead of the office norm of 8:30-5:30) and telecommuted on an ad-hoc basis “for things like snow days.”

Amy Bloom works in a regional office of the EPA. She used her accrued sick leave to take three months off when her first child was born and seven months off after the second was born. Not all of it was paid but she was able to “use up all my leave and then I still took some time off after that.” And she was guaranteed that “you do have a job waiting for you . . . when you come back.” After returning from leave she worked 23 hours per week; she is now working 27 hours a week. She also works from home one day per week and leaves work at 2:45 another day.

These three examples are quite typical of the cohort of women studied here. The most typical pattern of policy usage was 3-5 months of parental leave (partially paid), a 32-hour a week workweek, flex-hours and telecommuting on an ad-hoc basis. On-site (or near-site) childcare was less common but nonetheless used by nine women and formal telecommuting was the policy least likely to be used. Nonetheless, the overall pattern was one of high rates of policy usage with fully half of the sample using three or more policies. In short, although I cannot say how “typical” the women I studied are relative to the wider population of female federal career civil servants, I can say that this group made very extensive use of the formal and informal workplace policies available to them. There is clearly a cohort of professional mothers in the federal civil service availing themselves of these family-responsive policies.

**The Benefits of Policy Usage**

Surveys can capture – with larger Ns than the present study - how many people use any given policy. But much less attention has been paid to what civil service mothers use the policies for and how this usage impacts their work/family balance. What benefits do they reap by telecommuting, working part-time or working flex-hours? It is here that my qualitative research is particularly illuminating.

The role that workplace policies play in supporting civil service mothers’ work/life balance was best captured by the economist who told me that she uses her day off for “household production.” She elaborated, “And what do I do on my day off? I do mostly household production…I do things like bill-paying and food shopping. Sometimes, I’ll do doctor’s appointments.” Another informant, also an economist, picked up on that theme saying that she uses her day off to go to the supermarket and dry cleaner so that weekends can be reserved for “quality time” with her kids rather than being filled with errands. She elaborated:

I do grocery shopping…the dry cleaners…I mean, as a result, my kids have a full – I’m not doing housework type things on the weekend when we’re all there [home]. It totally frees it [the weekend] up.

Another part-timer, an epidemiologist at the NIH, was interviewed on her day off which she described as follows:
Like this morning, my daughter had a field trip to a swimming pool. So I spent the morning at the pool with her. And then, um, she’s back at school. And I went to the grocery store and I’m cleaning the house – stuff like that.

Many interviewees were like Lauren O’Leary, an attorney at the SEC who telecommutes on an ad-hoc basis when she needs to be home for the plumber or the electrician or Mary Zin who did so on snow days when her kids were younger. Jane Young, an economist at the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), likes to telecommute because she can “sleep in a little bit on those days and still be at work at the same time.” And because she can work in her pajamas and “throw laundry in while the data’s running!” Mary Jane Ogilve, an attorney at the Federal Communication Commission (FCC), has a formal telecommuting arrangement one day per week. She sees the benefits of telecommuting as two-fold: because her commute is such a long one, she gets to spend more time with her children on her telecommuting day and, second, her telecommuting enables her husband to work longer one day a week. As she put it:

Door-to-door, it [my commute] basically takes me an hour in the morning and in the evening so on the days I telecommute, I actually can spend an extra half hour in the morning with my daughter and my son, having breakfast with them or watching morning cartoons with them. In the afternoon, I pick them up earlier… So, I mean ideally, I would like to [telecommute] two days a week because then, you know, my husband can spend more time at work . . .

Flex-hours are often used to minimize the amount of time that children spend in day care or after-care and sometimes used to avoid the rush hour traffic for which Washington, DC is famous. As Joyce Gallagher told me:

I work 7-3:30 so I can pick them up relatively early. My husband does the morning. He gets them up and dressed and out the door. The downside is just that you have like five minutes with your spouse.

Lydia Harper, a GS-13 at the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), uses a variant on flex-hours known as 5-4-9 so that her son is only in day care four days a week. Under the 5-4-9 system (also known as a compressed work week) she works nine 9-hour days (five + four) and gets the tenth day off. She and her husband (also a federal employee) alternate weeks so that one of them is home with their son every Friday. In other words, she works nine longer days and earns a tenth day off. This allows her to remain a full-time employee but to have every other Friday off. She uses the day off so that her (then) nine-month old son is only in day care four days a week. She also finds that it’s “nice to have a day every other week to do errands in the middle of the day.”

Mary Jane Ogilve, the lawyer quoted above, currently telecommutes but she used the flex-hour policy known as AWS (alternative work schedule) when her daughter was younger. AWS, like 5-4-9 allows the employee to accrue time off. She recounted, “When I was on AWS, it allowed me to spend that extra day with my daughter, all to myself. Just her and me. Hanging out. And playing. Or going to her appointments, doctor’s appointments or what not.”
And finally, the civil service mothers I interviewed, especially those with younger children, made frequent use of FEFLA to deal with sick children. My experience trying to interview Debbie Rubin, a Department of Labor economist with an Ivy League Ph.D., provides a case in point. She was out of the office on FEFLA leave the day I initially contacted her. Then she was out on sick leave herself when she caught the “bug” from her daughter. And, even after we had connected, she had to re-schedule our interview when she was once again home caring for her ill daughter on the day we were supposed to meet. In the two instances that required her to care for her sick child, she was able to use FEFLA to take paid leave.

In sum, female civil servants use the available family-friendly workplace policies to perform their second shift responsibilities – meal preparation, food shopping, laundry, household repairs that require plumbers and electricians. And they use them to participate more actively in their children’s lives (attending field trips and parent-teacher conferences), for more basic child care responsibilities like doctor’s appointments, and to minimize the amount of time their children spend in non-parental care. As Jane Young (a 32-year old mother of three who works four days a week) put it:

> You know, my kids have a – every Wednesday – they have a school mass, you know I get to go with them as a family member, I go on their field trips. I just can’t even tell you how important it is to me.

**The Value of Family-Friendly Policies: “It’s much more important than money”**

The policies available to professional mothers in the federal civil service have very specific benefits: they enable women to perform their second shift duties, participate more actively in their children’s lives and limit the number of hours their children spend in non-parental care. None of these is a function of work hours alone. Rather, time and again, respondents referred to the specific benefits of the family-friendly workplace policies available to them. To Hilary Davis, the ability to telecommute has “been hugely useful.” Another telecommuter, Carolyn Pepperdine, commented, “And now with these new policies like Work-at-Home, it’s just such a wonderful advantage.” One part-timer told me, “The part-time has been great because it’s just nice to have that extra day.” Another part-timer, an attorney in a regional office, commented, “I like having the extra time with my son.” And a third stated, “It’s just enabled me to keep working. It’s much more important than money.” A forty-four year old mother of one, when asked which policies she had found the most beneficial replied, “The leave – which was awesome!” She elaborated, “Yeah, we actually had a great – I had a great – I have no complaints about the leave. I had a great opportunity with leave.” Finally, Jane Young’s comment above about her part-time schedule captures the sentiment of so many of the women I interviewed, “I just can’t even tell you how important it is to me.” Thus, the policies examined here play a positive and independent role in helping these women maintain their civil service careers while providing them with the time to do the things they want and/or need to do at home.

**The Role of Work-Hour Culture**

Previous research has pointed to the importance of long work hours and an “overtime culture” as depressing policy usage (Blair-Loy and Wharton 2002, 2004; Fried 1998; Hochshild 1997). The
federal government offers a case of a very different workplace culture with respect to work-hour expectations. I asked each woman how many hours they had worked prior to children and how many hours they worked after becoming mothers. Three distinct patterns emerged but all included post-motherhood work hours of 40-45 hours per week.

The first pattern applies to the women interviewed who were attorneys and who had started out in private practice. This was the case for half of the twelve attorneys I interviewed. In five out of these six cases, the women left private practice because of the long work hours required. Their work hours dropped from between 60 and 90 hours to between 45 and 50! They left private practice for the haven of the federal government – both its family-friendly policies and its work hours. As Sarah Yates, who left corporate law for the SEC when her second child was two, put it:

   How many hours total at the office? Easily 60, maybe more. Probably more. When I came to the federal government, I worked 9-5:30. And I felt like I was working part-time.

The second pattern is women who were working long hours in the federal government and cut their hours back after becoming mothers. Caroline Pepperdine is typical in this regard. Before kids, in her “workaholic stage,” she was “easily putting in 60 hours a week.” At the time of the interview, with two preschoolers at home, she estimated that she was working “between 45 and 50 hours.” When asked about how her children have impacted her career, Nancy Smith, a program officer at the State Department commented, “They have in that they’ve changed…changed my hours…leaving earlier.”

And the third pattern is women who worked between 40 and 45 hours both before and after children or who worked 40-45 before and who now work part-time. Joyce Gallagher estimated working 45-50 hours a week before her two girls were born and “now I’m down to 30.” Jane Davis, a conservation scientist at the Smithsonian, who also works 30 hours a week, recounted that before children, “Oh, I worked. I worked about 40 hours a week. I didn’t, I was never, you know, one of those people who worked 80 hours a week kind of thing.” Tamara Thompson described her hours:

   I think probably more like 40. It – always between 40-45. Then I got married and I pretty much started to do the 40. Which is really 37.5 because of lunch [laughter]. And then when we had our son, I went to four days a week. So I’m now doing 32. And I do 32 – I mean – it’s really, really rare that I would do more than 32 hours.

Most telling is that most of the interviewees viewed a 40-45 hour work week as typical for the federal government – at least for federal employees in non-managerial, non-SES positions. As Tamara Thompson elaborated, “there’s no expectation that you’re going to work longer than your stated hours; in fact, people who have the tendency to stay late, they are getting a lot of grief about justifying their late hours. You know, why can’t you get your work done in time?”

This forty hour workweek culture matters. As an attorney in one of the regional offices put it, “the reason that people want to come work in this office is because, is basically because, of the family-friendly stuff. . . . I mean the hours, the pay scale are such that you can raise a family.”
However, there are limits to this shorter-hour culture, even in the federal government. Where long work hours came into play was when the talk turned to career advancement. Once again, Hillary Davis was typical. She recounted turning down a promotion “primarily because of the additional hours.” Equally typical was Mary Jane Ogilve who joined the federal government out of a strong commitment to public service. But she stayed in the same position because of the hours involved in taking it to the next level. As she put it, “So I really don’t regret any of the decisions not to apply for a certain managerial position or a different position in the office that maybe would have worked longer hours….”

In sum, respondents perceive the norm in their workplace to be a 40-hour a week. They pointed to male supervisors who utilize the government’s “first forty” policy whereby once you have accrued 40-hours you can take the rest of the week off. But where hours came into play was when the talk turned to promotions. Respondents viewed higher-level, managerial, policy and supervisory jobs as requiring a greater time commitment with regards to work hours. The result is that this talented group of women and their skills, expertise, and institutional memory are not being fully utilized by the federal government due to the work-hour ethos that surrounds the jobs located above the glass ceiling.

**Implications for Gender Equity**

**A Mommy Track at Work**

The policies available and the forty-hour a week culture both played positive roles in enabling the women interviewed to obtain the work/family balance that they sought. But they also played a role in creating a “mommy track” in the federal government. Many of the women interviewed for this study had turned down either the opportunity to apply for a promotion or an actual promotion in order to retain the benefits of policy usage and either a forty-hour or part-time work week.

Diane Klein’s experience is illustrative. A Justice Department attorney with three sons, she was offered the position of Section Chief on three separate occasions. But each time she turned it down because she worked part-time and the position of Section Chief required full-time status. Only with her two older sons in college and the youngest in high school did she finally give up her part-time position and accept the full-time job of section chief. But even when I interviewed her – one week into her new job – she was still questioning the tradeoff between forgoing part-time work in order to accept the promotion.

Debbie Rubin, an economist at the BLS, attributed her decision to stay put in her current position to her use of her offices’ part-time work policy and flex-hours:

“I’m not going to be applying for any big supervisory jobs right now. I value my flexibility and my time at home.

As discussed above, Mary Jane Ogilve made a conscious decision not to apply for different positions because of the longer hours she felt such positions would entail:
I think that I probably would have applied to different types of positions if I didn’t have the responsibility of going home and taking care of the kids and the home. But it’s not something that I regret…So I really don’t regret any of the decisions not to apply for a certain managerial position or a different position in the office that maybe would have worked longer hours…

And Sally White, the NIH epidemiologist, remarked:

If I wanted to be on the fast track, I’d have to work much more than 40 hours a week…I mean, like we talked about earlier, I think I’ve chosen a career path that isn’t up to my full potential. But I’m very comfortable with that…and I’m able to do that and balance having the two kids. I’ve been really lucky.

Time and again, the women I interviewed spoke of trade-offs. With few exceptions they traded family-friendly workplace policies and forty hour work weeks over more challenging, financially lucrative and prestigious positions on the other side of the “glass ceiling.” One woman described this process as “coasting;” another as “treading water.” But whatever the label, it meant forgoing career advancement for policies and hours that better met their family’s needs and the work-life balance they sought and desired.

The Reinforcement of Gender at Home

For the most part, the women in this study used the family-friendly policies available to them to conduct their second shift responsibilities, to minimize the amount of time their children spent in child-care, and to be more active participants in their children’s lives. As a result, these women have found a way to fulfill their second shift responsibilities while remaining in the paid labor force. But in so doing, they are reinforcing a traditional division of labor in which women are the ones responsible for those activities, in which it is the women who do the food-shopping and pick up the dry cleaning, the women who schedule the doctor’s appointments and stay home for the plumber, and the women who chaperone the school field trips and attend the parent-teacher conferences. As Samantha Parenti, a Ph.D. economist who works four days a week, put it when asked about her family’s gendered division of labor, “I do more because I’m at home on Friday’s.”

This was by no means the case for all of the civil service mothers interviewed. One had a stay-at-home partner, one had a spouse whose office was near both their home and their children’s school, and three were single parents. But far more typical was Jane Davis who took three months of parental leave while her husband (also a federal employee and therefore eligible for the same leave) took one week and Sarah Yates, the attorney who joined the federal government for its family-friendly hours while her husband continued his high-powered career in private practice. What these interviews reveal is that when women use family-friendly policies they are able to do more of the second shift which then enables their husbands to do less of it (and to spend more time at work). It is, therefore, important to acknowledge the role that these policies play in reinforcing a traditionally gendered division of household labor. Even in the cases where both partners were employed by the federal government, the female partner used the policies to
decrease their work hours and increase their time at home while the male partner took advantage of his wife’s flexibility to work more.

**Implications for Work-Family Balance**

The vast majority of women interviewed for this study feel that they spend enough time with their kids and that, despite their presence on a slower “mommy track,” they are contributing to the public good. The case of Sally White, the epidemiologist at the NIH, highlights the nuanced consequences of women’s use of these policies:

> I think I’ve chosen a career progression that’s not as ambitious as I could have… *But I’m not in some cubicle somewhere, I’m in a fairly important position*...[and] a few weeks ago, [on my day off], I took my daughter to the aquarium.

And so we are left with a paradox. The federal government’s workplace policies and work-hour culture enable the women studied here to meet both their work and family demands – and to have time to enjoy their children – but do so at the expense of replicating traditional notions of a gendered division of labor at home and a glass ceiling at work. I would like to suggest that although we should continue to be troubled by the lack of progress vis-à-vis men’s household labor – and by the “glass ceiling” that these women face at work – we should also hail the work/family balance that the women studied here have achieved. They are indeed “doing it all” – spending quality time with their children and contributing to the public wealth (as well as to their own financial independence). The tasks that remain are to more actively encourage paternal policy usage (which quantitative studies indicate is lower than maternal usage) and to find a way to enable these women to advance up the federal hierarchy without having to forgo its use or the work/life balance they seek.

**Conclusions**

The main findings of this study are clear. First, when flexible workplace policies are available, civil service mothers take extensive advantage of them, and, second, the policies enhance the women’s ability to achieve the work/family balance they seek. The women interviewed viewed telecommuting, part-time work options, flexible work schedules, and the other policies discussed above as “godsends.” The same can be said for work-hour norms. In workplace settings, such as the federal government, where the forty-hour work week is adhered to, civil service mothers believe that their work hours play a critical role in their ability to balance their work and family obligations.

There are, however, two caveats to this study. The first is that, even within the federal government, the availability of flexible policies varied across agencies and supervisors. The small sample size of the research presented here, as well as the promise of anonymity to the women interviewed, prevents me from being able to identify the “best” and “worst” agencies for working mothers, but my findings regarding the policies’ benefits suggest that this is an important avenue for future research.
The second caveat is that extant policies only enable work/life balance to a point. Almost all of the women in this study reached a career plateau they felt they could not rise above without forgoing the very policies and work-hours that enabled them to succeed up to that point. This is the obstacle that must be overcome if women are going to obtain equal representation at the upper echelons of the federal civil service. We must find a way for this very talented group of women to advance above the glass ceiling without having to give up the working conditions that enabled them to reach the tier just below it in the first place.

I hope that this article has conveyed some of the stress-reduction and outright joy that flexible work policies afford the women I interviewed as well as the benefits that we as a nation receive from these women’s commitment to public service. And I hope that this leads to the more widespread availability of flexible workplace policies across agencies and throughout all the ranks of the civil service.
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Maternity Leave: Policy and Practice

By Victoria Gordon
Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2013

Reviewed by Lorenda A. Naylor

Introduction

Women in the U.S. have made significant advances politically, socially, and economically. The victories achieved during the 1960s feminist movement granted women easier entry into the work force, access to birth control and, as a consequence, more control over their lives. In contrast, today’s women are facing a different set of challenges. Today, women are contemplating how to balance careers, education, and motherhood; asking themselves is it possible to have it all? This dilemma has been coined the “Superwoman Myth.” (Spar, 2013) At the core of this issue is maternity leave. The question being asked is: “What is a fair and reasonable maternity leave policy in the 21st century?” Informing and shaping this national dialogue is Victoria Gordon’s book Maternity Leave: Policy and Practice (2013). She documents the disconnect between policy and practice and provides compelling evidence that women are still being forced to choose between career and motherhood. The general assumption is that maternity leave is paid, accessible, and based on clear, formal policies. Gordon provides undeniable documentation that this is simply not the case; in fact it is a myth. The reality is that some organizations do not provide any maternity leave and those that do often have unwritten policies. As a result, leave is granted on a case by case basis that raises concerns about equity and fairness. When organizations do have written maternity policies, those policies are often underutilized due to employees’ fear of reprisal. This book focuses specifically on maternity leave in public and private institutions of higher education. In addition, it incorporates interviews of women who have used maternity leave. This book is a must read for scholars and practitioners interested in human resources, social equity, parenthood, and career life balance.

Content

Chapter 1 provides a brief introduction framing the subject of maternity leave within the larger context of career life balance. Chapter two describes the historical development of pregnancy and maternity leave policies. Specifically, it provides an overview of federal policy including the
Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, which provides unpaid leave, and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010. An appendix containing the text of the legislation is inserted at the end of the chapter for ease of reference. The policy overview lays the foundation for Chapter 3, which discusses maternity leave as an employee benefit. By incorporating data on birth rates, fertility rates, and employment trends for women it presents compelling evidence of the great need for maternity leave. Having documented the increasing and fundamental role of women in the workforce, the author then discusses types of maternity leave (paid and unpaid) and weaves in policy examples to illustrate variations across universities. Chapter 4 segues into the women’s health care and core issues women face during pregnancy and after returning to work. Specifically, it highlights challenges associated with infertility, unintended pregnancy, delivery, post-partum depression, breast feeding, bonding, and length of maternity leave. Having documented the need for maternity leave policy and the complexities of such policies, the next three chapters (5, 6, and 7) provide interviews with individual women who recently utilized maternity leave. Specifically, it contains the rationale for qualitative interviews, a list of interview questions, verbatim responses of the interviewees, and the patterns and trends in the key findings from the interviews. The interviews offer a rich understanding of the complexity of maternity leave policy, the shortcomings in implementing these policies, and the policy gaps that remain. In essence, they reveal the disconnect between policy and practice, demonstrating that current policies are inadequate to guarantee a balance between work and family. Maternity leave policies are inconsistent with regard to access, length of time, paid or unpaid, utilization, and shifting work responsibilities (teaching load, service, and research). Chapter 8 captures other voices, including those of fathers, same sex couples, and women without children. Chapter 9 evaluates maternity leave policy in Western Europe offering a rich international comparison to US policies. For example, countries in the European Union offer a minimum of three months paid leave to care for newborns compared to US mothers who receive three months unpaid leave. Length of maternity leave in Europe ranges from twelve weeks (Sweden) to fifty-two weeks (United Kingdom). These comparisons highlight the fact that US maternity leave policies lag behind Western Europe. Chapter 10 concludes with policy recommendations. Specifically, the author advocates for written formal maternity policies and an amendment to the FMLA requiring employers to provide paid maternity leave.

**Contributions**

Gordon makes two distinct contributions to the field of public administration. First, she fills a gap in the literature. Currently, maternity leave is absent from the mainstream public administration literature. Maternity leave is a timely topic that has been ignored despite the destructive impact on women in the workforce. Overt and covert discrimination against pregnant women continues today despite federal policy to prevent it. Gordon highlights this unintended outcome through the compelling evidence presented in her book and by creating an understanding of the implementation complexities of maternity policies. Secondly, she makes key recommendations on how to resolve the problem. Specifically, the author proposes that the Family Medical Leave Act be amended to ensure that maternity leave is paid leave. As it stands today, maternity leave under FMLA is unpaid, thus rendering it ineffective since most women and families can’t afford to take unpaid leave for twelve weeks. In addition, Gordon argues that all organizations be required to have formal maternity policies. One of the unintended consequences of the FMLA is
that most organizations do not have written formal policies on maternity leave. They rely instead on the FMLA. Formal policies on maternity leave in higher education are required.

In addition to the policy recommendations, the strength of the book is the insightful and informative interviews, which highlighted the discrepancy between policy and practice. The research could have been bolstered by increasing the number of interviews. There were eighteen interviews conducted for the study. However, as noted by the author, some female scholars did not want to be interviewed or identified because of fear of reprisal. It was seen as too risky to speak out on the issue, even though confidentiality was guaranteed. This is disheartening given that the fields of public administration and higher education overall are charged with strengthening the common good and ensuring social equity. If institutions of higher education do not take action, maternity leave will remain a myth. Gordon is applauded for having the courage and conviction to address this invisible discriminatory policy.
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Professor Mommy: Finding Work-Family Balance in Academia

By Rachel Connelly and Kristen Ghodsee
Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011

Reviewed by Patricia M. Alt

Professor Mommy: Finding Work-Family Balance in Academia is a thoughtful examination of the plusses and minuses of combining parenthood with entering and completing graduate school, and with developing careers in academic institutions. While it is explicitly focused on women in academic settings, much of what it offers is relevant to anyone considering combining parenthood with a professional career. Beginning by questioning recent materials which concentrate on the difficulties of being “Mama: Ph.D.”, and acknowledging that parenthood-career issues also affect men, Connelly and Ghodsee focus primarily on navigating the choices made by women in their fertile years, and on the impact of those choices as their careers unfold (6). It is quite conversational and positive, including information from academic literature as well as from their own lives, and from surveys and interviews with mothers in academia.

Broken down into nine concise chapters, Professor Mommy moves from the authors’ encouraging personal success stories in the first Chapter into Chapter two, “The Nefarious Nine, or The Not-So-Pretty Truth about Motherhood and Academia.” The “nine” referred to are myths about the combination of academic careers and motherhood, including the ideas that: academics’ more flexible schedules mean that they can have more time for their families; being smart and working hard is enough; all students are like you were as a student; there is no longer sexism in the academy; getting and being pregnant will be easy; motherhood is instinctual; child care is always lower quality than mother care; liberal academics will let tenure standards slide for family reasons; and all senior women in the organization are your allies. Many of these “myths” also apply in public service positions, and can affect parents of either gender.

The third and fourth Chapters focus on “Knowing Thyself”, particularly deciding on one’s career path and whether and when to become a mother. They build on cases of actual women and the choices they made, including the need to discern one’s preferred balance among family, teaching, research, and service. Asking valuable questions, without any obvious bias toward particular answers, these chapters guide readers to analyze their deep-seated inclinations and how those could (and should) shape their paths through graduate school, and choices about careers afterwards. They carefully review previous research examining the timing of parenthood and its im-
pact on careers, finding that childbearing has less effect on achieving tenure if women have babies “late” in their careers (defining “late” as six or more years after earning the Ph.D.) (68). However, they also provide multiple cases of women who made differing choices, giving both the positive and negative effects, and concluding: “So given all of these diverse experiences, when should you have your first child if you want to be a successful academic and get tenure? Whenever...” (74). These cases are followed by a very useful set of considerations, including careful attention to the potential for family and medical leave in various work environments. These factors are certainly not limited to a purely academic career.

In Chapter five, “The Last Year of Graduate School: Heading for the Job Market and Choosing the Right Institution,” the assumption is that the reader is working on a Ph.D., and seeking an academic job. The reflective insights contained here could be useful for those working on other post-baccalaureate degrees, and planning on careers in public service, but the primary focus is on describing different sorts of academic settings and their perceived and actual friendliness to women academics who are also parents. The last few pages of the chapter do discuss other settings where Ph.D.’s might find employment, providing some interesting links and information. The authors explicitly state, however, that “our goal is to convince you that you can be a professor and a parent at the same time...” (108). They do acknowledge that there are disciplines where people are more able to move in and out of academia, particularly into consulting firms and government agencies, but this is clearly not the major focus of the book.

The next two chapters focus on the academic tenure track, and how to combine research, networking, teaching, service, and finding time for the family. There are useful points in the discussion of research and networking for parents in any sort of work environment. When, and how much, should one discuss family life and children while at work? How can one best manage one’s time, at work and at home...with particular emphasis on controlling the “time sink” which is email? Also, if in a junior position, how can you say “no” to being overcommitted to a plethora of committees and advising tasks, and still maintain your standing in the workplace? The authors’ thoughtful discussion of how best to manage demanding students, for example, can also be of help to a public administrator whose lower-level employees or agency clients expect constant attention, even outside of work hours (usually via email again).

The final chapters discuss what happens after one achieves tenure in an academic post. They continue the evaluation of the work-family balance, but also go further in exploring what other pathways are available. This section briefly examines moving to administrative positions within academe, but concentrates on the resources available for parents in academic settings, including things like tuition remission and advice about college admissions for one’s children. Overall, the focus is on balancing family and work obligations in order to succeed in both spheres.

In the Conclusion, the authors further discuss their attempt to gather information through questionnaires sent to academic mothers. Having gotten a very low response rate, they conclude that the women surveyed are very careful with their time...including not answering a very brief questionnaire. The general characteristic they identify is “there is a lot of voluntary labor in academia, and one has to protect oneself from doing too many things that are not directly related to one’s specific goals” (181). Their main points focus on the difficulty of combining academia and parenthood, with the recognition that it is definitely possible and worth it IF that is the path one
truly wants to take. Eleven questions at the end of the book summarize the points so far, and guide the reader through a careful consideration of what his/her preferences in life actually are at the moment, and for the long term. Key to these are awareness of the choices to be made, challenges to be faced, and a sense of what is most important in the reader’s life.

Overall, this book uses existing literature and personal experiences as an underpinning for a very reflective analysis of the various choices to be made about work and parenting. While it focuses primarily on women in academic careers, there are valuable insights for any young person who is exploring combining further education and a career path with potential parenthood. “Textboxes” in several chapters provide concise reviews of scientific literature on, for example, child care, family-friendly policies, part-time or adjunct positions, and putting together materials for promotion.

In reading this volume, I found myself reflecting on my own choices made along the way. Having parented two wonderful people while at the same time (slowly) completing a Ph.D. and having had a career in both academia and public service, I could have benefited from the insights contained here. It is encouraging to see the documented shift in acceptance of women in all sorts of professional roles, along with a rising awareness that workplaces benefit from family-friendly policies which didn’t exist earlier in my own career. However, the warnings are still appropriate as one navigates the choices to be made and deals with the biases which can emerge.

**Patricia M. Alt, Ph.D.,** is a professor of health science at Towson University.
Understanding the impact of the nonprofit sector on pursuing the public interest is increasingly important in the field of public administration. In 2010, there were an estimated 1.6 million registered nonprofit organizations in the United States and public charities – the arts, education, healthcare, and human services organizations that most of us think of as the nonprofit sector – comprised approximately two-thirds of them. These nonprofits reported more than $1.5 trillion in revenues for 2010, and almost one-third of those revenues came from government grants and fees for goods and services. In 2010, there were more than 76,000 foundations in the U.S. that gave a total of $45.7 billion and held assets in excess of $621 billion. Although individual charitable contributions and foundation giving decreased in 2008 and 2009 because of the economic recession, philanthropy remains a significant force for public good in the U.S. (Blackwood, Roeger, and Pettijohn 2012).

In *Women, Wealth & Giving* (2010, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.), authors Margaret May Damen and Niki Nicastro McCuistion highlight and encourage the role of women in philanthropy as a means to pursue the public interest. Their purpose is neither a technical tools and tips textbook nor an historical account of women in philanthropy, but rather a collection of stories of how women – baby boom women in particular – have found personal fulfillment and made a difference in their communities through giving. The authors consider the stories in their book to be a helping hand, a means by which to create a path “necessary for women to follow as we look for solutions to a more humane and sustainable world” (16). Both authors draw on a wealth of professional experience in the sector. Their combined expertise includes gift planning, investing strategies, and nonprofit leadership and management. As consultants, they have spoken to international audiences and written about philanthropic issues with deliberate emphasis on the role of women and the ability of philanthropy to empower them to improve their communities.

The book’s premise centers around the idea that the women of the baby boom generation (those born between 1946 and 1964) have “unprecedented independence, assets, and experience” and are “beginning to take the lead in reshaping the larger world, through highly individual and carefully focused giving of time, talent, and money” (25). Damen and McCuistion outline the attri-
utes of boomers, describe how the role of women has changed as a result of these attributes, and discuss how the aging of this unique population sets the stage for a substantial impact on philanthropic endeavors.

The authors portray boomers as narcissistic, altruistic, prone to excess spending, the wealthiest generation with the most debt, workaholics and idealists. Boomers who, at 29 percent of the current U.S. population, represent the vast majority of the U.S. workforce, are described as responsible for pushing the divorce rate to over 50 percent, increasing the ratio of debt to net worth 50 percent higher than the previous generation, and as having “denied their latch-key kids nothing, except close relationships with their parents” (30). That said the authors focus on the tendencies of boomers, particularly boomer women, to refocus their efforts as this unique generation approaches retirement and their “winter years”. They turn increasingly to altruism as the means of complying with the imperative of their generation to change the world, and according to the authors, women have a significantly different perspective on giving than men.

Women boomers are the first entire generation of women who have the financial assets, work experience, time, and desire to reshape the world. Women are at the helm of more than 50 percent of U.S. foundations and own 51.3 percent of all personal wealth. In addition, at 10.1 million firms and $1.9 trillion in sales, women-owned businesses represented the fastest-growing sector of the U.S. economy in 2008. Damen and McCuistion maintain that the beliefs by the baby boom generation that they are special and uniquely poised to change the world coupled with immense advances by boomer women in business and politics, have led to a tremendous change in the role of women in philanthropy. They argue that groups such as the Women Donors Network (WDN) reflect the collective impact that women can have on philanthropy not only in the amount of money given (donations by the 165 members of WDN approximate $125 to $200 million a year), but in what is targeted for funding (less for bricks and mortar or the traditional arts and more for social, environmental, and justice issues). According to a November 2008 symposium report from the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (IU), women are engaging in philanthropy in a much deeper way and the result is greater impact on many areas such as social policy, grants and other funding issues, program development, and nonprofit management.

The feminist movement begun in the 1960s has led to greater opportunities for women across the U.S., and women are increasingly taking action to infuse mainstream society with their values and vision. Examples cited in the book include: Gloria Steinem’s Ms. Foundation, Resourceful Women, Women & Philanthropy, The Women’s Funding Network, and the Women and Philanthropy Institute, now housed at IU’s Center on Philanthropy. Women interviewed for the book include Lucy Crow Billingsley, daughter of Dallas developer Trammel Crow and one of the founders of the Chiapas Project, which runs microfinance programs to address poverty in Latin American countries; Kathleen Miller, a certified financial planner who has seen the impact on philanthropy as women are drawn more and more to nontraditional charities; and Marie C. Wilson, founder and president of the White House Project, who argues that boomer women are starting to realize the importance of funding leadership development, of the need to put money into raising awareness of the impact of women in politics, business, and media. The stories of these women and others that were interviewed are dispersed throughout the book, woven into the narrative the authors provide to illustrate their conviction that boomer women are a driving force in modern philanthropy.
Also woven into the narrative are references to the body of literature in this field, such as Sherry Buffington’s *The Law of Abundance*, Daniel H. Pink’s *A Whole New Mind*, Claire Gaudiani’s *The Greater Good*, and Kim Klein’s *Fund Raising for Social Change*. The works cited focus upon the importance of emotional connections, relationships, and the role of social capital in women’s decisions to donate money and volunteer time. Damen and McCuiston repeatedly point to this as a main point of divergence in philanthropy between men and women. Because men and women differ in their approaches to giving and since boomer women now differ from previous generations of women in their ability to marshal significant financial resources, their impact on philanthropy is substantial and warrants attention.

While this is more self-help than textbook – complete with self-reflection questions at the end of each chapter – it could serve as a supplemental text for courses on nonprofits, grants or philanthropy. It is also a relatively quick read, approximately 160 pages of text in eight chapters plus an epilogue, written in a clear and engaging style. The authors have been on the front lines of philanthropy in the U.S. and their writing reflects substantial knowledge of the importance and impact of giving.

The book is not, however, an empirical study. While the authors frame the book as a collection of stories, it seems more an assortment of brief anecdotes and quotations from various women that are used to illustrate the themes in each of the chapters. I hoped for a collection of in-depth profiles of baby boom women that would serve as case studies for comparison of how this generation of women differs from other philanthropists. What I got falls short of that but leaves me more curious about the topics raised. While the authors’ intent more likely was to encourage women to see themselves as philanthropists and think more strategically about their giving, their book also provokes interesting research questions that beg further study. I expect to use the book as a springboard to evoke discussion and debate in the classroom and maybe to add a new item to my research agenda.
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Women and Public Service

By Mohamad Alkadry and Leslie E. Tower
Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 2014

Reviewed by Sharon Mastracci

Women and Public Service by Mohamad Alkadry and Leslie Tower is an important and necessary addition to public administration scholarship. Two significant contributions of this book are, first, its confident normative voice and, second, its rejection of the American exceptionalism implicit in public administration research originating in the US. These are the strengths of Women and Public Service. With respect to the first contribution, the authors assert the following early on (xvi):

As authors, we do not make the cliché claim of objectivity in our writing. However, we are not driven by an intentional bias other than the agenda of informing employees and managers of the challenges that face women in organizations.

This assertion is crucial to establish at the outset and would be refreshing to see catch on in social science literature. With respect to the second contribution, several examples of workplace policy in European Union countries illustrate the possible. In example after example, American policies compare poorly to their counterparts from other industrialized nations. Alkadry and Tower depart from domestic policy norms to demonstrate that the status quo is not good enough, that US workplace policies could do more to support the whole worker.

Chapter 1 situates the book’s argument in the theory of representative bureaucracy: Administrative bodies gain legitimacy and are more responsive if they are comprised of workers in whom the citizenry sees itself. A representative bureaucracy employs a more diverse range of workers than early- and mid-20th century bureaucracies employed; workers with differing levels of support at home and who face different barriers to work-life balance. But not all work-life balance programs affect all workers similarly; Alkadry and Tower are mindful of the intersection between sex and class: “Work-life conflict affects people in the upper-middle class differently than it affects working-class employees” (18). Alkadry and Tower conclude the first chapter by noting the lack of consensus on the need for a representative bureaucracy, which creates a substantial barrier to achieving workplace equality. Chapter 2 is a comprehensive review and critique of workplace legislation, where several examples of policies in other countries are used to demon-
strate what would be possible in the US if the value of workplace equality were not contested. The authors recommend decoupling full-time employment from receiving FMLA benefits. FMLA is not available to part-time or part-year workers: One must have worked at least 1,250 hours in the past twelve months, which is more than 24 hours per week at 52 weeks per year. The authors also recommend policymakers to reexamine the usefulness of comparable worth to foster equality: “Internationally, comparable worth has found more acceptance and largely been implemented in the public sector” (37). Why haven’t EU policy initiatives diffused to the US? The free-market ethos of the US rejects “special treatment” for any group, which explains the lack of consensus surrounding the importance of representative bureaucracy. As this ethos relates to family-friendly workplace policies (46):

Child care in the United States is viewed differently than it is around the world. In Europe, children are viewed through the “public good” notion: essential for population and economic growth, a society benefit that all may enjoy whether they pay for it or not. Therefore, quality child care and education are regarded as a social investment, a way to socialize the next generation of the country’s citizens, who will contribute to the nation’s economy. … The assumption that undergirds policy related to children and families in the United States may be understood through the “children as pet” notion: Those who want children ought to pay for them.

Chapter 3 parallels Chapter 2 and is a review and critique of case law related to workplace policies; policy implemented by the courts and through Executive Orders. Our free-market ethos underpins interpretations of case law, as well, and Alkadry and Tower note “A major barrier to reducing employment discrimination is the new composition of the Supreme Court” (66). The “administrative leg of government” (67) is imbued with political ideology, as well, and efforts on behalf of working women are vulnerable after every election.

The aforementioned normative voice of the authors is clearest and most powerful in Chapter 4: “We argue that no one should have to choose between paying attention to their family and succeeding at work” (69). The penalty of this false choice is borne by everyone, for the “Social costs [of careers] are incurred as a direct consequence of the conventional ideology of working men and family women, and the admission of women into the workforce under the terms of this ideology” (69). Another assumption that we in the US accept without question is that time spent outside the formal labor market is time wasted (79):

Research shows that women pay a substantial wage penalty when they reenter the workforce. The wage penalty appears to be correlated with the amount of time one remains outside the workforce … This wage penalty implies that caregivers lose human capital—competencies and skills valued by the labor market—when they are not attached to the workforce.

Comparable worth rejects this assumption and values competencies learned within or outside the formal labor market. Another received wisdom that goes unquestioned and penalizes women is the reification of full-time work: “The association of part-time work with low status and low pay is not inevitable” (85). The authors recommend: “The United States and organizations operating in it should follow EU policy initiatives and make part-time schedules more widely available as
well as offer equitable treatment of part-time and full-time workers” (85). This chapter concludes with a recognition of the US free-market ethos: “Families in the United States face systematic barriers that families in other industrialized countries do not because the US lacks a robust social safety net” (94).

Chapters 5 and 6 provide extensive data from OPM, EEOC, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics to illustrate employment segregation by gender and pay discrimination against women. The former is examined as segregation by gender in occupations and grades, by agencies, and by work schedules. The latter—pay discrimination—is an outcome of segregation, but also due to valuing women’s work lower than men’s, rather than equal pay for work of equal value. Better maternity/paternity leave policies would not penalize caregivers who temporarily leave paid employment. The gender pay gap would also be addressed if women—new hires as well as incumbents—were not underrepresented in GS11-GS15 and SES positions in the federal government, in distributive agencies in state and federal government, in service and caregiving occupations, and in part-time jobs. One important contribution of Chapter 6 is its focus on state and local government and special districts, which have been too infrequently examined and under theorized compared to federal agencies.

Explaining the gender pay gap as a function of segregation implies a structuralist approach to inequality. The structuralism explanation for gender inequality—for example, Kanter’s position that as women increase in number in an organization, gender dynamics will change—has been eclipsed in feminist scholarship by the sex-role socialization argument, which in turn, has been further developed into the gendered-organizations position of Joan Acker. Both structuralism and sex-role socialization imply a gender-neutral starting point and place gender in the individual. Acker and others find gender in individuals as well as organizations. Organizations are gendered in their practices and processes, and until those practices and processes are upended, male-dominated gender dynamics will remain and reproduce themselves, no matter the gender composition of the workforce. In the Introduction of Women and Public Service, Alkadry and Tower situate their approach in the sex-role socialization framework: “We believe that any differences between men and women (other than body parts) are socially constructed. Women grow up to be nurses, teachers, and social workers, not because of some natural inclination but rather because of their socialization into these roles” (xvi, emphases supplied). But they clearly embrace the gendered organizations framework, as well: “The workplace in the United States is structured around the assumptions of an ‘organization man’” (69); and “Women who enter the workplace are often expected to show the same kind of dedication and commitment to work that men with stay-at-home wives once did in the past” (143). These statements are consistent with Acker’s gendered organizations framework. Acker (1990, 146) defines gendered organizations as workplaces where, “advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine”. Consistent with Acker, Guy and Spice characterize gendered human resource practices as artifacts from when the workforce was dominated by men: “The demographics of the workforce have changed faster than the HR practices that govern classification, compensation, and benefits” (2009, 244). Reward systems are based on what Acker calls the “ideal worker”, tacitly perceived as masculine. If there is any weakness in Women and Public Service, it is the absence of Joan Acker’s highly relevant research to Alkadry and Tower’s thesis,
for clearly these scholars are collectively onto something and can benefit from one another’s work.

Chapter 7 tackles workplace culture and includes the important topic of bullying. In their discussion of workplace negotiating, women are often in a lose/lose situation. Expectations on how women should interact at work prevent them from “acting like men” in negotiations, which “shifts the responsibility for overcoming discrimination onto the one being discriminated against, rather than onto organizational structures, unconscious biases, and other factors undergirding discrimination” (159). Bullying, sexual harassment, and physical violence affects both male and female employees, but while sexual harassment is suffered disproportionately by women, it remains rarely reported.

In the final chapter, the authors challenge several assumptions and false choices related to women in the workplace and advocate for “a revision of work expectations for men and women” (168). Among these societal and, indeed, cultural reforms: “workplace policies should not start from and enforce societal images” (168); women should not “have to choose between work and family, [which] tests our human rights as individuals” (168-169). We must reverse “the conventional ideology of working men and family women” (171). What is more, pay systems must be reformed to disrupt “historical patterns and gender roles that are perpetuated by current pay systems” (171). Finally, our leave policies must be reformed to value children as a social good, and education as an investment. For that, we are advised strongly to take lessons from our counterparts throughout the industrialized world. Alkadry and Tower empower the reader to perceive new options and policy alternatives, and inspire working people and those of us who study workplace policy to reject the received wisdom and imagine greater possibilities for all.
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Symposium Conclusion

Whither and Whence:  
A Retrospective View  
Of Women in Public Service

John R. Phillips and Victoria Gordon

To conclude this symposium, we first must thank the contributors for their insightful and meaningful work. We applaud their efforts and encourage them to continue their research. Second, we offer the following brief observations on women in the discipline of public administration; women in the history of public service; and the unique contributions to the discipline made by Public Voices and the Virtual Museum of Public Service.

Women in the Discipline

Much of the career of the older of the co-editors was dominated by vigorous and sometimes rancorous debates over definitions of the discipline, what we should study, and how we should study it. Whatever the questions and whatever the terms of the debate, for much of the twentieth century, women were noticeable mostly by their absence from those debates.

This issue of Public Voices is a demonstration, but only in very small part, of how much the discipline has changed over the intervening years. It is inconceivable today that anyone could write, as Luther Gulick did in his foreword to Papers on the Science of Administration, “The papers brought together in this collection are essays by men scientifically interested in the phenomena of administration” (Gulick & Urwick 1937, v). The incongruity of such a remark, even in Gulick’s own time, is the more notable as Mary Parker Follett, the subject of an article in this issue by Stout and Love, was one of the “men” whose work was included in that famous volume (Phillips 2010). Finally, to detail the many contributions of women as practitioners, public servants, teachers, and scholars in the twenty-first century would require volumes dedicated, not to their work and accomplishments per se, but to the compilation of references and topical bibliographies on the tremendous range and quantity of their scholarly work and accomplishments.
Women in the Workforce

The place of women in the workplace is essential to the success of the U.S. economy and to their respective families. The U.S. Department of Labor (2010) provided the top 20 leading occupations of employed women in the United States. As presented in Table 1, the occupations are listed in descending order by total employed women in each occupation. The table also presents the percent of women employed in each occupation and the median weekly earnings by women in each occupation.

Table 1: Leading Occupations of Employed Women, 2010 Annual Averages. (Employment in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total employed women (in thousands)</th>
<th>Total employed men &amp; women</th>
<th>Percent women (%)</th>
<th>Women’s median weekly earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, 16 years and older</td>
<td>65,638</td>
<td>139,064</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>$669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries and administrative assistants</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered nurses</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and middle school teachers</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail salespersons</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing, psychiatric and home health aides</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters and waitresses</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-line supervisors/managers of retail sales workers</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service representatives</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maids and housekeeping cleaners</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionists and information clerks</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare workers</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-line supervisors/managers of office and administrative support</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, all others</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants and auditors</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher assistants</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and home care aides</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office clerks, general</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen from the table, teaching and nursing are near the top of the list of acceptable and chosen professions for women. As pointed out by the women interviewed by Rauhaus, “women are often concentrated in occupations that use values necessary for service, such as care, kindness and concern,” and these are all traits that illustrate the value that these women place on helping others.

One hundred years ago few professions were open to women—teaching and nursing were common choices then, but upon marriage most women left their calling to stay at home and raise their children. Victoria’s grandmother, Manila Dixon Loyd, was a teacher in a one-room school house in the 1920’s. Upon her marriage she had to resign her position. As a farm wife she was a help mate, raised five daughters, and was active in her small, rural community. She instilled in her family the love of reading and encouraged all women in their educational pursuits.

Similarly, John’s mother, Ann Brown Phillips (born in Scotland more than one hundred years ago), combined the role of farm wife and mother with her career specializing in obstetrics and surgery, a career that lasted more than 70 years. In Mississippi, in the 1920s and 1930s, she trained African-American women as midwives so that they could provide obstetrical and general health care to those in need of those services in their communities. These two women shared a commitment to family life and to a career. In a real sense they “did it all” decades before that term entered discourse on gender, politics, and public service. In their respective roles, these women made a difference where they were; they were the embodiment of women helping other women. Interestingly, it seems to us that neither of them would have thought that what they did was in the least unusual; certainly they would not have thought of themselves as extraordinary.

One lesson to be taken from this symposium is that we must learn from the legacy of all of the women our contributing scholars have studied, described, and discussed—women must continue to help other women. Specifically, as public administrators we must understand where we come from; learn from multiple perspectives; make a difference where we are; challenge and question rules and regulations that prevent meaningful change; embrace care and emotions as we perform our professional duties and as we exercise administrative discretion in decision making; instill in others the passion to serve through mentoring by offering encouragement to others; and develop organizational policies that help women advance professionally without asking them to forfeit their family commitments.

Another lesson is that researchers in the field have only begun to mine the daily experiences of women and men on the front lines, what Mastracci (one of our contributors) and her colleagues have referred to as “Working on the Razor’s Edge” (Mastracci, Guy, & Newman 2011). As an area for future research, we would enter a plea for the immediate recording and preservation of individual life histories of those on the front lines while there is still time to do so. Our sometimes too narrow focus on higher levels of administration puts at risk a different level and type of administrative knowledge. We lose at a very rapid rate both the living knowledge of those on the “Razor’s Edge” as well as the individual and community histories in which their work was or is embedded. The brief comments on this issue’s cover photograph of Ann Brown and the Mississippi Midwives is a case in point: Some information is known about Ann Brown’s work but it is now too late to recover its full extent and significance. Those present at a conference where her work was discussed (Phillips 2013) were charged with recording and preserving their own histo-
ries, their own stories, so that important aspects of public administration as a record of the individual, social, community, and political history of public service in the United States are not lost due to our own negligence, our failure to preserve that history for the future. We charge our readers with that same task.

Public Voices and the Virtual Museum of Public Service

Among the “rancorous debates” that roiled the discipline at various times in the twentieth century, perhaps none was testier than the exchanges between the quantifiers and the non-quantifiers. A single terse comment from a particularly (in)famous exchange between Dwight Waldo and Herbert Simon suggests the tenor of the time: “It is a verifiable proposition that a positivist would rather be broken on the rack than admit that there are ‘value decisions’ and ‘factual decisions’” (Simon 1952, 495). Waldo’s lengthy and discursive response in what he, himself, referred to as his “purple prose” (Waldo quoted in Simon 1952, 501, Note 1) was equally pointed. Fortunately, public administration as a discipline long ago moved beyond that controversy to a point where we can welcome and learn from quantitative as well as qualitative research, from poetry, short stories, film, novels, art, and other media. For many years, now Public Voices has provided a unique venue through which such diverse approaches to our discipline can be disseminated, a journal where many voices speak to us and instruct us.

The Virtual Museum of Public Service is another important resource and repository of information on public service and public administration. On October 16, 2012, the School of Public Affairs and Administration (SPAA) at Rutgers-Newark launched the Virtual Museum (www.vmps.us), as “an innovative web-based project that reflects the contributions public servants have made to their communities, nations, and the world” (Swiston 2012). The floor plan of the museum is shown in Figure 1.

We particularly draw our readers’ attention to the First Floor, Room D-5, Women in Public Service (http://www.vmps.us/women). The title of our symposium is taken from that room in the museum. Similarly, the cover photo of Ann Brown, R.N., and the Mississippi Midwives is one of three such photos to be found in Room C-2, Public Health and Healthcare (http://www.vmps.us/node/456). Having had this opportunity to work with our colleagues from around the country and to add to the scholarship and historical record of women in public service through this symposium in Public Voices has been a great privilege. We hope that ours is but the first of many more symposia to come, symposia that will address the various topics and collections in the museum. We hope, too, that our colleagues and the public-at-large will contribute items of historical importance to the Virtual Museum.
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Case Study #4: Star Trek
by Gene Roddenberry

Developed by Kenneth Nichols

STAR TREK began as a 1960s television series led by a swashbuckling starship captain, an intellectual off-world first officer, and a multicultural, heart-of-gold crew. In the half century since its appearance on our home screens, the series Gene Roddenberry created spawned a plethora of motion pictures, three spin-off TV series, paperbacks galore, conventions, a significant array of competing future-world shows, and a lively subculture. I almost said, “American subculture,” but the fact is that trekkies (declared and undeclared) are a worldwide phenomenon.

Star Trek is also a rich treasure trove of administrative literature: The setting is usually a starship, sometimes a planetary government organization. The characters are clearly delineated, colorful, share common goals, distinguish between their personal and professional roles and concerns, and serve well as archetypes for distinct organizational personalities. And the missions are clear, benevolent, in the public interest, and frequently controversial.

As you watch an episode from one of the Star Trek series, how many of these facets can you observe? Take a look at the five primary Star Trek captains: James Kirk, of the original series; Jean Luc Picard, of Next Generation; Benjamin Sisko, of Deep Space Nine; Kathryn Janeway, of Voyager; and Jonathan Archer of Enterprise. What distinguishes them and what do they share in common? What about their lines of authority? How are their duties alike? Different? What about the officials to whom they report? What about their subordinates? Others for whom they are responsible?

That’s public administration, all right, but in a very different wrapper.

Star Trek’s creator Gene Roddenberry died in 1991, having seen the remarkable popularity of his conception of what our lives might be like a few hundred years from now.
The Selection


The STAR TREK television series are set several hundred years in the future, in a kinder, more benign societal environment than we experience today — at least as far as Earth governments go. Earth belongs to a mega-government known as The Federation, which covers many star systems, races, and cultures. The Federation supports a social order that embodies world peace, equal opportunity and participation by all, eradication of starvation and diseases, universal education, and social and environmental sensitivity. It also portrays inter-species socialization, coalitions, governments, and warfare. Beyond the Federation, the galaxy is populated with other alliances (many of them unfriendly) and filled with countless natural and scientific unknowns.

Captains Archer, Kirk, and Picard head missions of scientific exploration. They each command a starship known as the Enterprise. (This is because their commands are each a generation apart.) Their crews represent the public service — the “bureaucracy.” The public is still the public — citizens of the Federation. Although only the ship’s crew is actively involved in the exploration, both the crew and the public enjoy scientific, political, and economic rewards of the Enterprise’s discoveries and diplomatic successes.

Aboard a much smaller ship christened Voyager, Captain Janeway has a similar role even though her ship has a different mission. Originally, it was to police a sector of space, keeping it peaceful for commercial and civilian travel. The original mission became secondary, though, when the vessel was thrown into a distant part of the Milky Way, our galaxy. Voyager’s new quest has become to return home, along the way collecting what new knowledge it can.

From the frontier outpost of Deep Space Nine, Sisko and his crew serve multiple publics: travelers who use the space station for which this series is named; inhabitants of the region of space, who look to Sisko’s presence to maintain (or reestablish) an at-best uneasy peace; and the public at large, who expect the space station to preserve the interests of the Federation.

Sample several Star Trek episodes or movies; then tackle the questions and exercises that your instructor assigns you.

For Students

Questions

○ How well does sociologist Max Weber’s description of a hierarchical organization fit the way the Enterprise and Voyager operate? Deep Space Nine?
What can you discern about the Federation government as a hierarchical organization?

How does the Federation in Star Trek differ from the government of the United States today?

In Star Trek, the “Prime Directive” prohibits Federation officials from interfering with developing societies. Interference would be unethical. Why? Is there a counter-argument?

Each of the Star Trek series includes a chief medical officer. As in most organizational hierarchies, personnel support activities (including medical care) are handled through staff positions. What distinguishes line employees from staff employees? Can you use a Star Trek situation and characters to illustrate your discussion?

Exercises

1. **Planning.** Captain Picard must convince a group of squatters to resettle to a distant location that does not violate the territorial claims of another group. The new location is also safer. The Captain wants to create a win-win situation that replaces what has been a long-running mess; however, the settlers must relocate voluntarily because no one on the starship has authority to force them to move. Picard has assigned you, Counselor Deanna Troi, and Security Officer Worf to develop an action plan for achieving those goals.
   a. Develop a set of specific recommendations on how Picard should proceed.
   b. Use your recommendations as the major steps in an action plan. For each action, identify the party (or parties) having primary responsibility and establish a target timeframe for completing the action.

2. **Leadership qualities.** You are a senior Starfleet training officer assigned to revise and update the Academy’s leadership development program. (Starfleet is the Federation’s military and space exploration agency; Starfleet Academy is its officer training school.) You have decided to use highly regarded Starfleet commanders as possible case studies.
   a. Select two of the five Star Trek captains: Kirk, Picard, Sisko, Janeway, and Archer. Compare and contrast their leadership traits, reflecting both on their individual strengths and weaknesses.
   b. Do the same with any two of the seconds-in-command: Spock, of the original series; Riker, of Next Generation; Kira, of Deep Space Nine; and Chakotey, of Voyager. Be sure to describe the relationship each has with his or her captain and crewmates. Create a concise list of leadership DOs and DON’Ts drawn from your analysis.

Creators of Other “Universes”

Isaac Asimov was a longtime friend of Gene Roddenberry and a prolific science fiction writer. Many of Asimov’s novels and stories tell the future history of humankind over nearly 50,000 years: The Robot novels tell of the development of the positronic robot and the beginnings of space travel; the Elijah Baley novels ex-
pound on the social issues of the first wave of galactic colonization and the continued isolation of Earth; the *Galactic* novels and stories deal with individual episodes in the history of the First Galactic Empire; and the *Foundation* novels describe the beginning of a new, greater Empire built upon the ruins of the older one.

*Robert A. Heinlein* — Another major writer of the Campbellesque era of science fiction, Robert Heinlein set many of his stories novels and novels within an interlinking *Future History*, which contributed to the title of one of his anthologies. Heinlein’s “universe” begins in the near future with burrowed colonies on the moon and continues thousands of years into a future populated by genetically-enhanced humans as well as nonhuman intelligences.

*George Lucas* — “A long time ago, in a galaxy far, far away, . . .” begins the prologue to the original *STAR WARS* trilogy (*Star Wars, The Empire Strikes Back, Return of the Jedi*). Now with its more recent prequels, the *STAR WARS* movies are among the significant achievements in modern movie history. Few movie series have had such a sustained and pervasive impact on popular culture as have *STAR WARS* characters and situations.

*Larry Niven* — Niven’s *known-space* universe is a future civilization populated by humans and anthropomorphic races. Particularly interesting is his concept of a *ringworld*: a terraformed shell or ring circling a star where a habitable planet would normally orbit; the sun-facing surface of the ring sustains life.

*J. R. R. Tolkien* — *The Lord of the Rings* (1948) series of novels (and recent movies) is a trilogy made up of *The Fellowship of the Ring* (1954), *The Two Towers* (1954), and *The Return of the King* (1955). With Tolkien’s companion novel, *The Hobbit* (1937), the series is a bellwether of the modern fantasy movement. Tolkien is credited with employing an old style — reminiscent of middle-English epics such as *Beowulf* — in creating a modern appreciation of magic as a manifestation of self.

**Internet Sites**

*STAR TREK* has an official internet site (http://www.startrek.com), managed by CBS Studios, Inc. Fan-sponsored sites can also be interesting and informative.

*STAR WARS*, the George Lucas creation, likewise has its own website (http://www.starwars.com).

*GENE RODDENBERRY* — Roddenberry.com offers biographical information and commentary about the late Gene Roddenberry and his ideas, along with some of his projects, both commercial and philanthropic (http://www.roddenberry.com).
THINKING ABOUT THE FUTURE — A number of organizations and projects have as their mission thinking about the future. Among the best are the World Future Society (http://www.wfs.org), a U.S.-based organization of 30,000 members worldwide, and Foresight (http://www.bis.gov.uk/foresight), a series of projects based in the United Kingdom.

Special Analysis: Leadership and Other Administrative Concepts

When I was younger (and I always used to be younger), Captain James T. Kirk made television history by leading the officers and crew of the Federation starship Enterprise on scientific missions to explore the reaches of the galaxy. Their mission: “To boldly go where no man has gone before.”

I grew older and so did Captain Kirk. In the decades I spent being part of — and, later, teaching about — American government, the phenomenon of STAR TREK provided us with a diverse and extraordinary set of heroic personalities. At the same time, STAR TREK seeded our imaginations with possibilities not only of technological wonders such as warp drive, replicators, holodecks, and transporters, but with the tantalizing prospect of a social order that (at least among humans) embodies world peace, equal opportunity and participation by all, eradication of starvation and diseases, universal education, social and environmental sensitivity, and a John Stuart Mills-like humanism raised nearly to the level of religion. Into that social tapestry, it also portrayed inter-species socialization, coalitions, governments, and warfare.

The original Star Trek television series created by Gene Roddenberry spawned both motion pictures and other TV series set in Star Trek’s universe, and stimulated other shows with futuristic settings and themes. During those decades, Star Trek’s imaginary technology, its clearly drawn characters, and even its value system permeated our popular culture to an impressive extent. Eight-year-olds and eighty-year-olds recognize and relate to Kirk, to his successor Jean Luc Picard, and to other Star Trek personalities.

What an opportunity! This popular series gives us an uplifting and yet demanding look at the workings of organizations, leadership, administration, and government:

- how our federal, state, and local bureaucracies operate on a day-to-day, year-to-year level;
- how the institutions of government and the people in government strive to handle routine and unforeseen responsibilities that we, as citizens and taxpayers, expect them to address; and
- how leadership in public organizations operates alongside and in relation to the political dynamics of government.
In other words, the characters depicted in *Star Trek* provide a rich source of contrasting images valuable for examining public leadership concepts and other aspects of public administration. College students, especially younger undergraduates who have spent little time in the workplace, may find it difficult to appreciate concepts of organization and leadership as those concepts are presented in the classroom. The popularity, richness, and universality of *Star Trek* help many students bridge that experience gap.

This works, of course, only because the characters themselves have distinct, larger-than-life qualities that make them useful as models for examination. As Patrick Stewart (a.k.a. Captain Picard) has observed in numerous interviews, *Star Trek*’s characters and situations have a theatrical — even Shakespearian — quality. That quality helps dramatize the traits and dilemmas of leadership along with many other dynamics of operating within complex organizations.

This analysis describes how the vicarious experience at hand from *Star Trek*’s high-contrast personalities helps the students assimilate and appreciate concepts pertaining to public leadership — and, in fact, leadership in general. This essay looks, first, at key personalities from several *Star Trek* series, using them to examine a number of leadership concepts. The analysis concludes by discussing limitations of using *Star Trek* examples.

**Key Characters from Star Trek**

Much discussion can be drawn from the two casts of characters in the original *Star Trek* series and in the show’s initial successor, *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. However, the characters from other *Star Trek* spin-offs have become sufficiently dimensional for illustrating particular aspects of public leadership.

Who are these characters? Let’s consider several of them beginning with the series' topmost leaders, their captains:

**The Captains: Kirk, Picard, Sisko, Janeway, and Archer**

Captain James Kirk commands the original series’ starship *Enterprise*. As an individual and as a leader, Kirk is quick to understand, decide, and act. In fact, Kirk is very much a hands-on, action-oriented leader who is often confronted with extraordinary encounters. From brash to clever, Kirk’s array of leadership skills serve him as he commands the *Enterprise* in its mission to explore distant worlds and galactic phenomena.

Captain Jean Luc Picard commands a later model of the “galaxy class” *Enterprise* in the *Next Generation* series. Picard is more mature and more cerebral than Kirk. Picard often takes his time in reaching key decisions. If Kirk’s hallmark is decisive action, Picard’s is moral determination and steely resolve. When confronted with a Hobson’s Choice, Picard often uses his intellectual prowess and leadership acumen to redefine a problem, acknowledge the value of stalemate (when inevitable), and at times invoke a win-win supersolution that accommodates all parties.
Unlike the other captains, Starfleet Commander Benjamin Sisko is in charge of an extremely distant space station rather than a vessel. *Deep Space Nine* is the name of the space station and the television series. Sisko must deal with an unstable, war-plagued sector of the Milky Way Galaxy. The space station is home not only to crew who directly report to Sisko, but also to a civilian population that includes traders, transients, merchants, and minors — the embodiment of a port city. Diplomacy, politics, and religions are dominant and recurring leadership issues for Sisko. Dealing with a teenage son and the aftermath of personal tragedy, Sisko is unsatisfied with himself. He considered dropping out at this frontier way station; instead he finds himself embroiled in emotions and allegiances he had not anticipated, including being drafted as the head of the dominant local religion.

Captain Kathryn Janeway commands the smallest craft and crew in her Odyssean journey homeward in *Star Trek: Voyager*. Janeway had to struggle when establishing her leadership authority — not because she is a woman (this is no longer a gender-biased society), but because the *Voyager*’s crew is a forced melding of Starfleet and renegade characters. Where the *Enterprise* engages in scientific exploration, *Voyager* simply is trying to get home to Earth — a 70-year trek even at warp speed. Hence, Janeway’s leadership challenges frequently deal with group isolation, cohesion, and morale.

Jonathan Archer captains an early version of the *Enterprise* in the prequel series *Star Trek: Enterprise*. Archer is the son of one of the starship’s original designers. As such, the role he and his crew fill is part test pilot, part explorer. Archer deals with off-world technical and cultural advisors who see Earth and its inhabitants as backwaterish junior members of the multi-world governing body, the Federation. Archer has by-the-book instincts, but experience has taught him its limitations.

**OTHER LEADERSHIP CHARACTERS**

The seconds-in-command include Spock, of the original *Star Trek* series; Will Riker, of *Next Generation*; Kira Nerys, of *Deep Space Nine*; and Chakotey, of *Voyager*. Mr. Spock is logic with suppressed emotion; he adds balance to Kirk’s impetuous brand of leadership. Will Riker embodies action, camaraderie, and humor; he balances the more introspective nature of his Captain Picard. Major Kira and her Commander Sisko are sometimes at odds, but they respect one another’s strengths. Her personality embodies an element of zealotry for a cause, seasoned with military straightforwardness and bouts of religious fervor. Chakotey has a spiritual/mystical aspect to his personality; moreover, a group within the *Voyager*’s crew is likely to be more loyal to him than to Captain Janeway.

The series offer many characters who have formal or informal leadership roles. *Star Trek: The Next Generation* offers a particularly rich vein: Lieutenant Worf, a starship security officer whose character also appears on *Deep Space Nine*, comes from a warrior race that, until recently, was at war with the allied forces of the Federation. Counselor Deanna Troi provides the *Enterprise*’s officers and crew with emotional counseling and its captain with insights about the emotional states of potentially hostile visitors. Commander Data is a Pinocchio-like character: a highly intelligent, mild-mannered android who wants to be more human. Guinan is the ship’s long-lived bartender and frequent Cassandra. Ah, and *Q* — who is not a member of the ship’s
complement — appears from time to time; Q is an omnipotent trickster, a sometimes-Tocquevillian character who likes to play nemesis to Picard as well as to other characters.

Public Leadership Concepts

Of the scores of leadership concepts that can be examined through the lens of these Star Trek personalities, a handful of examples are considered here. Besides leadership traits, this analysis briefly looks at Weberian hierarchy, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, public and organizational leadership situations, and leadership aphorisms.

Leadership Traits

Identifying leadership traits — that is, the traits or qualities to be found in an ideal leader — is something students find easy. Dozens of major studies exist on the subject; most of those studies validate what you or I or a classroom full of college undergraduates would enumerate as qualities desired/expected in a leader. Among those traits: Intelligence (though not particularly extreme intelligence), pleasant physical appearance, energy and stamina, fluency of speech, willingness to listen and respond, technical and administrative skill, knowledge and experience, insight and wisdom, decisiveness and sound judgment, originality, vision, adaptability, action-orientation, initiative and perseverance, a firm sense of responsibility and integrity, good humor and emotional control, and concern for others (especially for followers).⁵

Unlike leaders here in the real world (both present and past), Star Trek’s captains display all of these traits rather prominently. Even so, the mixture of dominant and subdominant leadership qualities helps demonstrate two important concepts: First, that, notwithstanding anyone’s list of mandatory leadership traits, leaders aren’t stamped out in just one or two basic models — they come in many shapes, sizes, and personalities; second, that all leaders (even TV role models) must deal with internal flaws just as they contend with external situations.

To the first point, the irony is interesting. It is tempting to say that Star Trek’s leaders are all from the same basic mold. That is true in several senses because all, one way or another, are part of Starfleet, a quasi-military arm of the Federation; the Federation is a multiculture, multistarsystem alliance of governments. Hence, their backgrounds are scientific, military, cosmopolitan, and humanist (in an extended sense of the term). All share a value system that, in an earlier generation of science fiction fans, we would poster as “truth, justice, and the American way.” (Yes, iconic Superman.) With few exceptions, such as Counselor Troi, all are formal leaders. The irony is that Star Trek series’ developers make extensive efforts to draw distinctions among the characters. Scriptwriter Robert Hewitt Wolfe describes that concern in speaking of an early episode of Deep Space Nine: The script had Sisko responding to a character by saying, “I’m not Picard.” Wolfe’s reflection on the dialogue: “That was important for us to do, but I don’t think it was enough. Sure, Sisko is not Picard, but Sisko is Sisko. The episode didn’t show enough of who Sisko is, or any of the others for that matter.”⁶

Regarding the second point (i.e., the internal flaws of leaders and other mortals), each captain — indeed, each of Star Trek’s leadership characters — wrestles with a carefully crafted flaw. For Kirk, as an example, it is rashness and a little hubris; for Picard, an Adlai Stevenson-like propen-
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sity foranguishing over the moral issues in a situation. Those flaws help define each character’s personality. Even as a flaw causes periodic embarrassment, difficulty, or personal anguish, it just as frequently provides a springboard for setting the character's compass and even resolving crises.

Our popular culture provides us with a close-up, if grainy, vision of leaders and other personalities in contemporary society. In fact, says James MacGregor Burns, “We peer into the private lives of leaders, as though their sleeping habits... and hobbies carry profound significance. Entire magazines are devoted to trivia about ‘people’. . . .”7 Certainly, we still have heroic interpreters — camera lens filters, if you will — who use mediated reality to create and project public images free of the “warts” of the real-life people those persona represent. We call them media consultants, public relations specialists, spin doctors, publicists, public information officers, directors of communication, and press secretaries. (We call them other things, too.) Elsewhere in the world, “[h]uge throngs parade in Red Square and in the T’ien An Men Square with giant portraits of men who are not giants.”8 But, in high contrast to closed societies and to ages past, people today get much closer and franker perspectives of their leaders than ever before. Lens filters notwithstanding, we see our leaders’ warts. Because we expect more of our leaders, we risk becoming cynical.

*Star Trek* helps enable students to accommodate human frailty — frailty within kept within bounds, at any rate — as a normal, acceptable aspect of a leader. Worf is a great example. He is a fierce warrior with a nearly unbridled instinct toward addressing confrontation through violence; yet he is deeply compassionate, courageous, and loyal to his comrades. Worf must constantly wrestle with his darker instincts, and he usually keeps them in check. Another example is Kira: Her war-born prejudice against another race and her religious zealotry threaten, at times, to put her at odds with her formal leadership role. Riker and Kirk are more easily enticed into romantic encounters. Troi and Worf are openly (and needlessly) embarrassed about their parents. Spock attempts to deny emotional elements within him that come from the mixed marriage of his parents. Sisko and Kirk each blame themselves for family tragedies. And so on.

It is important that the two points balance — or, at the least, get juxtaposed: Leaders come with almost all variations of leadership traits, and leaders contend with deep personal demons and with lesser imperfections. At root, leaders are just like everyone else. And — foibles, flaws, and all — good leaders perform.

**PUBLIC LEADERS**

In order to consider public leadership, let’s first talk about the concept of leadership itself. What is “leadership,” anyway? James MacGregor Burns, preeminent scholar on leadership, puts it this way:

Some define leadership as leaders making followers do what followers would not otherwise do... I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivation — the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations — of both leaders and followers.9
Phillip Selznick (1984: 61-63) focuses in on leadership within organizations and institutions, noting that effective leaders set goals and define the purpose of the institution (visionary leadership), integrate that purpose into the way the institution operates, reflect and sustain the values and identity of the institution (moral leadership), and maintain order and cohesion within the institution. Public leadership deals with two sets of followers: those who are under the leader’s direct oversight and who actively help achieve the vision (public servants), and those who share the vision and who benefit from it (the public).

Star Trek’s leaders illustrate that duality. Kirk and Picard head missions of scientific exploration. Their crews represent the public service — the “bureaucracy.” The public is still the public — citizens of the Federation. Although only the Enterprise crew is actively involved in the exploration, both the crew and the public enjoy the scientific, political, and economic rewards of the Enterprise’s discoveries and diplomatic successes.

Aboard the Voyager, Captain Janeway has a similar role though her ship has a different mission. Originally, it was to police a sector of space, keeping it peaceful for commercial and civilian travel. The original mission became secondary (even moot), however, when the vessel was thrown into a distant part of the Milky Way. Voyager’s new quest: Return home, collecting what new knowledge it can en route.

From the frontier outpost of Deep Space Nine, Sisko and his crew serve multiple publics: travelers who use the space station; inhabitants of that region of space, who look to Sisko’s presence to maintain (or reestablish) an at-best uneasy peace; and the public at large, who expect the space station to preserve the interests of the Federation.

Consequently, all captains face multiple sets of followers, and all face demanding public responsibility.

A Grab Bag of Other Concepts

Many aspects of leadership are abstract concepts. For most students, those concepts can be slippery to grasp on first encounter. The characters and circumstances of the Star Trek series provide simple yet sophisticated illustrations that help students access the concepts. The possibilities are varied, but here is a sampling:

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

While the Second World War raged, Abraham H. Maslow published what is known today as Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Recognizing that people act on, and respond to, a range of needs, Maslow grouped those needs into five levels: physiological (or survival) needs, safety needs, love needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. He then posited that, starting with the first group, each level of needs must be reasonably satisfied before the next level becomes compelling.

Star Trek situations, when examined at the organizational level (starship or space station) can be pegged to different levels in Maslow’s hierarchy. As captain of the Voyager, Janeway is dealing
with survival. She and her crew are willing to risk their safety and forego inconvenient higher-level needs in order to make it back home; to reach their destination, they will risk traveling through unstable wormholes, cut through (rather than skirt around) apparent enemy territories, waive opportunities to settle into welcoming communities, and even bypass intriguing but time-consuming scientific studies.

For the other commands, survival is only occasionally at risk. On Deep Space Nine, Sisko’s principal concern is the safety of the people of the planet Bajor and the safety of Federation control over the only wormhole in the galaxy dependable for travel. During periods of relative safety, Sisko is able to motivate through his crew’s responses to love and esteem; however, self-actualization needs on the space station are rarely addressed. Enterprise’s captains operate primarily at the upper end of Maslow’s hierarchy, venturing through portions of the galaxy where (at least since the Next Generation) “no one has gone before,” and frequently exercising their leadership by enabling the crew — and, perhaps, the public — to realize some of their needs for self-actualization. This might encompass Data’s interest in the violin as well as Picard’s interest in music and archeology.

Weberian Hierarchy

Star Trek is an excellent means for examining how traditional bureaucratic hierarchies operate. Early in the twentieth century, German sociologist Max Weber described the characteristics of bureaucratic organizations; his works were translated into English in 1946. The workings of organizational hierarchies, distinctions between formal and informal aspects of organizational behavior, personality types found in organizations, and scores of other aspects relating to hierarchical organizations have since been embellished by scholars and practitioners involved in organization theory and related disciplines.13

Weber, for example, wrote about chain of command, unity of command, and span of control — knowledge fundamental to the understanding of complex organizations. He also wrote useful but less-heralded descriptions, such as, “Whether . . . in a private office or a public bureau, the modern official always strives and usually enjoys a distinct social esteem as compared with the governed.”14 The line-and-staff structure portrayed throughout Starfleet creates images that students can discuss, analyze, and comprehend. The captains do enjoy an elevated social esteem, sometimes whether they like it or not. (Usually they don’t mind.) Counselor Troi and the ships’ doctors are first-rate examples of high-level staff, whose roles significantly differ from the complement of line officers on each ship. Who reports to whom? “Well,” notes a student, “the Chief Engineer reports to the Captain, while the other engineers report to the Chief Engineer — as for the Captain, I think there’s an admiral in Starfleet Headquarters.”

That is hierarchy in action on the student’s TV screen.

Cleveland’s Leadership Aphorisms

Educator and former ambassador Harlan Cleveland has set out more than a dozen aphorisms that apply particularly (though not exclusively) to public leadership. Among them: “No conflict, negotiation, settlement, or bargain is ever merely two-sided. . . . Force by itself is not power. . .
Openness has costs as well as benefits. . . . Our standards are not universal standards.”¹⁵ In the universe of Star Trek, these are rules to plot by: If you are Sisko, try finessing an agreement between the Federation, the Bajorans, the Cardassians, and the Klingons. If you are Kirk, try using force to contain a cargo hold overflowing with tribbles. If you are Commander Data, try explaining that you have technical proficiency on the violin but, lacking human emotions, you can only simulate the emotional intensity of a human performer. If you are one of Star Trek’s captains, try maintaining the Prime Directive in the face of anguished populations on a newly discovered planet.¹⁶

All this is to say that a well-selected Star Trek episode can serve as a learning laboratory in public leadership. It is a matter of what someone observes, consciously or subliminally, while enjoying the show.

Considerations and Conclusions

Consequently, people who are familiar with Star Trek have at their disposal a wonderful specimen for studying public leadership. Lines are crisply drawn, moral dilemmas are dramatically framed, and consequences loom clearly. Two considerations (“cautions” may be the better word) are worth noting, however. The first is caricaturization versus distillation: A model is a simplified version of reality that clarifies some things and leaves others out. In Star Trek, as in any fictional work, there is a risk that a leadership quality or action is overplayed for dramatic effect. Often, that’s what makes it enjoyable. Often, that’s what makes it accessible for study. As long as the teacher and the student keep that in mind, the “specimen” works.

The second consideration is limitation — that is, that the context and characters of Star Trek, however rich a tapestry for study, cannot reflect the totality of public leadership. They aren’t meant to. Star Trek’s writers are knowledgeable and creative, so they draw ideas from the turmoil of today and the lessons of history. But, notwithstanding the hundreds of episodes extant, Star Trek only samples real life and only portrays a surface version of what it does sample. (For instance, we are unlikely to hear one character say to another, “Sounds good, but how can we fit it into the budget?”) Again, however, as long as teacher and student draw examples from other sources as well as from the Star Trek library, the shows will be a useful and entertaining means of looking at leadership.

With those caveats, Star Trek is an exceptionally fine tool. Society needs good leaders, and future leaders need a variety of examples to consider, emulate, critique, combine, and adapt. Star Trek’s characters and situations offer a rich source of those contrasting images — images valuable for appreciating the concepts that underlie public leadership.
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For the Instructor

STARC TREK refers to a number of television series and motion picture series originally created by Gene Roddenberry. CBS Studios currently holds trademark and copyrights for Star Trek materials.

Discussion Points and Themes

- The Star Trek series are rich in themes. Dominating (■) those themes are leadership, decisionmaking, organizational and societal change, democratic principles, and organizational/small-group behavior. Major themes (●) are ethics, law enforcement/justice, functions of government, diversity/multiculturalism, and communication. Minor but important themes (*) are policy development and evaluation and democratic principles. In fact, budgeting is about the only theme absent from Star Trek material.

- Star Trek is excellent when selected scenes or episodes are viewed in class. Having students recount scenes and characters is also effective pedagogy.

Themes

- Organizational/Societal Change
- Functions of Government
- Democratic Principles
- Ethics
- Leadership
- Decisionmaking
- Planning/Budgeting
- Performance Evaluation
- Policy Development/Evaluation
- Law Enforcement/Justice
- Communication
- Organizational/Group Behavior
- Diversity/Multiculturalism
- Human Resources Management
- Personal/Professional Development

Questions

Any of the questions can be used in classroom and online discussion, assigned as homework, worked in class either individually or in small groups, and/or adapted as questions for essay or objective tests.

The commentaries below are brief reflections on each question; however, they are not intended as comprehensive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (from student section)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well does Max Weber’s description of a hierarchical organization fit the way the Enterprise and Voyager operate? Deep Space Nine?</td>
<td>To a T! This is especially true of the starships, where hierarchical organization, specializations, chain of command, line of command, line and staff, etc., are all clearly observable. It is also true aboard the space station Deep Space Nine; however, the space outpost is also permanent home to a civilian (mostly mercantile) population and a transient population of traders, refugees, diplomats, and other visitors — none of whom are part of the formal organizational reporting structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What can you discern about the Federation government as a hierarchical organization?</td>
<td>It is hierarchical, though it operates through a far more distributed organizational structure. Starship captains report to Starfleet Command, which would be equivalent to the Office of Secretary of Defense. In turn, Starfleet Command reports to a civilian Federation Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question (from student section) | Comment
---|---
3. *How does the Federation in Star Trek differ from the government of the United States today?* | In Star Trek, the Federation is a confederation of governments. Within the confederation, it may or may not reflect the decentralized autonomy of a federal structure, depending on the individual government involved (which is most frequently a world government).

4. *In Star Trek, the “Prime Directive” prohibits Federation officials from interfering with developing societies. Interference would be unethical. Why? Is there a counter-argument?* | Technology-rich societies could be disruptive and demoralizing to a developing society and risk overwhelming the nascent culture. Hawaiian and Native American cultures are often cited as examples. The other side of this position is that highly developed societies have a moral obligation to assist others as long as they do not impose their values and defects on the recipient society; in practice, this restriction is virtually impossible to abide by altogether.

5. *Each of the series includes a chief medical officer. As in most organizational hierarchies, personnel support activities (including medical care) are handled through staff positions. What distinguishes line employees from staff employees? Can you use a Star Trek situation and characters to illustrate your discussion?* | Line personnel are responsible for the mission-related activities of the organization; staff personnel assist line managers and employees, but are not part of that direct chain of command. The medical officers are part of the personnel support function of the starships to which they have been assigned, and personnel support is a staff function. The medical officers also at times provide expertise and advice to line employees in the execution of line responsibilities, such as happens when the doctor beams down as part of an away team to check out a newly encountered planet.

**Exercises**

As with the questions, above, any of these exercises can be used online and in the classroom (including flipped classrooms), or may be assigned as homework. They are usually best worked in small group settings. Some can be adapted as examination questions.

The commentaries below describe the potential utility of each exercise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise (from student section)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Planning.** Captain Picard must convince a group of squatters to resettle to a distant location that does not violate the territorial claims of another group. The new location is also safer. The Captain wants to create a win-win situation that replaces what has been a long-running mess; however, the settlers must relocate voluntarily because no one on the starship has authority to force them to move. Picard has assigned you, Counselor Deanna Troi, and Security Officer Worf to develop an action plan for achieving those goals.  
  a. Develop a set of specific recommendations about how Picard should proceed.  
  b. Use your recommendations as the major steps in an action plan. For each action, identify the party (or parties) who have primary responsibility and the target timeframe for completing the action. | This exercise gives students practice in articulating specific goals, presenting recommendations, and creating implementation plans. (See the action plan format accompanying Exercise 2 of the case study on Edgar Allan Poe.) |

2. **Leadership qualities.** You are a senior Starfleet training officer assigned to revise and update the Academy’s leadership development program. The exercise uses principal *Star Trek* characters as case studies. It also
Exercise (from student section)

program. (Starfleet is the Federation’s military and space exploration agency; Starfleet Academy is the officer training school.) You have decided to use highly regarded a set of Starfleet commanders as possible case studies.

a. Select two of the Star Trek captains: Archer, Kirk, Picard, Sisko, Janeway. Compare and contrast their leadership traits, reflecting both on their individual strengths and weaknesses.

b. Do the same with any two of the seconds-in-command: Spock, of the original series; Riker, of Next Generation; Kira, of Deep Space Nine; Chakotey, of Voyager. Be sure to describe the relationship each has with his or her captain and crew mates.

c. Create a concise list of leadership DOs and DON’Ts drawn from your analysis.

Other Classroom Activity

1. TOUGH CHOICES: A ROLE PLAY

Set up a scenario involving several Star Trek characters. Have students volunteer to assume specific roles and play out the scenario. Then have students in the audience explain the administrative relevance, competing priorities, and other challenges explicit or implicit in the scenario. Two scenario possibilities:

- The Enterprise (or Voyager or Deep Space Nine) has been asked to mediate a dispute between two worlds in a solar system over a third, uninhabited planet that has an orbit midway between the two. Both worlds lay claim the empty planet — to the inner world, the empty planet is a vital source of mineral resources, including a substance virtually absent from their own world that is essential for the health of the population; to the outer world, the empty planet is a sacred, taboo place to be used only for the burial of priests; a powerful religious ceremony performed three times a century. The away team has completed its fact-finding mission. Now the senior staff is evaluating the situation and considering a variety of options.

- Replicators (devices that “replicate” or create meals, clothes, and a wide range of other necessities) aboard the spacecraft are being used to synthesize a vital vaccine as rapidly as possible, but the power drain is enormous. Meanwhile, unusual malfunctions are occurring throughout the ship (or space station). The cause is undiagnosed, but the combined power drain has forced the captain to order life support systems to be shut down deck-by-deck to conserve power. That does not appear to be sufficient. The captain has called together the senior officers to help assess the situation and to recommend immediate and long-term actions.

Bottom Line. This activity gives students the opportunity to engage in small-group process in a difficult decision-making setting.
2. Administration in Star Trek: Case Studies

Divide class into teams. Have each team screen any one or two episodes of a given Star Trek series, with each team taking a different series. Each team then prepares a 5-8 minute in-class presentation briefly outlining the plot and major characters of the episode(s) they screened and, using those episodes, identifying the following elements the episodes illustrate, and how:

1) Functions of government
2) Democratic principles
3) Organizational or small-group behavior
4) Organizational or societal change
5) Ethics
6) Diversity

Allow time for team review and general discussion.

Bottom Line. This activity offers a range of benefits for students. It permits students to:

■ Employ episodes as case studies.
■ Practice small-group participation skills.
■ Gain experience in preparing and delivering presentations.
■ Participate in group discussion.

Further Reading

Beyond the references in the reader, identify relevant textbook or reading selections assigned for the course. Here are several more:

Barad, Judith, and Ed Robertson. 2001. The Ethics of Star Trek. Harper Perennial. Most Star Trek stories, say Barad and Robertson, “are indeed moral fables,” which is one reason Star Trek endures so well and illustrates many aspects of the study of ethics.


**Discussion and Essay Questions**

The questions and exercises in the student reader are readily adaptable for online or classroom discussion and as examination questions. Other possibilities:

- Force frequently seems unavoidable in Star Trek in order to secure “the rule of law.” Develop several guidelines Starfleet commanders can use to help them know when the use of force is appropriate, in what degree. How does this differ with respect to individuals compared with large groups? How would you modify your guidelines for use by contemporary law enforcement and military officials?
- Compare the organizational cultures of any two Star Trek organizations: The three *Enterprises*, *Voyager*, and *Deep Space Nine*.
- *Star Trek* often takes on the issues of multiculturalism and diversity. Identify and discuss a situation you recall from *Star Trek*. How would you explain it to a group of students in third grade? In junior high or middle school?
- What does *Star Trek* illustrate about the basic functions of government?

**Notes**

1 Continued from *Public Voices* XIII(1).
2 An early version of this essay was presented at the annual conference of the Northeast Popular Culture Association on October 31, 1997, Wentworth Institute of Technology, Boston, Massachusetts.
4 Berman and Pillar, p. 8.
8 Burns, p. 1.
9 Burns, p. 19.
12 To use the definition of theoretic physicist Kip Thorne (from his book, *Black Holes and Time Warps: Einstein’s Outrageous Legacy*. (New York, Norton, 1994, p. 559), a wormhole is a “handle” in the topology of space, connecting two widely separated locations in our Universe.” In Star Trek terms, Wormholes, simply put, are shortcuts through space. You go in one end and come out the other in seconds, but find yourself billions of kilometers away. All known wormholes previously encountered in the Star Trek universe have been unstable. Their ends can whip randomly around the universe. They last for brief periods of time before collapsing. But . . . the first stable wormhole is discovered near . . . the planet Bajor. (Berman and Pillar, p. 1)
Star Trek’s interpretation is reasonably consistent with more technical renderings by Thorne and other cosmologists, who have also mused that these space warps, if they exist, might be a convenient way to move about our universe. Star Trek and practicing cosmologists differ, however, on what a wormhole looks like. According to Thorne (54-55),
This space warp consists of two entrance holes (the wormhole’s mouths), which look much like black holes but without [event] horizons, and which can be far apart in the universe. Anything that enters one mouth finds itself in a very short tube (the wormhole’s throat) that leads to and out of the other mouth. The tube cannot be seen from our Universe because it extends through hyperspace rather than through normal space.

In Star Trek, however, a wormhole “is only visible when an object enters or exits through it. . . . The ride is a spectacular light show, with brilliant colors surrounding the ship — while inside, strange visual distortions affect perceptions as passengers tear through the space-time continuum.” (Berman and Pillar, p. 1) That’s show biz.


14 Gerth and Mills.


16 In Star Trek, “The Prime Directive” prohibits Federation officials from interfering with developing societies.

Dr. Kenneth Nichols is professor emeritus of public administration at the University of Maine.
Case Study #5:
Bartleby, the Scrivener, a Story of Wall Street
by Herman Melville

Developed by Kenneth Nichols

“Bartleby” is the name of the principal character in Herman Melville’s short story about the relationship between a manager and an employee. Bartleby is the employee. His job is to be a scrivener, or a copyist.

The setting is a small law firm on Wall Street a century and a half ago — long before computers and photocopy machines, or even typewriters and carbon paper. A scrivener’s job was to copy a document clearly and accurately using the information technology of the day: paper, a bottle of ink, and a sharpened quill (feather) or metal writing stylus (which was the precursor of the fountain pen). Copying documents was Bartleby’s full-time job; it was also the job of two of his coworkers, Turkey and Nippers.

You’ll find that the office technology may be different now than it was in Bartleby’s time, but people are much the same as ever. As you read this story, ask yourself what kind of employee Bartleby is. What kind of boss does the attorney make? Can you describe what something unique about each of his fellow employees: Nippers, Turkey, and Ginger Nut? Does the story have to end the way it does?

As for the author, Herman Melville was popular in his day for his many stories and novels about life at sea. He is most famous for Moby Dick, a complex novel that chronicles Captain Ahab’s undeterred pursuit of the cunning great white whale. For now, with “Bartleby,” let’s venture down to the Wall Street of another era and see how a new employee can change the way an office feels, if not how it operates.
The Selection: *Bartleby, the Scrivener, a Story of Wall Street*

(Herman Melville, “Bartleby, the Scrivener, a Story of Wall Street,” *Putnam’s Monthly* 2(11-12), Nov.-Dec. 1853, New York.)

I am a rather elderly man. The nature of my avocations for the last thirty years has brought me into more than ordinary contact with what would seem an interesting and somewhat singular set of men, of whom as yet nothing that I know of has ever been written:—I mean the law-copyists or scriveners. I have known very many of them, professionally and privately, and if I pleased, could relate divers histories, at which good-natured gentlemen might smile, and sentimental souls might weep. But I waive the biographies of all other scriveners for a few passages in the life of Bartleby, who was a scrivener the strangest I ever saw or heard of. While of other law-copyists I might write the complete life, of Bartleby nothing of that sort can be done. I believe that no materials exist for a full and satisfactory biography of this man. It is an irreparable loss to literature. Bartleby was one of those beings of whom nothing is ascertainable, except from the original sources, and in his case those are very small. What my own astonished eyes saw of Bartleby, that is all I know of him, except, indeed, one vague report which will appear in the sequel.

Ere introducing the scrivener, as he first appeared to me, it is fit I make some mention of myself, my employées, my business, my chambers, and general surroundings; because some such description is indispensable to an adequate understanding of the chief character about to be presented.

Imprimis: I am a man who, from his youth upwards, has been filled with a profound conviction that the easiest way of life is the best. Hence, though I belong to a profession proverbially energetic and nervous, even to turbulence, at times, yet nothing of that sort have I ever suffered to invade my peace. I am one of those unambitious lawyers who never addresses a jury, or in any way draws down public applause; but in the cool tranquility of a snug retreat, do a snug business among rich men's bonds and mortgages and title-deeds. All who know me consider me an eminently safe man. The late John Jacob Astor, a personage little given to poetic enthusiasm, had no hesitation in pronouncing my first grand point to be prudence; my next, method. I do not speak it in vanity, but simply record the fact, that I was not unemployed in my profession by the late John Jacob Astor; a name which, I admit, I love to repeat, for it hath a rounded and orbicular sound to it, and rings like unto bullion. I will freely add, that I was not insensible to the late John Jacob Astor's good opinion.

Some time prior to the period at which this little history begins, my avocations had been largely increased. The good old office, now extinct in the State of New-York, of a Master in Chancery, had been conferred upon me. It was not a very arduous office, but very pleasantly remunerative. I seldom lose my temper; much more seldom indulge in dangerous indignation at wrongs and outrages; but I must be permitted to be rash here and declare, that I consider the sudden and violent abrogation of the office of Master of Chancery, by the new Constitution, as a— premature act; inasmuch as I had counted upon a life-lease of the profits, whereas I only received those of a few short years. But this is by the way.
My chambers were up stairs at No. — Wall-street. At one end they looked upon the white wall of the interior of a spacious sky-light shaft, penetrating the building from top to bottom. This view might have been considered rather tame than otherwise, deficient in what landscape painters call “life.” But if so, the view from the other end of my chambers offered, at least, a contrast, if nothing more. In that direction my windows commanded an unobstructed view of a lofty brick wall, black by age and everlasting shade; which wall required no spy-glass to bring out its lurking beauties, but for the benefit of all near-sighted spectators, was pushed up to within ten feet of my window panes. Owing to the great height of the surrounding buildings, and my chambers being on the second floor, the interval between this wall and mine not a little resembled a huge square cistern.

At the period just preceding the advent of Bartleby, I had two persons as copyists in my employment, and a promising lad as an office-boy. First, Turkey; second, Nippers; third, Ginger Nut. These may seem names, the like of which are not usually found in the Directory. In truth they were nicknames, mutually conferred upon each other by my three clerks, and were deemed expressive of their respective persons or characters. Turkey was a short, pursy Englishman of about my own age, that is, somewhere not far from sixty. In the morning, one might say, his face was of a fine florid hue, but after twelve o’clock, meridian—his dinner hour—it blazed like a grate full of Christmas coals; and continued blazing—but, as it were, with a gradual wane—till 6 o’clock, P. M. or thereabouts, after which I saw no more of the proprietor of the face, which gaining its meridian with the sun, seemed to set, to rise, culminate, and decline the following day, with the like regularity and undiminished glory. There are many singular coincidences I have known in the course of my life, not the least among which was the fact, that exactly when Turkey displayed his fullest beams from his red and radiant countenance, just then, too, at that critical moment, began the daily period when I considered his business capacities as seriously disturbed for the remainder of the twenty-four hours. Not that he was absolutely idle, or averse to business then; far from it. The difficulty was, he was apt to be altogether too energetic. There was a strange, inflamed, flurried, flighty recklessness of activity about him. He would be incautious in dipping his pen into his inkstand. All his blots upon my documents, were dropped there after twelve o’clock, meridian. Indeed, not only would he be reckless and sadly given to making blots in the afternoon, but some days he went further, and was rather noisy. At such times, too, his face flamed with augmented blazonry, as if cannel coal had been heaped on anthracite. He made an unpleasant racket with his chair; spilled his sand-box; in mending his pens, impatiently split them all to pieces, and threw them on the floor in a sudden passion; stood up and leaned over his table, boxing his papers about in a most indecorous manner, very sad to behold in an elderly man like him. Nevertheless, as he was in many ways a most valuable person to me, and all the time before twelve o’clock, meridian, was the quickest, steadiest creature too, accomplishing a great deal of work in a style not easy to be matched—for these reasons, I was willing to overlook his eccentricities, though indeed, occasionally, I remonstrated with him. I did this very gently, however, because, though the civilest, nay, the blandest and most reverential of men in the morning, yet in the afternoon he was disposed, upon provocation, to be slightly rash with his tongue, in fact, insolent. Now, valuing his morning services as I did, and resolved not to lose them; yet, at the same time made uncomfortable by his inflamed ways after twelve o’clock; and being a man of peace, unwilling by my admonitions to call forth unseemly retorts from him; I took upon me, one Saturday noon (he was always worse on Saturdays), to hint to him, very kindly, that perhaps now that he was growing old, it might be well to abridge his labors; in short, he
need not come to my chambers after twelve o’clock, but, dinner over, had best go home to his lodgings and rest himself till tea-time. But no; he insisted upon his afternoon devotions. His countenance became intolerably fervid, as he oratorically assured me—gesticulating with a long ruler at the other end of the room—that if his services in the morning were useful, how indispensable, then, in the afternoon?

“With submission, sir,” said Turkey on this occasion, “I consider myself your right-hand man. In the morning I but marshal and deploy my columns; but in the afternoon I put myself at their head, and gallantly charge the foe, thus!”—and he made a violent thrust with the ruler.

“But the blots, Turkey,” intimated I.

“True,—but, with submission, sir, behold these hairs! I am getting old. Surely, sir, a blot or two of a warm afternoon is not to be severely urged against gray hairs. Old age—even if it blot the page—is honorable. With submission, sir, we both are getting old.”

This appeal to my fellow-feeling was hardly to be resisted. At all events, I saw that go he would not. So I made up my mind to let him stay, resolving, nevertheless, to see to it, that during the afternoon he had to do with my less important papers.

Nippers, the second on my list, was a whiskered, sallow, and, upon the whole, rather piratical-looking young man of about five and twenty. I always deemed him the victim of two evil powers—ambition and indigestion. The ambition was evinced by a certain impatience of the duties of a mere copyist, an unwarrantable usurpation of strictly professional affairs, such as the original drawing up of legal documents. The indigestion seemed betokened in an occasional nervous testiness and grinning irritability, causing the teeth to audibly grind together over mistakes committed in copying; unnecessary maledictions, hissed, rather than spoken, in the heat of business; and especially by a continual discontent with the height of the table where he worked. Though of a very ingenious mechanical turn, Nippers could never get this table to suit him. He put chips under it, blocks of various sorts, bits of pasteboard, and at last went so far as to attempt an exquisite adjustment by final pieces of folded blotting-paper. But no invention would answer. If, for the sake of easing his back, he brought the table lid at a sharp angle well up towards his chin, and wrote there like a man using the steep roof of a Dutch house for his desk:—then he declared that it stopped the circulation in his arms. If now he lowered the table to his waistbands, and stooped over it in writing, then there was a sore aching in his back. In short, the truth of the matter was, Nippers knew not what he wanted. Or, if he wanted anything, it was to be rid of a scrivener’s table altogether. Among the manifestations of his diseased ambition was a fondness he had for receiving visits from certain ambiguous-looking fellows in seedy coats, whom he called his clients. Indeed I was aware that not only was he, at times, considerable of a ward-politician, but he occasionally did a little business at the Justices’ courts, and was not unknown on the steps of the Tombs. I have good reason to believe, however, that one individual who called upon him at my chambers, and who, with a grand air, he insisted was his client, was no other than a dun, and the alleged title-deed, a bill. But with all his failings, and the annoyances he caused me, Nippers, like his compatriot Turkey, was a very useful man to me; wrote a neat, swift hand; and, when he chose, was not deficient in a gentlemanly sort of deportment. Added to this, he always dressed in a gentlemanly sort of way; and so, incidentally, reflected credit upon my chambers. Whereas
with respect to Turkey, I had much ado to keep him from being a reproach to me. His clothes were apt to look oily and smell of eating-houses. He wore his pantaloons very loose and baggy in summer. His coats were execrable; his hat not be to handled. But while the hat was a thing of indifference to me, inasmuch as his natural civility and deference, as a dependent Englishman, always led him to doff it the moment he entered the room, yet his coat was another matter. Concerning his coats, I reasoned with him; but with no effect. The truth was, I suppose, that a man with so small an income, could not afford to sport such a lustrous face and a lustrous coat at one and the same time. As Nippers once observed, Turkey’s money went chiefly for red ink. One winter day I presented Turkey with a highly-respectable looking coat of my own, a padded gray coat, of a most comfortable warmth, and which buttoned straight up from the knee to the neck. I thought Turkey would appreciate the favor, and abate his rashness and obstreperousness of afternoons. But no. I verily believe that buttoning himself up in so downy and blanket-like a coat had a pernicious effect upon him; upon the same principle that too much oats are bad for horses. In fact, precisely as a rash, restive horse is said to feel his oats, so Turkey felt his coat. It made him insolent. He was a man whom prosperity harmed.

Though concerning the self-indulgent habits of Turkey I had my own private surmises, yet touching Nippers I was well persuaded that whatever might be his faults in other respects, he was, at least, a temperate young man. But indeed, nature herself seemed to have been his vintner, and at his birth charged him so thoroughly with an irritable, brandy-like disposition, that all subsequent potations were needless. When I consider how, amid the stillness of my chambers, Nippers would sometimes impatiently rise from his seat, and stooping over his table, spread his arms wide apart, seize the whole desk, and move it, and jerk it, with a grim, grinding motion on the floor, as if the table were a perverse voluntary agent, intent on thwarting and vexing him; I plainly perceive that for Nippers, brandy and water were altogether superfluous.

It was fortunate for me that, owing to its peculiar cause—indigestion—the irritability and consequent nervousness of Nippers, were mainly observable in the morning, while in the afternoon he was comparatively mild. So that Turkey’s paroxysms only coming on about twelve o’clock, I never had to do with their eccentricities at one time. Their fits relieved each other like guards. When Nippers’ was on, Turkey’s was off; and vice versa. This was a good natural arrangement under the circumstances.

Ginger Nut, the third on my list, was a lad some twelve years old. His father was a carman, ambitious of seeing his son on the bench instead of a cart, before he died. So he sent him to my office as student at law, errand boy, and cleaner and sweeper, at the rate of one dollar a week. He had a little desk to himself, but he did not use it much. Upon inspection, the drawer exhibited a great array of the shells of various sorts of nuts. Indeed, to this quick-witted youth the whole noble science of the law was contained in a nut-shell. Not the least among the employments of Ginger Nut, as well as one which he discharged with the most alacrity, was his duty as cake and apple purveyor for Turkey and Nippers. Copying law papers being proverbially a dry, husky sort of business, my two scriveners were fain to moisten their mouths very often with Spitzenbergs to be had at the numerous stalls nigh the Custom House and Post Office. Also, they sent Ginger Nut very frequently for that peculiar cake—small, flat, round, and very spicy—after which he had been named by them. Of a cold morning when business was but dull, Turkey would gobble up scores of these cakes, as if they were mere wafers—indeed they sell them at the rate of six or
eight for a penny—the scrape of his pen blending with the crunching of the crisp particles in his mouth. Of all the fiery afternoon blunders and flurried rashnesses of Turkey, was his once moistening a ginger-cake between his lips, and clapping it on to a mortgage for a seal. I came within an ace of dismissing him then. But he mollified me by making an oriental bow, and saying—"With submission, sir, it was generous of me to find you in stationery on my own account."

Now my original business—that of a conveyancer and title hunter, and drawer-up of recondite documents of all sorts—was considerably increased by receiving the master’s office. There was now great work for scriveners. Not only must I push the clerks already with me, but I must have additional help. In answer to my advertisement, a motionless young man one morning, stood upon my office threshold, the door being open, for it was summer. I can see that figure now—pallidly neat, pitifully respectable, incurably forlorn! It was Bartleby.

After a few words touching his qualifications, I engaged him, glad to have among my corps of copyists a man of so singularly sedate an aspect, which I thought might operate beneficially upon the flighty temper of Turkey, and the fiery one of Nippers.

I should have stated before that ground glass folding-doors divided my premises into two parts, one of which was occupied by my scriveners, the other by myself. According to my humor I threw open these doors, or closed them. I resolved to assign Bartleby a corner by the folding-doors, but on my side of them, so as to have this quiet man within easy call, in case any trifling thing was to be done. I placed his desk close up to a small side-window in that part of the room, a window which originally had afforded a lateral view of certain grimy back-yards and bricks, but which, owing to subsequent erections, commanded at present no view at all, though it gave some light. Within three feet of the panes was a wall, and the light came down from far above, between two lofty buildings, as from a very small opening in a dome. Still further to a satisfactory arrangement, I procured a high green folding screen, which might entirely isolate Bartleby from my sight, though not remove him from my voice. And thus, in a manner, privacy and society were conjoined.

At first Bartleby did an extraordinary quantity of writing. As if long famishing for something to copy, he seemed to gorge himself on my documents. There was no pause for digestion. He ran a day and night line, copying by sun-light and by candle-light. I should have been quite delighted with his application, had he been cheerfully industrious. But he wrote on silently, palely, mechanically.

It is, of course, an indispensable part of a scrivener's business to verify the accuracy of his copy, word by word. Where there are two or more scriveners in an office, they assist each other in this examination, one reading from the copy, the other holding the original. It is a very dull, weary, and lethargic affair. I can readily imagine that to some sanguine temperaments it would be altogether intolerable. For example, I cannot credit that the mettlesome poet Byron would have contentedly sat down with Bartleby to examine a law document of, say five hundred pages, closely written in a crimply hand.

Now and then, in the haste of business, it had been my habit to assist in comparing some brief document myself, calling Turkey or Nippers for this purpose. One object I had in placing Bartle-
by so handy to me behind the screen, was to avail myself of his services on such trivial occasions. It was on the third day, I think, of his being with me, and before any necessity had arisen for having his own writing examined, that, being much hurried to complete a small affair I had in hand, I abruptly called to Bartleby. In my haste and natural expectancy of instant compliance, I sat with my head bent over the original on my desk, and my right hand sideways, and somewhat nervously extended with the copy, so that immediately upon emerging from his retreat, Bartleby might snatch it and proceed to business without the least delay.

In this very attitude did I sit when I called to him, rapidly stating what it was I wanted him to do—namely, to examine a small paper with me. Imagine my surprise, nay, my consternation, when without moving from his privacy, Bartleby in a singularly mild, firm voice, replied, “I would prefer not to.”

I sat awhile in perfect silence, rallying my stunned faculties. Immediately it occurred to me that my ears had deceived me, or Bartleby had entirely misunderstood my meaning. I repeated my request in the clearest tone I could assume. But in quite as clear a one came the previous reply, “I would prefer not to.”

“Prefer not to,” echoed I, rising in high excitement, and crossing the room with a stride.

“What do you mean? Are you moon-struck? I want you to help me compare this sheet here—take it,” and I thrust it towards him.

“I would prefer not to,” said he.

I looked at him steadfastly. His face was leanly composed; his gray eye dimly calm. Not a wrinkle of agitation rippled him. Had there been the least uneasiness, anger, impatience or impertinence in his manner; in other words, had there been any thing ordinarily human about him, doubtless I should have violently dismissed him from the premises. But as it was, I should have as soon thought of turning my pale plaster-of-paris bust of Cicero out of doors. I stood gazing at him awhile, as he went on with his own writing, and then reseated myself at my desk. This is very strange, thought I. What had one best do? But my business hurried me. I concluded to forget the matter for the present, reserving it for my future leisure. So calling Nippers from the other room, the paper was speedily examined.

A few days after this, Bartleby concluded four lengthy documents, being quadruplicates of a week’s testimony taken before me in my High Court of Chancery. It became necessary to examine them. It was an important suit, and great accuracy was imperative. Having all things arranged I called Turkey, Nippers and Ginger Nut from the next room, meaning to place the four copies in the hands of my four clerks, while I should read from the original. Accordingly Turkey, Nippers and Ginger Nut had taken their seats in a row, each with his document in hand, when I called to Bartleby to join this interesting group.

“Bartleby! quick, I am waiting.”
I heard a slow scrape of his chair legs on the uncarpeted floor, and soon he appeared standing at 
the entrance of his hermitage.

“What is wanted?” said he mildly.

“The copies, the copies,” said I hurriedly. “We are going to examine them. There”—and I held 
towards him the fourth quadruplicate.

“I would prefer not to,” he said, and gently disappeared behind the screen.

For a few moments I was turned into a pillar of salt, standing at the head of my seated column of 
clerks. Recovering myself, I advanced towards the screen, and demanded the reason for such ex-
traordinary conduct.

“Why do you refuse?”

“I would prefer not to.”

With any other man I should have flown outright into a dreadful passion, scorned all further 
words, and thrust him ignominiously from my presence. But there was something about Bartleby 
that not only strangely disarmed me, but in a wonderful manner touched and disconcerted me. I 
began to reason with him.

“These are your own copies we are about to examine. It is labor saving to you, because one ex-
amination will answer for your four papers. It is common usage. Every copyist is bound to help 
examine his copy. Is it not so? Will you not speak? Answer!”

“I prefer not to,” he replied in a flute-like tone. It seemed to me that while I had been addressing 
him, he carefully revolved every statement that I made; fully comprehended the meaning; could 
not gainsay the irresistible conclusion; but, at the same time, some paramount consideration pre-
vailed with him to reply as he did.

“You are decided, then, not to comply with my request—a request made according to common usage and common sense?”

He briefly gave me to understand that on that point my judgment was sound. Yes: his decision 
was irreversible.

It is not seldom the case that when a man is browbeaten in some unprecedented and violently 
unreasonable way, he begins to stagger in his own plainest faith. He begins, as it were, vaguely 
to surmise that, wonderful as it may be, all the justice and all the reason is on the other side. Ac-
cordingly, if any disinterested persons are present, he turns to them for some reinforcement for 
his own faltering mind.

“Turkey,” said I, “what do you think of this? Am I not right?”
“With submission, sir,” said Turkey, with his blandest tone, “I think that you are.”

“Nippers,” said I, “what do you think of it?”

“I think I should kick him out of the office.”

(The reader of nice perceptions will here perceive that, it being morning, Turkey's answer is couched in polite and tranquil terms, but Nippers replies in ill-tempered ones. Or, to repeat a previous sentence, Nippers’s ugly mood was on duty, and Turkey’s off.)

“Ginger Nut,” said I, willing to enlist the smallest suffrage in my behalf, “what do you think of it?”

“I think, sir, he's a little luny,” replied Ginger Nut, with a grin.

“You hear what they say,” said I, turning towards the screen, “come forth and do your duty.”

But he vouchsafed no reply. I pondered a moment in sore perplexity. But once more business hurried me. I determined again to postpone the consideration of this dilemma to my future leisure. With a little trouble we made out to examine the papers without Bartleby, though at every page or two, Turkey deferentially dropped his opinion that this proceeding was quite out of the common; while Nippers, twitching in his chair with a dyspeptic nervousness, ground out between his set teeth occasional hissing maledictions against the stubborn oaf behind the screen. And for his (Nippers's) part, this was the first and the last time he would do another man's business without pay.

Meanwhile Bartleby sat in his hermitage, oblivious to every thing but his own peculiar business there.

Some days passed, the scrivener being employed upon another lengthy work. His late remarkable conduct led me to regard his ways narrowly. I observed that he never went to dinner; indeed that he never went any where. As yet I had never of my personal knowledge known him to be outside of my office. He was a perpetual sentry in the corner. At about eleven o'clock though, in the morning, I noticed that Ginger Nut would advance toward the opening in Bartleby's screen, as if silently beckoned thither by a gesture invisible to me where I sat. The boy would then leave the office jingling a few pence, and reappear with a handful of ginger-nuts which he delivered in the hermitage, receiving two of the cakes for his trouble.

He lives, then, on ginger-nuts, thought I; never eats a dinner, properly speaking; he must be a vegetarian then; but no; he never eats even vegetables, he eats nothing but ginger-nuts. My mind then ran on in reveries concerning the probable effects upon the human constitution of living entirely on ginger-nuts. Ginger-nuts are so called because they contain ginger as one of their peculiar constituents, and the final flavoring one. Now what was ginger? A hot, spicy thing. Was Bartleby hot and spicy? Not at all. Ginger, then, had no effect upon Bartleby. Probably he preferred it should have none.
Nothing so aggravates an earnest person as a passive resistance. If the individual so resisted be of a not inhumane temper, and the resisting one perfectly harmless in his passivity; then, in the better moods of the former, he will endeavor charitably to construe to his imagination what proves impossible to be solved by his judgment. Even so, for the most part, I regarded Bartleby and his ways. Poor fellow! thought I, he means no mischief; it is plain he intends no insolence; his aspect sufficiently evinces that his eccentricities are involuntary. He is useful to me. I can get along with him. If I turn him away, the chances are he will fall in with some less indulgent employer, and then he will be rudely treated, and perhaps driven forth miserably to starve. Yes. Here I can cheaply purchase a delicious self-approval. To befriend Bartleby; to humor him in his strange willfulness, will cost me little or nothing, while I lay up in my soul what will eventually prove a sweet morsel for my conscience. But this mood was not invariable with me. The passiveness of Bartleby sometimes irritated me. I felt strangely goaded on to encounter him in new opposition, to elicit some angry spark from him answerable to my own. But indeed I might as well have essayed to strike fire with my knuckles against a bit of Windsor soap. But one afternoon the evil impulse in me mastered me, and the following little scene ensued:

“Bartleby,” said I, “when those papers are all copied, I will compare them with you.”

“I would prefer not to.”

“How? Surely you do not mean to persist in that mulish vagary?”

No answer.

I threw open the folding-doors near by, and turning upon Turkey and Nippers, exclaimed in an excited manner—

“He says, a second time, he won't examine his papers. What do you think of it, Turkey?”

It was afternoon, be it remembered. Turkey sat glowing like a brass boiler, his bald head steaming, his hands reeling among his blotted papers.

“Think of it?” roared Turkey; “I think I'll just step behind his screen, and black his eyes for him!”

So saying, Turkey rose to his feet and threw his arms into a pugilistic position. He was hurrying away to make good his promise, when I detained him, alarmed at the effect of incautiously rousing Turkey’s combativeness after dinner.

“Sit down, Turkey,” said I, “and hear what Nippers has to say. What do you think of it, Nippers? Would I not be justified in immediately dismissing Bartleby?”

“Excuse me, that is for you to decide, sir. I think his conduct quite unusual, and indeed unjust, as regards Turkey and myself. But it may only be a passing whim.”
“Ah,” exclaimed I, “you have strangely changed your mind then—you speak very gently of him now.”

“All beer,” cried Turkey; “gentleness is effects of beer—Nippers and I dined together to-day. You see how gentle I am, sir. Shall I go and black his eyes?”

“You refer to Bartleby, I suppose. No, not to-day, Turkey,” I replied; “pray, put up your fists.”

I closed the doors, and again advanced towards Bartleby. I felt additional incentives tempting me to my fate. I burned to be rebelled against again. I remembered that Bartleby never left the office.

“Bartleby,” said I, “Ginger Nut is away; just step round to the Post Office, won't you? (it was but a three minutes walk,) and see if there is any thing for me.”

“I would prefer not to.”

“You will not?”

“I prefer not.”

I staggered to my desk, and sat there in a deep study. My blind inveteracy returned. Was there any other thing in which I could procure myself to be ignominiously repulsed by this lean, penniless wight?—my hired clerk? What added thing is there, perfectly reasonable, that he will be sure to refuse to do?

“Bartleby!”

No answer.

“Bartleby,” in a louder tone.

No answer.

“Bartleby,” I roared.

Like a very ghost, agreeably to the laws of magical invocation, at the third summons, he appeared at the entrance of his hermitage.

“Go to the next room, and tell Nippers to come to me.”

“I prefer not to,” he respectfully and slowly said, and mildly disappeared.

“Very good, Bartleby,” said I, in a quiet sort of serenely severe self-possessed tone, intimating the unalterable purpose of some terrible retribution very close at hand. At the moment I half intended something of the kind. But upon the whole, as it was drawing towards my dinner-hour, I
thought it best to put on my hat and walk home for the day, suffering much from perplexity and distress of mind.

Shall I acknowledge it? The conclusion of this whole business was, that it soon became a fixed fact of my chambers, that a pale young scrivener, by the name of Bartleby, had a desk there; that he copied for me at the usual rate of four cents a folio (one hundred words); but he was permanently exempt from examining the work done by him, that duty being transferred to Turkey and Nippers, one of compliment doubtless to their superior acuteness; moreover, said Bartleby was never on any account to be dispatched on the most trivial errand of any sort; and that even if entreated to take upon him such a matter, it was generally understood that he would prefer not to—in other words, that he would refuse point-blank.

As days passed on, I became considerably reconciled to Bartleby. His steadiness, his freedom from all dissipation, his incessant industry (except when he chose to throw himself into a standing revery behind his screen), his great stillness, his unalterableness of demeanor under all circumstances, made him a valuable acquisition. One prime thing was this,—he was always there;—first in the morning, continually through the day, and the last at night. I had a singular confidence in his honesty. I felt my most precious papers perfectly safe in his hands. Sometimes to be sure I could not, for the very soul of me, avoid falling into sudden spasmodic passions with him. For it was exceeding difficult to bear in mind all the time those strange peculiarities, privileges, and unheard of exemptions, forming the tacit stipulations on Bartleby’s part under which he remained in my office. Now and then, in the eagerness of dispatching pressing business, I would inadvertently summon Bartleby, in a short, rapid tone, to put his finger, say, on the incipient tie of a bit of red tape with which I was about compressing some papers. Of course, from behind the screen the usual answer, “I prefer not to,” was sure to come; and then, how could a human creature with the common infirmities of our nature, refrain from bitterly exclaiming upon such perverseness—such unreasonableness. However, every added repulse of this sort which I received only tended to lessen the probability of my repeating the inadvertence.

Here it must be said, that according to the custom of most legal gentlemen occupying chambers in densely-populated law buildings, there were several keys to my door. One was kept by a woman residing in the attic, which person weekly scrubbed and daily swept and dusted my apartments. Another was kept by Turkey for convenience sake. The third I sometimes carried in my own pocket. The fourth I knew not who had.

Now, one Sunday morning I happened to go to Trinity Church, to hear a celebrated preacher, and finding myself rather early on the ground, I thought I would walk round to my chambers for a while. Luckily I had my key with me; but upon applying it to the lock, I found it resisted by something inserted from the inside. Quite surprised, I called out; when to my consternation a key was turned from within; and thrusting his lean visage at me, and holding the door ajar, the apparition of Bartleby appeared, in his shirt sleeves, and otherwise in a strangely tattered dishabille, saying quietly that he was sorry, but he was deeply engaged just then, and—preferred not admitting me at present. In a brief word or two, he moreover added, that perhaps I had better walk round the block two or three times, and by that time he would probably have concluded his affairs.
Now, the utterly unsurmised appearance of Bartleby, tenanting my law-chambers of a Sunday morning, with his cadaverously gentlemanly nonchalance, yet withal firm and self-possessed, had such a strange effect upon me, that incontinently I slunk away from my own door, and did as desired. But not without sundry twinges of impotent rebellion against the mild effrontery of this unaccountable scrivener. Indeed, it was his wonderful mildness chiefly, which not only disarmed me, but unmanned me, as it were. For I consider that one, for the time, is a sort of unmanned when he tranquilly permits his hired clerk to dictate to him, and order him away from his own premises. Furthermore, I was full of uneasiness as to what Bartleby could possibly be doing in my office in his shirt sleeves, and in an otherwise dismantled condition of a Sunday morning. Was any thing amiss going on? Nay, that was out of the question. It was not to be thought of for a moment that Bartleby was an immoral person. But what could he be doing there?—copying? Nay again, whatever might be his eccentricities, Bartleby was an eminently decorous person. He would be the last man to sit down to his desk in any state approaching to nudity. Besides, it was Sunday; and there was something about Bartleby that forbade the supposition that we would by any secular occupation violate the proprieties of the day.

Nevertheless, my mind was not pacified; and full of a restless curiosity, at last I returned to the door. Without hindrance I inserted my key, opened it, and entered. Bartleby was not to be seen. I looked round anxiously, peeped behind his screen; but it was very plain that he was gone. Upon more closely examining the place, I surmised that for an indefinite period Bartleby must have ate, dressed, and slept in my office, and that too without plate, mirror, or bed. The cushioned seat of a ricketty old sofa in one corner bore the faint impress of a lean, reclining form. Rolled away under his desk, I found a blanket; under the empty grate, a blacking box and brush; on a chair, a tin basin, with soap and a ragged towel; in a newspaper a few crumbs of ginger-nuts and a morsel of cheese. Yet, thought I, it is evident enough that Bartleby has been making his home here, keeping bachelor's hall all by himself. Immediately then the thought came sweeping across me, What miserable friendlessness and loneliness are here revealed! His poverty is great; but his solitude, how horrible! Think of it. Of a Sunday, Wall-street is deserted as Petra; and every night of every day it is an emptiness. This building too, which of week-days hums with industry and life, at nightfall echoes with sheer vacancy, and all through Sunday is forlorn. And here Bartleby makes his home; sole spectator of a solitude which he has seen all populous—a sort of innocent and transformed Marius brooding among the ruins of Carthage!

For the first time in my life a feeling of overpowering stinging melancholy seized me. Before, I had never experienced aught but a not-unpleasing sadness. The bond of a common humanity now drew me irresistibly to gloom. A fraternal melancholy! For both I and Bartleby were sons of Adam. I remembered the bright silks and sparkling faces I had seen that day, in gala trim, swan-like sailing down the Mississippi of Broadway; and I contrasted their with the pallid copyist, and thought to myself, Ah, happiness courts the light, so we deem the world is gay; but misery hides aloof, so we deem that misery there is none. These sad fancyings—chimeras, doubtless, of a sick and silly brain—led on to other and more special thoughts, concerning the eccentricities of Bartleby. Presentiments of strange discoveries hovered round me. The scrivener's pale form appeared to me laid out, among uncaring strangers, in its shivering winding sheet.

Suddenly I was attracted by Bartleby's closed desk, the key in open sight left in the lock.
I mean no mischief, seek the gratification of no heartless curiosity, thought I; besides, the desk is mine, and its contents too, so I will make bold to look within. Every thing was methodically arranged, the papers smoothly placed. The pigeon holes were deep, and removing the files of documents, I groped into their recesses. Presently I felt something there, and dragged it out. It was an old bandanna handkerchief, heavy and knotted. I opened it, and saw it was a savings’ bank.

I now recalled all the quiet mysteries which I had noted in the man. I remembered that he never spoke but to answer; that though at intervals he had considerable time to himself, yet I had never seen him reading—no, not even a newspaper; that for long periods he would stand looking out, at his pale window behind the screen, upon the dead brick wall; I was quite sure he never visited any refectory or eating house; while his pale face clearly indicated that he never drank beer like Turkey, or tea and coffee even, like other men; that he never went any where in particular that I could learn; never went out for a walk, unless indeed that was the case at present; that he had declined telling who he was, or whence he came, or whether he had any relatives in the world; that though so thin and pale, he never complained of ill health. And more than all, I remembered a certain unconscious air of pallid—how shall I call it?—of pallid haughtiness, say, or rather an austere reserve about him, which had positively awed me into my tame compliance with his eccentricities, when I had feared to ask him to do the slightest incidental thing for me, even though I might know, from his long-continued motionlessness, that behind his screen he must be standing in one of those dead-wall reveries of his.

Revolving all these things, and coupling them with the recently discovered fact that he made my office his constant abiding place and home, and not forgetful of his morbid moodiness; revolving all these things, a prudential feeling began to steal over me. My first emotions had been those of pure melancholy and sincerest pity; but just in proportion as the forlornness of Bartleby grew and grew to my imagination, did that same melancholy merge into fear, that pity into repulsion. So true it is, and so terrible too, that up to a certain point the thought or sight of misery enlists our best affections; but, in certain special cases, beyond that point it does not. They err who would assert that invariably this is owing to the inherent selfishness of the human heart. It rather proceeds from a certain hopelessness of remedying excessive and organic ill. To a sensitive being, pity is not seldom pain. And when at last it is perceived that such pity cannot lead to effectual succor, common sense bids the soul be rid of it. What I saw that morning persuaded me that the scrivener was the victim of innate and incurable disorder. I might give alms to his body; but his body did not pain him; it was his soul that suffered, and his soul I could not reach.

I did not accomplish the purpose of going to Trinity Church that morning. Somehow, the things I had seen disqualified me for the time from church-going. I walked homeward, thinking what I would do with Bartleby. Finally, I resolved upon this;—I would put certain calm questions to him the next morning, touching his history, &c., and if he declined to answer then openly and reservedly (and I supposed he would prefer not), then to give him a twenty dollar bill over and above whatever I might owe him, and tell him his services were no longer required; but that if in any other way I could assist him, I would be happy to do so, especially if he desired to return to his native place, wherever that might be, I would willingly help to defray the expenses. Moreover, if, after reaching home, he found himself at any time in want of aid, a letter from him would be sure of a reply.
The next morning came.

“Bartleby,” said I, gently calling to him behind his screen.

No reply.

“Bartleby,” said I, in a still gentler tone, “come here; I am not going to ask you to do any thing you would prefer not to do—I simply wish to speak to you.”

Upon this he noiselessly slid into view.

“Will you tell me, Bartleby, where you were born?”

“I would prefer not to.”

“Will you tell me any thing about yourself?”

“I would prefer not to.”

“But what reasonable objection can you have to speak to me? I feel friendly towards you.”

He did not look at me while I spoke, but kept his glance fixed upon my bust of Cicero, which as I then sat, was directly behind me, some six inches above my head.

“What is your answer, Bartleby?” said I, after waiting a considerable time for a reply, during which his countenance remained immovable, only there was the faintest conceivable tremor of the white attenuated mouth.

“At present I prefer to give no answer,” he said, and retired into his hermitage.

It was rather weak in me I confess, but his manner on this occasion netted me. Not only did there seem to lurk in it a certain disdain, but his perverseness seemed ungrateful, considering the undeniable good usage and indulgence he had received from me.

Again I sat ruminating what I should do. Mortified as I was at his behavior, and resolved as I had been to dismiss him when I entered my office, nevertheless I strangely felt something superstitious knocking at my heart, and forbidding me to carry out my purpose, and denouncing me for a villain if I dared to breathe one bitter word against this forlornest of mankind. At last, familiarly drawing my chair behind his screen, I sat down and said: “Bartleby, never mind then about revealing your history; but let me entreat you, as a friend, to comply as far as may be with the usages of this office. Say now you will help to examine papers to-morrow or next day: in short, say now that in a day or two you will begin to be a little reasonable:—say so, Bartleby.”

“At present I would prefer not to be a little reasonable,” was his mildly cadaverous reply.
Just then the folding-doors opened, and Nippers approached. He seemed suffering from an unusually bad night's rest, induced by severer indigestion than common. He overheard those final words of Bartleby.

“Prefer not, eh?” gritted Nippers—“I’d prefer him, if I were you, sir,” addressing me—“I’d prefer him; I’d give him preferences, the stubborn mule! What is it, sir, pray, that he prefers not to do now?”

Bartleby moved not a limb.

“Mr. Nippers,” said I, “I’d prefer that you would withdraw for the present.”

Somehow, of late I had got into the way of involuntarily using this word “prefer” upon all sorts of not exactly suitable occasions. And I trembled to think that my contact with the scrivener had already and seriously affected me in a mental way. And what further and deeper aberration might it not yet produce? This apprehension had not been without efficacy in determining me to summary means.

As Nippers, looking very sour and sulky, was departing, Turkey blandly and deferentially approached.

“With submission, sir,” said he, “yesterday I was thinking about Bartleby here, and I think that if he would but prefer to take a quart of good ale every day, it would do much towards mending him, and enabling him to assist in examining his papers.”

“So you have got the word too,” said I, slightly excited.

“With submission, what word, sir,” asked Turkey, respectfully crowding himself into the contracted space behind the screen, and by so doing, making me jostle the scrivener. “What word, sir?”

“I would prefer to be left alone here,” said Bartleby, as if offended at being mobbed in his privacy.

“That’s the word, Turkey,” said I—“that’s it.”

“Oh, prefer? oh yes—queer word. I never use it myself. But, sir, as I was saying, if he would but prefer—“

“Turkey,” interrupted I, “you will please withdraw.”

“Oh, certainly, sir, if you prefer that I should.”

As he opened the folding-door to retire, Nippers at his desk caught a glimpse of me, and asked whether I would prefer to have a certain paper copied on blue paper or white. He did not in the least roguishly accent the word prefer. It was plain that it involuntarily rolled from his tongue. I
thought to myself, surely I must get rid of a demented man, who already has in some degree
turned the tongues, if not the heads of myself and clerks. But I thought it prudent not to break the
dismission at once.

The next day I noticed that Bartleby did nothing but stand at his window in his dead-wall revery.
Upon asking him why he did not write, he said that he had decided upon doing no more writing.

“Why, how now? what next?” exclaimed I, “do no more writing?”

“No more.”

“And what is the reason?”

“Do you not see the reason for yourself,” he indifferently replied.

I looked steadfastly at him, and perceived that his eyes looked dull and glazed. Instantly it oc-
curred to me, that his unexampled diligence in copying by his dim window for the first few
weeks of his stay with me might have temporarily impaired his vision.

I was touched. I said something in condolence with him. I hinted that of course he did wisely in
abstaining from writing for a while; and urged him to embrace that opportunity of taking whole-
some exercise in the open air. This, however, he did not do. A few days after this, my other
clers being absent, and being in a great hurry to dispatch certain letters by the mail, I thought
that, having nothing else earthly to do, Bartleby would surely be less inflexible than usual, and
carry these letters to the post-office. But he blankly declined. So, much to my inconvenience, I
went myself.

Still added days went by. Whether Bartleby’s eyes improved or not, I could not say. To all ap-
pearance, I thought they did. But when I asked him if they did, he vouchsafed no answer. At all
events, he would do no copying. At last, in reply to my urgings, he informed me that he had
permanently given up copying.

“What!” exclaimed I; “suppose your eyes should get entirely well—better than ever before—
would you not copy then?”

“I have given up copying,” he answered, and slid aside.

He remained as ever, a fixture in my chamber. Nay—if that were possible—he became still more
of a fixture than before. What was to be done? He would do nothing in the office: why should he
stay there? In plain fact, he had now become a millstone to me, not only useless as a necklace,
but afflictive to bear. Yet I was sorry for him. I speak less than truth when I say that, on his own
account, he occasioned me uneasiness. If he would but have named a single relative or friend, I
would instantly have written, and urged their taking the poor fellow away to some convenient
retreat. But he seemed alone, absolutely alone in the universe. A bit of wreck in the mid Atlantic.
At length, necessities connected with my business tyrannized over all other considerations. De-
cently as I could, I told Bartleby that in six days’ time he must unconditionally leave the office. I
warned him to take measures, in the interval, for procuring some other abode. I offered to assist him in this endeavor, if he himself would but take the first step towards a removal. “And when you finally quit me, Bartleby,” added I, “I shall see that you go not away entirely unprovided. Six days from this hour, remember.”

At the expiration of that period, I peeped behind the screen, and lo! Bartleby was there. I buttoned up my coat, balanced myself; advanced slowly towards him, touched his shoulder, and said, “The time has come; you must quit this place; I am sorry for you; here is money; but you must go.”

“I would prefer not,” he replied, with his back still towards me.

“You must.”

He remained silent.

Now I had an unbounded confidence in this man’s common honesty. He had frequently restored to me sixpences and shillings carelessly dropped upon the floor, for I am apt to be very reckless in such shirt-button affairs. The proceeding then which followed will not be deemed extraordinary.

“Bartleby,” said I, “I owe you twelve dollars on account; here are thirty-two; the odd twenty are yours.—Will you take it?” and I handed the bills towards him.

But he made no motion.

“I will leave them here then,” putting them under a weight on the table. Then taking my hat and cane and going to the door I tranquilly turned and added—“After you have removed your things from these offices, Bartleby, you will of course lock the door—since every one is now gone for the day but you—and if you please, slip your key underneath the mat, so that I may have it in the morning. I shall not see you again; so good-bye to you. If hereafter in your new place of abode I can be of any service to you, do not fail to advise me by letter. Good-bye, Bartleby, and fare you well.”

But he answered not a word; like the last column of some ruined temple, he remained standing mute and solitary in the middle of the otherwise deserted room.

As I walked home in a pensive mood, my vanity got the better of my pity. I could not but highly plume myself on my masterly management in getting rid of Bartleby. Masterly I call it, and such it must appear to any dispassionate thinker. The beauty of my procedure seemed to consist in its perfect quietness. There was no vulgar bullying, no bravado of any sort, no choleric hectoring, and striding to and fro across the apartment, jerking out vehement commands for Bartleby to bundle himself off with his beggarly traps. Nothing of the kind. Without loudly bidding Bartleby depart—as an inferior genius might have done—I assumed the ground that depart he must; and upon the assumption built all I had to say. The more I thought over my procedure, the more I was charmed with it. Nevertheless, next morning, upon awakening, I had my doubts,—I had some-
how slept off the fumes of vanity. One of the coolest and wisest hours a man has, is just after he awakes in the morning. My procedure seemed as sagacious as ever,—but only in theory. How it would prove in practice—there was the rub. It was truly a beautiful thought to have assumed Bartleby's departure; but, after all, that assumption was simply my own, and none of Bartleby's. The great point was, not whether I had assumed that he would quit me, but whether he would prefer so to do. He was more a man of preferences than assumptions.

After breakfast, I walked down town, arguing the probabilities pro and con. One moment I thought it would prove a miserable failure, and Bartleby would be found all alive at my office as usual; the next moment it seemed certain that I should see his chair empty. And so I kept veering about. At the corner of Broadway and Canal-street, I saw quite an excited group of people standing in earnest conversation.

"I'll take odds he doesn't," said a voice as I passed.

"Doesn't go?—done!" said I, "put up your money."

I was instinctively putting my hand in my pocket to produce my own, when I remembered that this was an election day. The words I had overheard bore no reference to Bartleby, but to the success or non-success of some candidate for the mayoralty. In my intent frame of mind, I had, as it were, imagined that all Broadway shared in my excitement, and were debating the same question with me. I passed on, very thankful that the uproar of the street screened my momentary absent-mindedness.

As I had intended, I was earlier than usual at my office door. I stood listening for a moment. All was still. He must be gone. I tried the knob. The door was locked. Yes, my procedure had worked to a charm; he indeed must be vanished. Yet a certain melancholy mixed with this: I was almost sorry for my brilliant success. I was fumbling under the door mat for the key, which Bartleby was to have left there for me, when accidentally my knee knocked against a panel, producing a summoning sound, and in response a voice came to me from within—"Not yet; I am occupied."

It was Bartleby.

I was thunderstruck. For an instant I stood like the man who, pipe in mouth, was killed one cloudless afternoon long ago in Virginia, by summer lightning; at his own warm open window he was killed, and remained leaning out there upon the dreamy afternoon, till some one touched him, when he fell.

"Not gone!" I murmured at last. But again obeying that wondrous ascendancy which the inscrutable scrivener had over me, and from which ascendancy, for all my chafing, I could not completely escape, I slowly went down stairs and out into the street, and while walking round the block, considered what I should next do in this unheard-of perplexity. Turn the man out by an actual thrusting I could not; to drive him away by calling him hard names would not do; calling in the police was an unpleasant idea; and yet, permit him to enjoy his cadaverous triumph over me,—this too I could not think of. What was to be done? or, if nothing could be done, was there
any thing further that I could assume in the matter? Yes, as before I had prospectively assumed that Bartleby would depart, so now I might retrospectively assume that departed he was. In the legitimate carrying out of this assumption, I might enter my office in a great hurry, and pretending not to see Bartleby at all, walk straight against him as if he were air. Such a proceeding would in a singular degree have the appearance of a home-thrust. It was hardly possible that Bartleby could withstand such an application of the doctrine of assumptions. But upon second thoughts the success of the plan seemed rather dubious. I resolved to argue the matter over with him again.

“Bartleby,” said I, entering the office, with a quietly severe expression, “I am seriously displeased. I am pained, Bartleby. I had thought better of you. I had imagined you of such a gentlemanly organization, that in any delicate dilemma a slight hint would suffice—in short, an assumption. But it appears I am deceived. Why,” I added, unaffectedly starting, “you have not even touched the money yet,” pointing to it, just where I had left it the evening previous.

He answered nothing.

“Will you, or will you not, quit me?” I now demanded in a sudden passion, advancing close to him.

“I would prefer not to quit you,” he replied, gently emphasizing the not.

“What earthly right have you to stay here? Do you pay any rent? Do you pay my taxes? Or is this property yours?”

He answered nothing.

“Are you ready to go on and write now? Are your eyes recovered? Could you copy a small paper for me this morning? or help examine a few lines? or step round to the post-office? In a word, will you do any thing at all, to give a coloring to your refusal to depart the premises?”

He silently retired into his hermitage.

I was now in such a state of nervous resentment that I thought it but prudent to check myself at present from further demonstrations. Bartleby and I were alone. I remembered the tragedy of the unfortunate Adams and the still more unfortunate Colt in the solitary office of the latter; and how poor Colt, being dreadfully incensed by Adams, and imprudently permitting himself to get wildly excited, was at unawares hurried into his fatal act—an act which certainly no man could possibly deplore more than the actor himself. Often it had occurred to me in my ponderings upon the subject, that had that altercation taken place in the public street, or at a private residence, it would not have terminated as it did. It was the circumstance of being alone in a solitary office, up stairs, of a building entirely unhallowed by humanizing domestic associations—an uncarpeted office, doubtless, of a dusty, haggard sort of appearance;—this it must have been, which greatly helped to enhance the irritable desperation of the hapless Colt.
But when this old Adam of resentment rose in me and tempted me concerning Bartleby, I grappled him and threw him. How? Why, simply by recalling the divine injunction: “A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another.” Yes, this it was that saved me. Aside from higher considerations, charity often operates as a vastly wise and prudent principle—a great safeguard to its possessor. Men have committed murder for jealousy’s sake, and anger’s sake, and hatred’s sake, and selfishness’ sake, and spiritual pride’s sake; but no man that ever I heard of, ever committed a diabolical murder for sweet charity’s sake. Mere self-interest, then, if no better motive can be enlisted, should, especially with high-tempered men, prompt all beings to charity and philanthropy. At any rate, upon the occasion in question, I strove to drown my exasperated feelings towards the scrivener by benevolently construing his conduct. Poor fellow, poor fellow! thought I, he don't mean any thing; and besides, he has seen hard times, and ought to be indulged.

I endeavored also immediately to occupy myself, and at the same time to comfort my despondency. I tried to fancy that in the course of the morning, at such time as might prove agreeable to him, Bartleby, of his own free accord, would emerge from his hermitage, and take up some decided line of march in the direction of the door. But no. Half-past twelve o’clock came; Turkey began to glow in the face, overturn his inkstand, and become generally obstreperous; Nippers abated down into quietude and courtesy; Ginger Nut munched his noon apple; and Bartleby remained standing at his window in one of his profoundest dead-wall reveries. Will it be credited? Ought I to acknowledge it? That afternoon I left the office without saying one further word to him.

Some days now passed, during which, at leisure intervals I looked a little into “Edwards on the Will,” and “Priestley on Necessity.” Under the circumstances, those books induced a salutary feeling. Gradually I slid into the persuasion that these troubles of mine touching the scrivener, had been all predestinated from eternity, and Bartleby was billeted upon me for some mysterious purpose of an all-wise Providence, which it was not for a mere mortal like me to fathom. Yes, Bartleby, stay there behind your screen, thought I; I shall persecute you no more; you are harmless and noiseless as any of these old chairs; in short, I never feel so private as when I know you are here. At least I see it, I feel it; I penetrate to the predestinated purpose of my life. I am content. Others may have loftier parts to enact; but my mission in this world, Bartleby, is to furnish you with office-room for such period as you may see fit to remain.

I believe that this wise and blessed frame of mind would have continued with me, had it not been for the unsolicited and uncharitable remarks obtruded upon me by my professional friends who visited the rooms. But thus it often is, that the constant friction of illiberal minds wears out at last the best resolves of the more generous. Though to be sure, when I reflected upon it, it was not strange that people entering my office should be struck by the peculiar aspect of the unaccountable Bartleby, and so be tempted to throw out some sinister observations concerning him. Sometimes an attorney having business with me, and calling at my office, and finding no one but the scrivener there, would undertake to obtain some sort of precise information from him touching my whereabouts; but without heeding his idle talk, Bartleby would remain standing immovable in the middle of the room. So after contemplating him in that position for a time, the attorney would depart, no wiser than he came.
Also, when a Reference was going on, and the room full of lawyers and witnesses and business was driving fast; some deeply occupied legal gentleman present, seeing Bartleby wholly unemployed, would request him to run round to his (the legal gentleman’s) office and fetch some papers for him. Thereupon, Bartleby would tranquilly decline, and yet remain idle as before. Then the lawyer would give a great stare, and turn to me. And what could I say? At last I was made aware that all through the circle of my professional acquaintance, a whisper of wonder was running round, having reference to the strange creature I kept at my office. This worried me very much. And as the idea came upon me of his possibly turning out a long-lived man, and keep occupying my chambers, and denying my authority; and perplexing my visitors; and scandalizing my professional reputation; and casting a general gloom over the premises; keeping soul and body together to the last upon his savings (for doubtless he spent but half a dime a day), and in the end perhaps outlive me, and claim possession of my office by right of his perpetual occupancy: as all these dark anticipations crowded upon me more and more, and my friends continually intruded their relentless remarks upon the apparition in my room; a great change was wrought in me. I resolved to gather all my faculties together, and for ever rid me of this intolerable incubus. Ere revolving any complicated project, however, adapted to this end, I first simply suggested to Bartleby the propriety of his permanent departure. In a calm and serious tone, I commended the idea to his careful and mature consideration. But having taken three days to meditate upon it, he apprised me that his original determination remained the same; in short, that he still preferred to abide with me.

What shall I do? I now said to myself, buttoning up my coat to the last button. What shall I do? what ought I to do? what does conscience say I should do with this man, or rather ghost. Rid myself of him, I must; go, he shall. But how? You will not thrust him, the poor, pale, passive mortal,—you will not thrust such a helpless creature out of your door? you will not dishonor yourself by such cruelty? No, I will not, I cannot do that. Rather would I let him live and die here, and then mason up his remains in the wall. What then will you do? For all your coaxing, he will not budge. Bribes he leaves under your own paperweight on your table; in short, it is quite plain that he prefers to cling to you.

Then something severe, something unusual must be done. What! surely you will not have him collared by a constable, and commit his innocent pallor to the common jail? And upon what ground could you procure such a thing to be done?—a vagrant, is he? What! he a vagrant, a wanderer, who refuses to budge? It is because he will not be a vagrant, then, that you seek to count him as a vagrant. That is too absurd. No visible means of support: there I have him. Wrong again: for indubitably he does support himself, and that is the only unanswerable proof that any man can show of his possessing the means so to do. No more then. Since he will not quit me, I must quit him. I will change my offices; I will move elsewhere; and give him fair notice, that if I find him on my new premises I will then proceed against him as a common trespasser. Acting accordingly, next day I thus addressed him: “I find these chambers too far from the City Hall; the air is unwholesome. In a word, I propose to remove my offices next week, and shall no longer require your services. I tell you this now, in order that you may seek another place.” He made no reply, and nothing more was said.
On the appointed day I engaged carts and men, proceeded to my chambers, and having but little furniture, every thing was removed in a few hours. Throughout, the scrivener remained standing behind the screen, which I directed to be removed the last thing. It was withdrawn; and being folded up like a huge folio, left him the motionless occupant of a naked room. I stood in the entry watching him a moment, while something from within me upbraided me.

I re-entered, with my hand in my pocket—and—and my heart in my mouth.

“Good-bye, Bartleby; I am going—good-bye, and God some way bless you; and take that,” slipping something in his hand. But it dropped upon the floor, and then,—strange to say—I tore myself from him whom I had so longed to be rid of.

Established in my new quarters, for a day or two I kept the door locked, and started at every foot-fall in the passages. When I returned to my rooms after any little absence, I would pause at the threshold for an instant, and attentively listen, ere applying my key. But these fears were needless. Bartleby never came nigh me.

I thought all was going well, when a perturbed looking stranger visited me, inquiring whether I was the person who had recently occupied rooms at No. — Wall-street.

Full of forebodings, I replied that I was.

“Then sir,” said the stranger, who proved a lawyer, “you are responsible for the man you left there. He refuses to do any copying; he refuses to do any thing; he says he prefers not to; and he refuses to quit the premises.”

“I am very sorry, sir,” said I, with assumed tranquillity, but an inward tremor, “but, really, the man you allude to is nothing to me—he is no relation or apprentice of mine, that you should hold me responsible for him.”

“In mercy’s name, who is he?”

“I certainly cannot inform you. I know nothing about him. Formerly I employed him as a copyist; but he has done nothing for me now for some time past.”

“I shall settle him then,—good morning, sir.”

Several days passed, and I heard nothing more; and though I often felt a charitable prompting to call at the place and see poor Bartleby, yet a certain squeamishness of I know not what withheld me.

All is over with him, by this time, thought I at last, when through another week no further intelligence reached me. But coming to my room the day after, I found several persons waiting at my door in a high state of nervous excitement.
“That’s the man—here he comes,” cried the foremost one, whom I recognized as the lawyer who had previously called upon me alone.

“You must take him away, sir, at once,” cried a portly person among them, advancing upon me, and whom I knew to be the landlord of No. — Wall-street. “These gentlemen, my tenants, cannot stand it any longer; Mr. B——” pointing to the lawyer, “has turned him out of his room, and he now persists in haunting the building generally, sitting upon the banisters of the stairs by day, and sleeping in the entry by night. Every body is concerned; clients are leaving the offices; some fears are entertained of a mob; something you must do, and that without delay.”

Aghast at this torrent, I fell back before it, and would fain have locked myself in my new quarters. In vain I persisted that Bartleby was nothing to me—no more than to any one else. In vain:—I was the last person known to have any thing to do with him, and they held me to the terrible account. Fearful then of being exposed in the papers (as one person present obscurely threatened) I considered the matter, and at length said, that if the lawyer would give me a confidential interview with the scrivener, in his (the lawyer’s) own room, I would that afternoon strive my best to rid them of the nuisance they complained of.

Going up stairs to my old haunt, there was Bartleby silently sitting upon the banister at the landing.

“What are you doing here, Bartleby?” said I.

“Sitting upon the banister,” he mildly replied.

I motioned him into the lawyer’s room, who then left us.

“Bartleby,” said I, “are you aware that you are the cause of great tribulation to me, by persisting in occupying the entry after being dismissed from the office?”

No answer.

“No; I would prefer not to make any change.”

“Would you like a clerkship in a dry-goods store?”

“There is too much confinement about that. No, I would not like a clerkship; but I am not particular.”

“Too much confinement,” I cried, “why you keep yourself confined all the time!”

“I would prefer not to take a clerkship,” he rejoined, as if to settle that little item at once.
“How would a bar-tender’s business suit you? There is no trying of the eyesight in that.”

“I would not like it at all; though, as I said before, I am not particular.”

His unwonted wordiness inspired me. I returned to the charge.

“Well then, would you like to travel through the country collecting bills for the merchants? That would improve your health.”

“No, I would prefer to be doing something else.”

“How then would going as a companion to Europe, to entertain some young gentleman with your conversation,—how would that suit you?”

“Not at all. It does not strike me that there is any thing definite about that. I like to be stationary. But I am not particular.”

“Stationary you shall be then,” I cried, now losing all patience, and for the first time in all my exasperating connection with him fairly flying into a passion. “If you do not go away from these premises before night, I shall feel bound—indeed I am bound—to—to—to quit the premises myself!” I rather absurdly concluded, knowing not with what possible threat to try to frighten his immobility into compliance. Despairing of all further efforts, I was precipitately leaving him, when a final thought occurred to me—one which had not been wholly indulged before.

“Bartleby,” said I, in the kindest tone I could assume under such exciting circumstances, “will you go home with me now—not to my office, but my dwelling—and remain there till we can conclude upon some convenient arrangement for you at our leisure? Come, let us start now, right away.”

“No: at present I would prefer not to make any change at all.”

I answered nothing; but effectually dodging every one by the suddenness and rapidity of my flight, rushed from the building, ran up Wall-street towards Broadway, and jumping into the first omnibus was soon removed from pursuit. As soon as tranquillity returned I distinctly perceived that I had now done all that I possibly could, both in respect to the demands of the landlord and his tenants, and with regard to my own desire and sense of duty, to benefit Bartleby, and shield him from rude persecution. I now strove to be entirely care-free and quiescent; and my conscience justified me in the attempt; though indeed it was not so successful as I could have wished. So fearful was I of being again hunted out by the incensed landlord and his exasperated tenants, that, surrendering my business to Nippers, for a few days I drove about the upper part of the town and through the suburbs, in my rockaway; crossed over to Jersey City and Hoboken, and paid fugitive visits to Manhattanville and Astoria. In fact I almost lived in my rockaway for the time.

When again I entered my office, lo, a note from the landlord lay upon the desk. I opened it with trembling hands. It informed me that the writer had sent to the police, and had Bartleby removed
to the Tombs as a vagrant. Moreover, since I knew more about him than any one else, he wished me to appear at that place, and make a suitable statement of the facts. These tidings had a conflicting effect upon me. At first I was indignant; but at last almost approved. The landlord's energetic, summary disposition had led him to adopt a procedure which I do not think I would have decided upon myself; and yet as a last resort, under such peculiar circumstances, it seemed the only plan.

As I afterwards learned, the poor scrivener, when told that he must be conducted to the Tombs, offered not the slightest obstacle, but in his pale unmoving way, silently acquiesced.

Some of the compassionate and curious bystanders joined the party; and headed by one of the constables arm in arm with Bartleby, the silent procession filed its way through all the noise, and heat, and joy of the roaring thoroughfares at noon.

The same day I received the note I went to the Tombs, or to speak more properly, the Halls of Justice. Seeking the right officer, I stated the purpose of my call, and was informed that the individual I described was indeed within. I then assured the functionary that Bartleby was a perfectly honest man, and greatly to be compassionated, however unaccountably eccentric. I narrated all I knew, and closed by suggesting the idea of letting him remain in as indulgent confinement as possible till something less harsh might be done—though indeed I hardly knew what. At all events, if nothing else could be decided upon, the alms-house must receive him. I then begged to have an interview.

Being under no disgraceful charge, and quite serene and harmless in all his ways, they had permitted him freely to wander about the prison, and especially in the inclosed grass-platted yards thereof. And so I found him there, standing all alone in the quietest of the yards, his face towards a high wall, while all around, from the narrow slits of the jail windows, I thought I saw peering out upon him the eyes of murderers and thieves.

“Bartleby!”

“I know you,” he said, without looking round,—“and I want nothing to say to you.”

“It was not I that brought you here, Bartleby,” said I, keenly pained at his implied suspicion. “And to you, this should not be so vile a place. Nothing reproachful attaches to you by being here. And see, it is not so sad a place as one might think. Look, there is the sky, and here is the grass.”

“I know where I am,” he replied, but would say nothing more, and so I left him.

As I entered the corridor again, a broad meat-like man, in an apron, accosted me, and jerking his thumb over his shoulder said—“Is that your friend?”

“Yes.”

“Does he want to starve? If he does, let him live on the prison fare, that’s all.”
“Who are you?” asked I, not knowing what to make of such an unofficially speaking person in such a place.

“I am the grub-man. Such gentlemen as have friends here, hire me to provide them with something good to eat.”

“Is this so?” said I, turning to the turnkey.

He said it was.

“Well then,” said I, slipping some silver into the grub-man’s hands (for so they called him). “I want you to give particular attention to my friend there; let him have the best dinner you can get. And you must be as polite to him as possible.”

“Introduce me, will you?” said the grub-man, looking at me with an expression which seem to say he was all impatience for an opportunity to give a specimen of his breeding.

Thinking it would prove of benefit to the scrivener, I acquiesced; and asking the grub-man his name, went up with him to Bartleby.

“Bartleby, this is Mr. Cutlets; you will find him very useful to you.”

“Your servant, sir, your servant,” said the grub-man, making a low salutation behind his apron. “Hope you find it pleasant here, sir;—spacious grounds—cool apartments, sir—hope you’ll stay with us some time—try to make it agreeable. May Mrs. Cutlets and I have the pleasure of your company to dinner, sir, in Mrs. Cutlets’ private room?”

“I prefer not to dine to-day,” said Bartleby, turning away. “It would disagree with me; I am unused to dinners.” So saying he slowly moved to the other side of the inclosure, and took up a position fronting the dead-wall.

“How’s this?” said the grub-man, addressing me with a stare of astonishment. “He’s odd, aint he?”

“I think he is a little deranged,” said I, sadly.

“Deranged? deranged is it? Well now, upon my word, I thought that friend of yourn was a gentleman forger; they are always pale and genteel-like, them forgers. I can’t help pity ‘em—can’t help it, sir. Did you know Monroe Edwards?” he added touchingly, and paused. Then, laying his hand pitifully on my shoulder, sighed, “he died of consumption at Sing-Sing. So you weren’t acquainted with Monroe?”

“No, I was never socially acquainted with any forgers. But I cannot stop longer. Look to my friend yonder. You will not lose by it. I will see you again.”
Some few days after this, I again obtained admission to the Tombs, and went through the corridors in quest of Bartleby; but without finding him.

“I saw him coming from his cell not long ago,” said a turnkey, “may be he’s gone to loiter in the yards.”

So I went in that direction.

“Are you looking for the silent man?” said another turnkey passing me. “Yonder he lies—sleeping in the yard there. ‘Tis not twenty minutes since I saw him lie down.”

The yard was entirely quiet. It was not accessible to the common prisoners. The surrounding walls, of amazing thickness, kept off all sounds behind them. The Egyptian character of the masonry weighed upon me with its gloom. But a soft imprisoned turf grew under foot. The heart of the eternal pyramids, it seemed, wherein, by some strange magic, through the clefts, grass-seed, dropped by birds, had sprung.

Strangely huddled at the base of the wall, his knees drawn up, and lying on his side, his head touching the cold stones, I saw the wasted Bartleby. But nothing stirred. I paused; then went close up to him; stooped over, and saw that his dim eyes were open; otherwise he seemed profoundly sleeping. Something prompted me to touch him. I felt his hand, when a tingling shiver ran up my arm and down my spine to my feet.

The round face of the grub-man peered upon me now. “His dinner is ready. Won’t he dine today, either? Or does he live without dining?”

“What?” said I, and closed the eyes.

“Eh!—He’s asleep, aint he?”

“With kings and counsellors,” murmured I.

There would seem little need for proceeding further in this history. Imagination will readily supply the meagre recital of poor Bartleby’s interment. But ere parting with the reader, let me say, that if this little narrative has sufficiently interested him, to awaken curiosity as to who Bartleby was, and what manner of life he led prior to the present narrator's making his acquaintance, I can only reply, that in such curiosity I fully share, but am wholly unable to gratify it. Yet here I hardly know whether I should divulge one little item of rumor, which came to my ear a few months after the scrivener's decease. Upon what basis it rested, I could never ascertain; and hence, how true it is I cannot now tell. But inasmuch as this vague report has not been without a certain strange suggestive interest to me, however sad, it may prove the same with some others; and so I will briefly mention it. The report was this: that Bartleby had been a subordinate clerk in the Dead Letter Office at Washington, from which he had been suddenly removed by a change in the administration. When I think over this rumor, I cannot adequately express the emotions which seize me. Dead letters! does it not sound like dead men? Conceive a man by nature and misfortune prone to a pallid hopelessness, can any business seem more fitted to heighten it than that of
continually handling these dead letters and assorting them for the flames? For by the cart-load they are annually burned. Sometimes from out the folded paper the pale clerk takes a ring:—the finger it was meant for, perhaps, moulders in the grave; a bank-note sent in swiftest charity:—he whom it would relieve, nor eats nor hungers any more; pardon for those who died despairing; hope for those who died unhoping; good tidings for those who died stifled by unrelieved calamities. On errands of life, these letters speed to death.

Ah Bartleby! Ah humanity!

For Students

Questions

○ Is Bartleby displaying a “can’t do” problem or a “won’t do” problem? What leads you to this conclusion? How does the can’t do/won’t do distinction make a difference in the way Bartleby’s boss should approach the situation?

○ Identify a sequence of three or four actions that Bartleby’s manager could have taken with Bartleby, and when he should have taken them.

○ If you were Nippers or Turkey, what would you think of Bartleby? What, if anything, could you have done as you saw the events taking place?

○ Does it matter that the office in “Bartleby” is more than a hundred-fifty years in the past? Could such a situation occur today? Why or why not?

○ What would have happened if the attorney had insisted that Bartleby fulfill his responsibilities as soon as Bartleby’s work habits became evident? What would have happened if the attorney had fired Bartleby at that point?

○ Who has gained by the set of actions and events that took place over the course of the story? What have they gained? Who has lost, and what? How might that have changed if the attorney had been quick to fire Bartleby?

○ What, if any, socially responsible actions might the attorney have taken if and when he realized the nature of the Bartleby’s inability to cope?

Exercises

1. Understanding Your Employees. The attorney (who is the story’s narrator) has decided to focus on what he does best — practice law — and has hired you as office manager. Spend your first week learning the office routine and studying the strengths and weaknesses of each of your four employees.
   a. List the major strength and weakness of each employee.
   b. Each employee has a different personality and a different weakness. Working with each employee individually, explain how you would help him address the weakness
you identified in 1.a., above.

2. **Job Interviewing.** The attorney has asked you to help him refine his recruiting and interviewing techniques for hiring new employees. He has invited you to sit in on an interview with a job applicant he is to meet at the end of the week, a Mr. Bartleby.
   a. Make up a list of points to cover in announcing a position and its requirements, interviewing, and following up on references.
   b. You have been asked not to participate actively in the interview, but you have an opportunity to pass a note to the attorney as the interview takes place. Would you? Why or why not? If so, what would you write?
   c. In your after-the-interview evaluation, what would you say to the attorney about how he handled the interview? About what he might consider next time?
   d. What would your advice be about hiring Bartleby? What is your basis for that recommendation?

3. **Evaluating Job Performance.** Develop employee performance evaluation criteria for all scrivener positions in the attorney’s office. Apply those criteria to Turkey, Nippers, and Bartleby.

**Other Works by the Author**

*Moby Dick* is more than a novel about the pursuit of a great white whale. Melville’s masterpiece also chronicles the life, lore, and even the craft of whaling in the nineteenth century. This classic tale illustrates the value of teamwork, the indispensability of leadership, as well as the folly — and, potentially, the tragedy — of misdirected goals, among other administrative subthemes.

*Typee*, the novel that made Melville a popular author in his day, is an adventure yarn about two sailors who jump ship at an island in the south pacific. They have less fun than they anticipate but never get bored. As they near the end of their adventure, civilization, structure, and the confines of a nautical organization start looking pretty desirable.

*Billy Budd* (a novelette) and *Redburn* (a novel) portray the adventures and hardships of life aboard ships in the mid-nineteenth century. Young people at the bottom of demanding organizations may wish to compare notes with these youthful (and not altogether willing) sailors.

*Pierre, or the Ambiguities* is a dark, troubled novel that Melville considered his greatest literary contribution. Critics don’t. However, if you find Melville your kind of author, you might look into this novel for yourself.

**Internet Sites**

**The Life and Works of Herman Melville** ([http://www.melville.org](http://www.melville.org)). This site is “dedicated to disseminating information about Herman Melville on the Internet and the World Wide Web.” This site includes current Melville events, biographies, info on Melville, quotes by and about Melville, excerpts and electronic texts, publishing history, criticism, other Melville-related sites on the web, links to whales, sailing, literature, and more.
OPM’s Performance Management Cycle (http://www.opm.gov/policy-dataoversight/performance-management/performance-management-cycle). The U.S. Office of Personnel Management administers federal employment practices, setting policies that affect employees in federal agencies. OPM also offers training and assistance for many aspects of supervision and leadership. This portion of OPM’s website includes tips about dealing with employees who have problems with their job performance as well as goal-setting and other aspects concerning employee performance.

Retired Employees — Labor unions help protect the interests of employees, both individually and in collective bargaining actions. (See the Asimov selection, forthcoming.) Retired workers also have access to organizations that offer advice, assistance, lobbying for the group’s interests, and even collective purchasing opportunities. Two such organizations are AARP, formerly known as the American Association of Retired Persons (http://www.aarp.org), and the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association (http://www.narfe.org).

For the Instructor

The story is Herman Melville’s “Bartleby, the Scrivener,” published in 1853.

Discussion Points and Themes

- Dominating this story are the themes (■) of leadership, human resources management, and performance evaluation. Also major are the themes (■) of personal/professional development and organizational/small-group behavior. Ethics and decisionmaking are minor, but important, themes (▪), as is communication.
- Melville presents a compound problem: Bartleby is a poor employee and the attorney is a poor manager.
- The attorney is far more of a Theory Y manager than a Theory X manager, but he does it badly because he allows his employees to exploit him.
- Managers who are effective only with good employees and only when things are running well are sometimes referred to as “country club managers.”
- Nippers is the slow-to-start, grumpy, dyspeptic employee. Turkey is even-tempered and experienced, but possibly a lunchtime alcoholic. Both are heavily burdened by Bartleby’s poor work performance and his special treatment. Ginger Nut is in a different job series and not directly affected; because he is new to the workforce, however, everyone in the office becomes a potential role model for him, thus making Bartleby an especially negative influence.

Themes
- Organizational/Societal Change
- Functions of Government
- Democratic Principles
- Ethics
  - Leadership
  - Decisionmaking
  - Planning/Budgeting
- Performance Evaluation
- Policy Development/Evaluation
- Law Enforcement/Justice
- Communication
- Organizational/Group Behavior
- Diversity/Multiculturalism
- Human Resources Management
- Personal/Professional Development
Questions

Any of the questions can be used in classroom and online discussion, assigned as homework, worked in class either individually or in small groups, and/or adapted as questions for essay or objective tests.

The commentaries below are brief reflections on each question; however, they are not intended as comprehensive.

Question (from student section)  Comment

1. **Is Bartleby displaying a “can’t do” problem or a “won’t do” problem?** What leads you to this conclusion? How does the can’t do/won’t do distinction make a difference in the way Bartleby’s boss should approach the situation?

   Bartleby’s performance is probably based on a combination of can’t-do and won’t-do causes. As long as the student’s response has a reasonable justification, either position is fine. The distinction is important because, to the extent that the problem is can’t-do, the attorney should be able to provide remedial training, clearer instructions, appropriate tools and facilities, and the like. To the extent the problem is won’t-do, the attorney can adjust rewards and punishment, clearly lay out potential consequences, point out the role Bartleby has in performing his duties dependably and well, and then following through based on Bartleby’s job-related performance — in this case, “performance” would include abandoning unearned privileges.

2. **Identify a sequence of three or four actions that Bartleby’s manager could have taken with Bartleby, and when he should have taken them.**

   If your students have studied Situational Management, this would be an appropriate application. In any case, students might identify performance evaluation, problem identification, solution development and implementation — including, perhaps, management tools such as coaching and probation.

3. **If you were Nippers or Turkey, what would you think of Bartleby? What, if anything, could you have done as you saw the events taking place?**

   This question invites students to explore different points of view as they examine the situation. Whether the employees could change any of the events in the story is doubtful. But some scenarios are plausible, such as the three employees approaching the attorney as a group to insist on a change; or, perhaps, Turkey’s offering to take supervisory responsibility for (and concomitant authority over) Bartleby, then exercising that authority.

4. **Does it matter that the office in “Bartleby” is more than a hundred years in the past?**

   Could such a situation occur today? Why or why not?

   Technology changes rapidly. Institutions evolve, too, but far more slowly. As for people, they have been much the same for many thousand years.

5. **What would have happened if the attorney had insisted that Bartleby fulfill his responsibilities as soon as Bartleby’s work habits became evident? What would have happened if the attorney had**

   If the attorney had taken prompt action, Bartleby might have become a better employee or have left the firm. If the attorney had terminated Bartleby as an employee when Bartleby first refused to fulfill his responsibilities, the impact on other employees — and, ultimately, on the effectiveness of the office — would have been far more benign.
6. Who has gained by the set of actions and events that took place over the course of the story? What have they gained? Who has lost, and what? How might that have changed if the attorney had been quick to fire Bartleby?

Ultimately, no one gained from the situation as it transpired. Stronger, timelier action by the attorney would have been very uncomfortable for the attorney in the short term but easier for him in the long term. Bartleby, if he left the firm, might have met his ultimate fate more swiftly or might have found a more suitable position. Because the attorney would have been able to replace Bartleby with a better employee, the other employees would face a more reasonable workload.

7. What, if any, socially responsible actions might the attorney have taken if and when he realized the nature of the Bartleby’s inability to cope?

In Melville’s time, few choices would have been available to the attorney except committing Bartleby to an asylum; to what extent that would have been socially responsible, is questionable. In our time, however, a range of support programs would be available, some privately and others publicly supported. Many employers offer employee assistance programs that may be directly beneficial or may lead to more intensive treatment options.

Exercises

As with the questions, above, any of these exercises can be used online, in the classroom (including flipped classrooms), or assigned as homework. They are usually best worked in small group settings. Some can be adapted as examination questions.

The commentaries below describe the potential utility of each exercise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise (from student section)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Understanding Your Employees. The attorney (the story’s narrator) has decided to focus on what he does best — practice law — and has hired you as office manager. Spend your first week learning the office routine and studying the strengths and weaknesses of each of your four employees.  
  a. List the major strength and weakness of each employee.  
  b. Each employee has a different personality and a different weakness. Working with each employee individually, explain how you would help him address the weakness you identified in 1.a., above. | This exercise helps students understand that each employee is a unique mix of strengths and weaknesses, some of which can be dealt with more readily than others. |
| 2. Job Interviewing. The attorney has asked you to help him refine his recruiting and interviewing techniques for hiring new employees. He has invited you to sit in on an interview with a job applicant he is to meet at the end of the week, a Mr. Bartleby.  
  a. Make up a list of points to cover in announcing a position and its requirements, interviewing, and following up on references.  
  b. You have been asked not to participate actively in the | This exercise can help students realize the importance of having a good selection process — and the limitations of that process. |
Exercise (from student section) | Comment
--- | ---
interview, but you have an opportunity to pass a note to the attorney as the interview takes place. Would you? Why or why not? If so, what would you write?
c. In your after-the-interview evaluation, what would you say to the attorney about how he handled the interview? About what he might consider next time?
d. What would your advice be about hiring Bartleby? What is your basis for that recommendation?

3. Evaluating Job Performance. Develop performance evaluation criteria for all scrivener positions in the attorney’s office. Apply those criteria to Turkey, Nippers, and Bartleby.

Other Classroom Activity

1. **ROLE PLAY: 1-ON-1 WITH BARTLEBY**
   Ask for two volunteers and have them come forward. Seat them somewhat facing one another, but also partially facing the class. Use a small desk or table between them if it’s available.

   First, have the two volunteers improvise an office conversation between Bartleby and the attorney as it might actually have taken place. Second (using the original volunteers or replacements), have the students repeat the situation as they think it ought to have gone if it had been handled correctly. Third, invite everyone (with the volunteers joining in) to point out contrasts between the first and second conversation and suggest additions or alternative approaches.

   **Variation #1:** Once the conversation is underway, have other volunteers participate as Turkey, Nippers, and, possibly, Ginger Nut.

   **Variation #2:** Include a third volunteer in the second improvisation. The third person assumes the role of a training counselor. Alternatively, the third student portrays a union representative (either presenting the case for Bartleby or for the other two scriveners).

   **Bottom Line.** This activity gives students the opportunity to observe and practice good management and labor relations interactions. It also assists students in drawing salient elements from a written fictional story and, by inference, from real-world case studies they may encounter elsewhere.

2. **ORGANIZATIONAL ADVISORS**
   Divide the class into groups. The number and size of the groups can vary based on your situation. Ask each group to put together — and present to the class as a whole — their
diagnosis of the situation in Melville’s story along with a set of recommendations for bringing Bartleby up to full performance. (Variation: At your discretion or theirs, they may also address the supervisory performance of the attorney.) Each group is to consider their proposal from the perspective you assign them, including (but not limited to) —

- training and development officer
- employee assistance program coordinator
- quality coordinator
- union steward
- customer service manager
- chief executive officer

Give the students a week or more (outside of class time) to prepare their presentations. Invite flip charts, transparencies, e-media, handouts, etc., but caution that each member of the group must participate in some part of the presentation.

All members of a group receive the same grade, which is based on the quality of their presentation. Decide whether to grade the presentations yourself, grade them with input from the students of the other teams, or have the other students grade the presentations. If the grading is by other students or with their input, you may wish to adapt the form below to meet your needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Sheet for “Bartleby” Presentations</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team rated</strong></td>
<td><strong>Members:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions:** *Rate each element on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INTRO/PERSPECTIVE:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rating (1-5)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do members introduce themselves?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they identify their POV?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does presentation reflect assigned POV?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it logical?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PRESCRIPTION (set of recommendations):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it practical?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are roles assigned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are timeframes clear?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESENTATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it clear?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it organized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it interesting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are handouts and a/v aids helpful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does each member play a part?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **OVERALL EVALUATION (1-5):**
- **RECOMMENDED LETTER GRADE:**

Other comments and suggestions:

Rater(s) [must be filled in]:
Distributing copies at least one class session in advance of deadline can help teams focus their presentations. Specify minimum and maximum length for each presentation (for example, 8-10 minutes, plus two minutes for questions), and penalty for nonadherence.

At the beginning of class session(s) at which student teams make their presentations, distribute forms for each student to rate each team (other than her/his own team). Arrange for enough additional forms (reproduced on colored stock if printed rather than distributed electronically) for each team to rate the other teams. When a team has completed its presentation and Q&A session, have each member of the audience to rate that team and then, in teams, consolidate their ratings on the colored rating sheet — that is, use consensus to derive (at minimum) an “overall evaluation” and “recommended letter grade.” Have the teams put the consolidated/colored sheet on top of their individual ratings and return them into you.

(Variation: While this is happening, members of the team that gave its briefing may use a third version/color of the form to evaluate one another and provide constructive critique.)

The forms are then forwarded to you. Once you formulate and record a grade for each team based on the students’ input, eliminate the raters’ identification and return the rating sheets to each presentation team. Allow time for team review and general discussion.

**Bottom Line.** This activity offers a range of benefits for students. It permits students to —

■ Explore, from a variety of perspectives, issues relating to nonperforming and underperforming employees (and managers).
■ Practice small group participation skills.
■ Gain experience in preparing and delivering presentations.
■ Participate in evaluating and critiquing peers.
■ Receive and consider peer feedback on their performance.

**Further Reading**

Beyond the references in this study, you may wish to identify relevant textbook or reading selections assigned for the course. Below are several more:


Discussion and Essay Questions

The questions and exercises in the student section of this study are readily adaptable for online or classroom discussion and as examination questions. Other possibilities:

- Discuss (list, identify, choose) ethical issues in Herman Melville’s “Bartleby.”
- Managers in the public sector must closely document the performance of problem employees (that is, employees potentially subject to dismissal if their on-the-job performance does not improve to a specified level). The process includes consultations and advisory letters to the employee. Devise a scenario that involves these elements in the case of Mr. Bartleby.
- Devise a 360-degree evaluation for the attorney’s office in “Bartleby, the Scrivener.” Discuss how the attorney would be likely to fare based on that evaluation tool.
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