1992

A leadership model for a woman in the U.S. presidency

Patricia Anne Stroup
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Stroup, Patricia Anne, "A leadership model for a woman in the U.S. presidency" (1992). *Master's Theses*. 365.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.4gqf-g267>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/365

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Beil & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1348726

A leadership model for a woman in the U.S. presidency

Stroup, Patricia Anne, M.A.

San Jose State University, 1992

U·M·I

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**

A LEADERSHIP MODEL FOR A WOMAN IN THE U. S. PRESIDENCY

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Social Sciences

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

By

Patricia Anne Stroup

May, 1992

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Dr. Roy Young, Chairman

Dr. Mary E. Carroll

Dr. Yoko Baba

Dr. Robert Kumamoto, Graduate Advisor

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

A LEADERSHIP MODEL FOR A WOMAN IN THE U. S. PRESIDENCY

by Patricia Anne Stroup

To determine leadership characteristics which are seen as traditional in approach, literature by James MacGregor Burns, Warren Bennis, Sheila Murray Bethel, and John Kotter is reviewed. The idea of a leadership style more natural to women is presented based on the works of Marilyn Loden, Judy Rosener, Mary Billard and others. Their perspective on the uniqueness of a feminine leadership style as compared to the more traditional command and control style is discussed.

Examples illustrate an emerging style of leadership in business. There is also a need for a similar style of leadership in the presidency. To understand leadership in the presidency, it is important to realize what the expectations and demands are of the office, and what has helped to shape those expectations.

Finally, a model is presented which shows the leadership skills a woman president will need to possess and use in the office. The conclusion is that a woman may have the necessary leadership skills needed within the presidency and even has an advantage in using the skills described as more suited to women.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.	vi
--------------------------------	----

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Shifting the Model	
A New Vision	
The Focus of the Research	
II. TYPES OF LEADERSHIP	7
Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles - Burns	
Characteristics of Leadership - Kotter, Bethel, and Bennis	
Women's Leadership Style	
Charting Leadership	
III. THE U. S. PRESIDENCY.	29
Development of the Presidency	
Expectations of the Presidency	
Shaping the Presidency	
Types of Leadership Demanded by the Office of the Presidency	
Illustrating the Leadership Needs in the Presidency	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

IV. DEVELOPING A MODEL FOR A WOMAN PRESIDENT. 49

Differences in Leadership Styles

Are the Differences Functional and Significant?

Women in Political Leadership

The Challenge

The Model for a Woman President

Charting the Model

Conclusion

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
2.1 Leadership Characteristics - traditional and . . . feminine	28
3.1 Leadership Skills Needed in the Office of the. . . Presidency	48
4.1 A Leadership Model for a Woman President	64

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Shifting the Model

When one thinks of the U. S. Presidency or the occupant in the White House the image that automatically comes to mind is that of a male figure. If we think of the Oval Office, we see in our mind's eye a man sitting at the desk with the presidential seal on it and views of the gardens creeping in from the nearby window. To imagine a woman in the presidency, sitting in the Oval Office would require a shift from the usual to something never before experienced. Such an image is not unrealistic but definitely a change from the old way of thinking or paradigm model.

In Joel Barker's book on paradigm shifting he quotes Willis Harmon in his definition of a paradigm. He says it is the "basic way of perceiving, thinking, valuing, and doing associated with a particular vision of reality."¹ In other words, a paradigm is the model we use in formulating our thoughts. How we perceive the person designated to be our national leader comes from the models that have been implanted on our minds. As far as our nation goes these

¹Joel Arthur Barker, Discovering the Future: The Business of Paradigms (St. Paul: ILI Press, 1988), 13.

models have been developing from the beginning when our forefathers gathered to decide how we would be governed and who had the right to be considered a voting citizen.

Although the framers of our young country may not easily recognize our current political process as the model they envisioned, the perceived image of a U. S. president has not changed significantly and still requires a change in our conceptual modeling to allow a woman in the office of the presidency.

A New Vision

Usually a shift in a paradigm comes when someone takes the leadership in making the change happen no matter what the obstacles encountered. The progress women have made in the past century have come about because someone with a new vision not only presented a new model but pushed with all their might to make it become a reality. Mary Wollstonecraft began the shift in people's thinking towards women when she wrote A Vindication of the Rights of Women in 1833. By 1848 others such as Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton took up the banner of change by convening the Seneca Falls Convention where women's rights were debated. Susan B. Anthony and other notable women continued the challenge for women's right to vote. More than seventy years later the change was a reality with the Nineteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution.

Some say the change in the thinking model towards women and their capabilities has only begun. Where else is that more clear than when we look at the attitude towards women in American politics? Currently, there are only 2 women in the Senate and 29 women in the House of Representatives which equates to 5% of the total congressional population. Along with other writers, Ann Morrison feels the change required to have gender equality in Congress (and in business) takes several decades. She says, "the kind of change we view as necessary involves change in institutions, change in attitudes, and change in behavior."² The possibility is great that a woman will reach the presidency before equal representation in Congress. A global example would be Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister of Great Britain with a male-dominated Parliament.

It is clear that much more shifting of the thought process towards women in political leadership roles must take place. Revolutionary change--even in conceptual models--does not come without a period of stress and insecurity. Scientist Thomas S. Kuhn has written about the paradigm shifting that takes place in scientific theory. It would seem that his ideas fit well with the Social Sciences. He says,

²Ann M. Morrison, Randall P. White, and Ellen Van Velsor, Breaking The Glass Ceiling (Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1987), 158.

the emergence of new theories is generally preceded by a period of pronounced professional insecurity. As one might expect, that insecurity is generated by the persistent failure of the puzzles of normal science to come out as they should. Failure of existing rules is the prelude to a search for new ones.³

In congruence the difficulty encountered in making a shift in our thought patterns is also expressed by Professor Anne Fausto-Sterling of Brown University who has done extensive research in the field of genetics. She says, "a scientist may fail to see something that is right under his or her nose because currently accepted theory cannot account for the observation."⁴ The idea of a woman in the presidency requires a new pattern of thought. It requires dispensing with the familiar paradigm and seeing what is already there. As the shift takes a firmer hold on society there will be a time of resistance to the new thought and a resistance to accepting the failure of the old paradigm which supports the thought that a president will be a man. Failure in providing the necessary leadership time and time again in the male dominated position may be the prelude to the realization that a woman does have the leadership capabilities needed in the presidency. When a woman finally reaches the U. S. presidency, the shift in the thought process will still not be finished. She will have to prove her leadership ability

³Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), 67-68.

⁴Anne Fausto-Sterling, Myths of Gender (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1985) 10.

far more profoundly than a male counterpart. In doing so, she might assume that she must be "male" in her thought process. However, as women are discovering in management roles, they must be themselves and use their feminine thought processes and leadership skills to their advantage.

The Focus of the Research

Within the confines of this paper an investigation of the idea of leadership and the characteristics of male and female leadership will be addressed. We will also look at the office of the presidency and review some significant characteristics of leadership needed to be successful in the office and some applications of leadership within the presidency to various national situations. Finally, a woman in the presidency will be evaluated as to her leadership characteristics and how they will accommodate the office with the result being a model of leadership characteristics for a woman president.

This paper assumes a woman is sitting in the Oval Office behind the Presidential Seal. How she got there will not be addressed. We assume she gathered a team of experts to direct her campaign, she had the financial backing required, and fought her way through the party dissent directed towards her as a woman candidate. She also endured successfully the grueling primary campaigns, the nominating convention, the non-stop campaigning preceding an election, and the media

scrutinizing which is often experienced by political candidates, and emerged a victor over her male opponent.

Now that she is in the office, what will she need to be a successful leader? Will she demonstrate a new type of leadership that is unique to woman, or will she become a leader copying the male leadership image? Is there such a thing as a leadership style unique to a woman? For that matter, is there a male oriented leadership style exclusive of the influence of female qualities? Does the presidency demand a style of leadership a woman does not possess? We will look at the office of the presidency and attempt to determine if a woman's leadership style will be functional.

CHAPTER II

TYPES OF LEADERSHIP

An attempt to define the leadership that a woman president might use while in office will require looking at general explanations of leadership, unique characteristics of a woman, and application of definitions to scenarios describing male leadership and female leadership. A look at the experts who have defined leadership will begin with a review of transforming and transactional leadership, and will end with a report indicating a style of leadership seemingly more comfortable for women than men.

Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles - Burns

James MacGregor Burns has categorized transformational and transactional leadership as two distinct types. Burns would also agree that there can be a combination of both types of leadership and that a leader is not always one particular type but will fluctuate from one type to the other as the need dictates. Burns says that transforming leadership is less prevalent in usage since it is the grand master of leadership. It is the revolutionary style of leadership where major paradigm shifts take place in a dazzling array of events and system and ideological changes.

A transforming leader would be someone such as Lenin, or the founders of our country. It is leadership in response to a fundamental need and a connection with the hopes and expectations of the people. These types of leaders change and reconstruct social and political systems.

The secret of transforming leadership is the capacity of leaders to have their goals clearly and firmly in mind, to fashion new institutions relevant to those goals, to stand back from immediate events and day-to-day routines, and understand the potential and consequences of change.⁵

According to Burns the "essence of transformational leadership is the capacity to adapt means to ends--to shape and reshape institutions and structures. . . ." ⁶ From this definition one may see why it is difficult to identify too many of these types of leaders in the American political system. It is explosive and revolutionary.

Many writers on leadership feel that our current political system in America thwarts transformational leadership because of the built-in checks and balances between the various branches in the government. They say there is a lack of great leadership within the system. The leadership we experience today is not one that produces significant changes; it is not one that resolves problems quickly or revolutionizes institutions or systems. After decades of leadership our country still cannot provide

⁵James MacGregor Burns, The Power to Lead (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), 103.

⁶Ibid., 102.

adequate care for the vulnerable people in society such as the poor, the elderly, women, and children.

Sometimes we can see a glimpse of transformational leadership in business. Lee Iacocca had a "bold new vision of what Chrysler could and should be,"⁷ says John Kotter. He took the fledgling company and with his vision imprinted in his mind and transplanted to others, he made his vision come to life. He dissolved the old paradigm and transformed the institution into a new model. Leaders in companies such as IBM, Digital, Apple, and Hewlett-Packard have revolutionized the collection and dissemination of information with computers.

In the political arena our own nation's early beginning had revolutionary leaders who instituted a new model of government different from Great Britain's. After the early years of our nation's beginning and through the following years it becomes more difficult to point to a revolutionary change in the political model and thus no revolutionary leaders. The current political thought process has become too ingrained in our social structure. Franklin Roosevelt may come as close as we can to a transformational (or revolutionary) leader in America's recent history as he revolutionized government with the welfare system and his

⁷John P. Kotter, The Leadership Factor (New York: The Free Press, 1988), 18.

somewhat successful attempt to implement the "New Deal" concept into the legislative thought processes.

Our political system does not compliment a transforming leadership style. Instead, it is a system of checks and balances which impedes any fast change or shift in the social and political models. Our legislative system demonstrates a slow and cumbersome process of lawmaking. Two Houses battle each other and both of them are in contention with the Executive Branch. This creates a stale environment for transforming change.

Yet in this framework, our expectations of the executive leader, the president, are result oriented. We vote a new president into office and expect this person to produce results. There is a honeymoon period of around one year where the incumbent is allowed time to formulate and demonstrate a plan of action and direction. Thereafter, we expect results to be forthcoming. The president is measured on the results of tenure in office. Historians cite results or lack thereof as the way we are to remember this person in history. When there is a crisis in the country or across the globe, we expect results from our president. Although a president may possess some of the transformational drives and characteristics, because this person has to work within our cumbersome legislative system, the transformational style of leadership does not lend itself well to the circumstance.

Rather, the other style which Burns defines as transactional appears to work best within our political system.

Transactional leadership gets results for the day-to-day problems we face as a collective body. This style of leadership is one that "thrives on bargaining, accommodating, manipulating, and compromising within a given system."⁸

Although both types of leadership involve bargaining and accommodating, for example, Burns says there is a difference in the actions because transformational leadership "raises one to higher levels of motivation and morality."⁹ The accommodating and bargaining are done with the ultimate great vision kept in the forefront. In transactional situations the ultimate goals (or immediate vision) of the parties involved may begin from different perspectives, such as economics verses public relations. It may end up looking even more different for both parties when the transacting is finished. Burns goes on to say that transactional leadership is "incremental, gradual, and adjusting." It is a leadership style which

makes short-run plans, adjusts to other leaders' needs and decisions, adapts hopes and aspirations to existing conditions, bargains and competes and maneuvers in a continuing series of accommodations.¹⁰

⁸Ibid., 16.

⁹James MacGregor Burns. Leadership (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 20.

¹⁰Burns, The Power to Lead, 153.

Burns says that the transactional style of leadership lends itself to short-term gratification for the participants. It is successfully used with day-to-day problem solving and where some sort of change or result (often short-termed) is needed to placate a group or a whole nation of people.

He uses Jimmy Carter as an example of a president who did not function well in an environment requiring the transactional style of leadership. He quotes Meg Greenfield when he says that Carter had "no appetite for and certainly took no joy in that combination of management, manipulation, inspiration, deceit, psychiatry and arm-wrestling that it takes to get things to happen when you are President."¹¹ Burns says that Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy were able to use some of the transactional leadership characteristics such as manipulation and arm-wrestling to get their administrations out of gridlock. He says that when they saw the need for compromise they made positional shifts which they felt were essential to the success of their programs or positions such as the New Deal and civil rights legislation.

Although Carter may have been perceived as unwilling to use some of the basic transactional leadership skills during his presidency, others have used these skills very effectively. Lyndon Johnson was a master at manipulation, arm-wrestling, and bargaining. Some women in Congress have

¹¹Ibid., 32.

also found the need to be "transactional" in getting things accomplished. Kay Orr, Representative from Nebraska, was known as the "Dragon Lady" because of her determination and sharp tongue when driven by her ideals. Corinne Boggs, Congresswoman from Louisiana, knew the need for building a supportive network within the congressional environment as an accommodation to getting bills to the floor of Congress. She used this network to press male congressional leaders to back her proposed bills on such issues as domestic violence. Although Congresswoman Barbara Mikulski spoke out on many causes affecting the "little guy," she was pragmatic when it came to knowing what is possible within congressional bounds. She was viewed as a "practical political theorist" which blends well with a transactional style of leadership.¹²

Characteristics of Leadership - Kotter, Bethel, and Bennis

Most writers on leadership concur that there are certain characteristics that are present in leaders, and are needed for a leader to be effective. John Kotter says that managing and leading in today's society are less and less distinguishable. A good manager must possess and use leadership skills while a leader must now also be a manager to ensure effectiveness in our fast-changing technological and social environment. Because of the scrutiny that a

¹²Esther Stineman, American Political Women (Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1980), 12-14, 47-49, 88-89, 109-111, 133-136.

national leader undergoes, it is necessary to manage the people reacting to the leader's vision. It is necessary to produce results which people can view in terms of successfulness of the leader they have followed. Some of the characteristics John Kotter emphasizes are as follows:

- 1) Industry and organizational knowledge which includes market, competition, products, and technological knowledge.
- 2) A broad set of solid relationships in the firm and industry.
- 3) Excellent reputation and strong track record in a broad set of activities.
- 4) Keen mind, strong analytical ability, good judgment, ability to think strategically and multidimensional, and the ability to develop good working relationships and possess and employ various strong interpersonal skills.
- 5) High level of integrity.
- 6) High energy level and strong drive to lead and empower.¹³

Sheila Murray Bethel has her own list of leadership characteristics which, when compared to Kotter's list, one can see many likenesses. Bethel says an effective leader must possess high ethics which is the same as Kotter's requirement for a high level of integrity. She says that a leader must be a master of change, be sensitive to relationships, use power wisely, and communicate effectively. She also says a leader must be a "big thinker"; someone who can put big thoughts into practice. These attributes are included in Kotter's statement regarding interpersonal relationship skills and the need for a keen mind. He

¹³Kotter, The Leadership Factor, 30.

indicates a leader must think strategically and multidimensional which is similar to what Bethel describes as a big thinker. To Bethel, a leader must be able to make decisions and be a team-builder. Kotter similarly says a leader must have an excellent reputation in the field and must be able to build relationships within the industry which will be helpful in reaching the desired goals.

Bethel goes a few steps beyond Kotter in listing qualities of leadership. She also says a leader must have a mission that matters to other people. They must be able to rally people around a cause that gives them direction and purpose. In fact, this is her number one quality of leadership; a leader is a person who has a common good as the primary purpose of his/her mission. Bethel summarizes her definition of leadership as the ability to influence others.

To make a difference and to be effective leaders, we have to influence others to think and to act, as well as to follow. We must set an example that others choose to follow. And the secret to eliciting that choice is the very essence of leadership.¹⁴

James MacGregor Burns would call this effort to influence others to choose, transactional leadership. However, the driving mission or dream may well be transformational in nature.

To be a successful leader a man or woman must have a purpose or mission that others see as significant and want to

¹⁴Sheila Murray Bethel, Making a Difference (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1990), 16.

rally around. It must be a purpose that is so important to a large percentage of the population that they will follow the leader until a paradigm shift has taken place in society and the purpose becomes reality (or at least the roots are firmly planted).

In another chapter we will be looking at some examples of such missions some presidents have had and how they fared in their efforts to bring about change towards their desired purpose. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "I have a dream" and with this statement he changed U. S. society. Any leader's mission will be part dream and part practical. With the dream people's hearts are set on fire, and with the practical there are expectations of results which the people want to see become reality.

Bethel says the right kind of mission can create charisma which draws people into the cause. She says the mission should be clearly defined with a deep passion felt by the leader before it will be very effective. Placing a driving mission as top priority on a list of leadership characteristics correlates with Burns' idea of transformational leadership. Burns concludes transforming leaders reshape a portion of the world (or the whole world!). Bethel suggests that "big thinkers can transform the world."¹⁵ They begin with the dream and vision and then they

¹⁵Ibid, 45.

must apply their other leadership characteristics to the situation to finally become successful in reaching their goals. One can ask, what good is a mission or a cause if you cannot attract others to join the cause and follow you to the conclusion of the dream? If a person cannot get people to act upon the vision or mission, then all they have is a dream. This is where effective leadership comes into focus and produces results. A United States president must produce results if the president is to be viewed as a successful leader. This applies doubly to a woman president who will have caused a paradigm shift in getting to the presidency. Once there, she must produce results to be deemed a successful leader. To do that she must have a mission which will be a driving force for herself and a large percentage of the population, and she must also use the transactional skills of bargaining, accommodating, manipulating, and others.

Warren Bennis concurs that leaders must make their missions become reality through translation of the vision into reality. He says that leaders "forge the future."¹⁶ Kotter and Bethel would agree with Bennis as he discusses the factors leaders need to forge this future: they must manage the dream, aim high, encourage reflective back talk and dissent, see into the future, and be willing to wait

¹⁶Warren Bennis, On Becoming a Leader (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1989), 192.

patiently for the outcome. The difference between Bennis and the other writers is that he takes a more philosophical approach towards the necessary leadership qualities. Bennis believes that leadership characteristics are learned through life experiences. He says that leaders do not set out to be leaders but have an "abiding interest in expressing themselves freely and fully."¹⁷ In his book, On Becoming a Leader, Bennis says to become a leader there is a need for education, a need to unlearn so that one can learn, a need for reflecting, a need to take risks, and a need for competence.

Bethel and Kotter talk about the practicality of leadership characteristics while Bennis looks inward. He says that a successful leader is one that listens to the inner voice and trusts that voice. Many of the other characteristics which he indicates are necessary for leadership, correlate well with Bethel and Kotter. Leaders must have a guiding vision (mission), a passion for the promises of life and a course of action. He says they must have integrity (high ethics and wise use of power). They must earn people's trust and they must have curiosity and daring qualities. These are like Bethel and Kotter's risk-taking, courage and commitment. Underlying Bennis' theory is his idea that "true leaders are not born, but made, and

¹⁷Ibid., 5.

usually self-made. Leaders invent themselves."¹⁸ Another point that Bennis makes is one's childhood experiences can either help or hinder a person. They can help a person become master of his/her life or a servant of the past. He says that one should seek life-experiences which will help enlarge and broaden a person. Bennis phrases his theory for leadership in a philosophical covering, but it is basically a list of the same qualities that Bethel and Kotter have stated make successful leaders.

These leadership qualities are applicable to both male and females. They are the qualities that have made successful leaders throughout the ages. The writers discussed have used many examples from politics, business, entertainment, and other organizations to stress their point of what leadership is and how it works. There have been analyses of former U. S. presidents as to whether they were successful or not in their attempt to lead and why they were or were not successful. A successful woman president will have these same characteristics and perhaps additional ones as well.

Women's Leadership Style

Few people have researched and published data regarding the differences in male and female leadership qualities or even whether there are significant differences between the

¹⁸Ibid., 42.

two. Following are four sources of data which have investigated the idea of a female leadership style different from the traditional style that most sources describe. This is not to say that men do not utilize the same qualities as described as "women's" just as most women adopt many of the leadership qualities of their male counterparts. However, the data indicates that women are more comfortable with this particular style of leadership which the four sources propose. In fact, according to Judy Rosener, the current need for leadership and management demands a diversity of leadership styles. People have "come to expect their bosses to be open and frank. They no longer accept being dictated to but want to be treated as individuals with minds of their own."¹⁹ Sources examined are a book by Marilyn Loden entitled Feminine Leadership or How to Succeed in Business Without Being One of the Boys, a collection of statistics and other data summarized by Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc. entitled Men, Women, and Leadership in the American Corporation, an article in Harvard Business Review by Judy Rosener, and a study done on Arizona state government administrators by Rita Mae Kelly, Mary M. Hale, and Jayne Burgess.

To begin with, Loden emphasizes the point that the feminine style of leadership is not meant to be a replacement

¹⁹Judy B. Rosener, "Ways Women Lead," Harvard Business Review, November-December 1990, 123, 125.

for the traditional style but that each has its own strengths and contributes to the overall leadership character. She develops a good argument for the feminine style of leadership saying that the more "traditional style of leadership does not enhance women's innate abilities or make the best use of their natural feminine skills and instincts."²⁰ Loden recognizes the same traditional leadership characteristics as the other writers referenced, but she takes her list beyond that point and addresses feminine leadership characteristics. She proposes that a masculine leadership style is based on competition, the need for tight control, assertiveness, the ability to think analytically or strategically, and an objective, nonemotional attitude towards application of leadership in the business or organization. Many of these are what Loden says are foreign to the majority of women in our society.

Loden concludes that the leadership characteristics which are now recognized as working best in management of today's business environment and organizations are the very "qualities that women as a group are encouraged to develop and rely on throughout their lives."²¹ In other words, they are the characteristics which come more naturally to women

²⁰Marilyn Loden, Feminine Leadership or How to Succeed in Business Without Being One of the Boys (New York: Random House, 1985) 9.

²¹Ibid., 61.

since they have been practicing them from the beginning of their socialization.

According to James Doyle and Michele Paludi, "socialization is the process by which children, adolescents, and adults learn what is expected of them through their interactions with other individuals."²² Women are taught and expected to act in a more cooperative way. They are more interested in making the group work together in a collaborative way rather than a hierarchical power-control methodology. Women are taught to use their intuition, to be empathic, and to expect high quality from members of the group, according to Loden. Female leaders are more apt to use empowerment and cooperation to motivate someone or a team of people to get the job done. Loden says that "connectedness and building networks in which one is at the center rather than hierarchies in which one is on top are both critical elements in effective feminine leadership."²³ Loden says compromise and consensus-building are part of the female leaders skill set. Women are more willing to listen to the group's ideas and allow everyone on the team to express themselves. From this listening and openness comes a willingness to modify their views on a subject based on the

²²James A. Doyle and Michele A. Paludi, Sex and Gender, The Human Experience (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1991) 129.

²³Loden, Feminine Leadership, 119.

arguments which have been presented by the group or various individuals.

Developing interpersonal skills are very important to women. They begin this training early in childhood and continue it throughout their lives. They have more of an ability to sense the nonverbal cues in an interactive relationship than men. They have good listening skills where they pay close attention to what is being said and incorporate their sensing skills into the listening technique. Since women find it easier to share their thoughts and feelings, it comes easier for them to develop personal relationships. And in today's competitive and fast changing world the same characteristics which are important in a good personal relationship are also needed in successful working relationships and in networking with others. Loden says communication and building interpersonal relationships are vital qualities in management:

Today, organizations need the interpersonal perspective, the people orientation that women provide. They have to appeal to their employees' needs for human recognition, dignity, and fair treatment as well as to their desire for challenging work.²⁴

The growing success of women in top management positions in business indicates that the nontraditional leadership style complemented by characteristics more suitable to a woman's socialization may even contribute to an organization's

²⁴Ibid, 149.

chances of success. Thus the idea is supported which indicates there is "strength in a diversity of leadership styles."²⁵ It is obvious the characteristics described as more easily a part of a woman's personal makeup are clearly available within the male personality as well. Carl Jung proposed that all people have within their personality a male and a female part. He called them the anima and the animus. He said the anima is the female element in the male unconscious and the animus is the male element in the female unconscious. How our counter unconscious parts develop is mostly contingent upon our socialization, although there has been some research into the differences between the chemistry of men and women and also into the brains of women as compared to men. These data have suggested certain differences contribute to women's ability to control their aggression and to better "integrate the functions of language and visual-spatial analysis" than men.²⁶ Loden quotes Dr. Estelle Ramey of Georgetown Medical School on her theory of differences in brain structure.

While it's difficult to separate the role of society and the role of the brain in shaping behavior, it looks as if the female brain is the kind of brain that should be able to handle several problems at once with less difficulty . . . and to be able to shift attention quickly from one thing to another.²⁷

²⁵Rosener, "Ways Women Lead," 120.

²⁶Loden, Feminine Leadership, 191.

²⁷Ibid., 203.

The Russell Reynolds Associates study was to be, as they said, a test of their hypothesis that "women managers had special strengths as . . . task-oriented managers . . . [transactional characteristics] but were less likely as executives to be . . . visionary, solitary, charismatic [transformational characteristics] individuals who create change as leaders, as were their male counterparts."²⁸ However, the results of the test were not what was expected. The data indicated that the majority of women in both management and in executive positions "displayed leader-style orientation."²⁹ The Reynolds study suggests that women possess the leadership skills of their male counterparts, and more. It goes on to confirm James MacGregor Burns' two types of leadership -- transformational (leaders) and transactional (managers). It uses the 1988 Burke Leadership Questionnaire developed by Warner Burke of Columbia University which is based on Burns definitions.

Leaders [men and women] are visionary, solitary, inspirational figures consumed with certain ideals and goals. They are charismatic, aware of their followers' needs, and extremely accurate in their perceptions of others. Managers are best at teamwork, task accomplishment, problem solving and implementing solutions. They are steady and reliable in their interpersonal interactions. For clarity of goals and direction, managers need leaders. For indispensable help in reaching the goals, leaders need managers.³⁰

²⁸Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc., Men, Women, and Leadership in the American Corporation (New York: Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc., 1990), i-ii, 4.

²⁹Ibid., 14.

³⁰Ibid., 30-31.

Judy Rosener has a name for the type of leadership we have been describing. She calls it "interactive leadership." Through interviews with women leaders in business she found they make an effort to encourage people around them to participate in decision-making and in sharing the power which the women had because of their position in the organization. Rosener says interactive leadership is one where inclusion is at the core of the leadership style and that the women use a "conversational style that sends signals inviting people to get involved."³¹ She goes on to make the point that this leadership style comes naturally to the women. She says the early socialization of women, especially before the 1960's, was to be cooperative, supportive, understanding, gentle, and to provide service to others. This socialization has bestowed an unexpected reward in allowing women to maintain a leadership style they are comfortable with and works well in many corporate cultures today.

In a study done by Rita Mae Kelly, Mary M. Hale, and Jayne Burgess on the Arizona high-level state government administrators, the following points were made:

1. Women scored significantly higher than men in taking an assertive lead during the cooperative group exercise.
2. Men and women may approach their jobs differently, using somewhat different styles to accomplish their ends, but this difference in approach may enhance a woman's job performance.
3. Women prefer a participative leadership style, rather

³¹Rosener, "Ways Women Lead," 120.

than an authoritative or consultative style preferred by most men.

4. A feminine style pays more attention to personal abilities, charisma, interpersonal relationships, and personal commitment by and to others.
5. Women executives are characterized as being comfortable working in team settings, preferring win-win approaches to conflict management and placing a high priority on managing relationships.³²

The study indicates that cooperation, participation, relationships, and the team setting are familiar methods of leadership for women. This is not to say that male executives are not capable of using these same methods of leadership, but that women prefer them over the traditional methods of leadership.

Another factor contributing to the success of women in leadership roles is the improved opportunity for a better education. In 1971 40.1% of the eligible women were earning Masters degrees compared to 51.5% of the eligible men. A statistical projection indicates that by 1995 the number of women earning a Masters degree will surpass men by approximately 10%.

Charting Leadership

Figure 2.1 illustrates the various leadership characteristics for the traditional style of leading. And it shows the characteristics more natural to a woman through socialization indicating she may have the advantage in their

³²Rita Mae Kelly, Mary M. Hale, and Jayne Burges, "Gender and Managerial/Leadership Styles: A Comparison of Arizona Public Administrators," Women & Politics 11 (1991): 19-39.

usage. These advantages coupled with the other traditional characteristics will support a woman's style of leadership which will then potentially provide for effective leadership as a president of the United States.

FIGURE 2.1 Leadership Characteristics - traditional and feminine

=====

Leadership characteristics described as the traditional style of leadership most familiar in our society.

Burns

transformational
 revolutionary
 clear and firm goals
 reshape
 transactional
 get results
 bargain, accommodate,
 manipulate, compromise
 short-run plans

Kotter

knowledge
 solid relationships
 excellent reputation
 keen mind/multidimensional
 strong interpersonal skills
 integrity
 high energy level
 strong drive

Bethel

high ethics
 master of change
 relationship builder
 effective communicator
 big thinker
 decision maker
 team builder
 mission for common good
 influence others
 charisma
 passion for leadership

Bennis

manage the dream
 aim high
 encourage dissent
 patience
 self-made leader

=====

Female leadership characteristics different from the traditional style.

Loden

cooperative
 collaborative
 expect high quality
 intuitive
 empathic
 consensus-building
 good listening skills
 empowerment
 use sensing skills
 group oriented

The Reynolds Study

perceptive of others

Rosener

interactive
 share the power

The Arizona Study

participative
 commitment
 team builder
 win-win approach
 attention to personal
 abilities

=====

Sources: Marilyn Loden, Feminine Leadership p. 61-189, Rita Mae Kelly, et al, "Gender and Managerial/Leadership Styles," p. 22-23, Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc., Men, Women, and Leadership in the American Corporation p. 31, Judy Rosener, "Ways Women Lead," p. 120-122.

CHAPTER III

THE U. S. PRESIDENCY

Before one may determine what leadership style will be successful for a woman president, it is imperative to review the presidency and make some determinations as to what the demands are for leadership in the office of the presidency. We will look at how the office has become our national political symbol, what the expectations are of the office, and how presidents have shaped the presidency through the years. We will also look at what the Constitution says about the office in regard to authority and power granted to it. We will be using some presidential examples in our discussion. Finally, in Figure 3.1 we will summarize the needs of leadership in the presidency to be used later to determine a leadership model for a woman president.

Development of the Presidency

Although our Founding Fathers established three branches of government, the Executive branch is where the public looks for leadership. Most specifically, the public looks to the president because it is easier to relate to one person rather than a group or body of individuals. Since the president is elected by a majority of the people, whereas members of

Congress are elected locally within the confines of one state, expectations of political strength flow towards the presidency. The office of the presidency has evolved into the prominent focal point of all things political in our system of government. That certainly was not the intent of the Founders, but it has without a doubt, become the subject of the public's political focus.

The nation no longer looks at the political party of their choice or even the Congress as the symbol of leadership for the country. Richard Neustadt says that the weakening of party ties, along with rapid changing world events and our attention to political personalities, has brought about this change. He goes on to say that the nation has come to expect the person in the White House to "do something about everything."³³ The nation expects a strong presidency which will always take control of the leadership of the country on domestic and international issues. Unfortunately, the presidency no longer brings with it the guarantee of total support by any political party and the power which that support entails. Presidents are no longer elected via a political party machine. They must determine their own strategy for winning and obtaining financial support. This eroding of the political parties has affirmed the presidency

³³Richard Neustadt, Presidential Power, The Politics of Leadership From FDR to Carter (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980), 7.

as the political symbol of the nation. For public policy and during crisis management, people do not look to the Congress for direction but to the presidency. One result of this may be why the office of the presidency, or the president in particular, also carries the burden of approval and disapproval by the nation on the results of political actions taken or not taken. The population who places the presidency out front as the national symbol is the same population which shows antagonism towards the office and the individual in the office when the country is in turmoil or when the officeholder exercises too much power according to perceptions of just how far the individual has a right to go.

Barbara Kellerman indicates that this paradox of looking to the president as the national symbol and the public's antagonism towards the office is a result of the "American Creed" defined as a desire for individualism and a general antagonism and ambivalence toward our political leaders. She says because of this set of values "political leadership will be difficult in a system in which the governing ideology imposes limits on power and on the institutions of government,"³⁴ especially on the presidency. While we are cautious about giving the presidency too much domestic power, we as a nation look to the president as our national symbol abroad. Attending summit meetings or dealing with foreign

³⁴Barbara Kellerman, The Political Presidency (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 6.

political leaders is viewed as a privilege for the presidency only.

Hedrick Smith in The Power Game says that we look upon our president as the "nation's political John Wayne"³⁵ when developing foreign policy. We want the president to demonstrate strength and toughness to other nations. Thomas Cronin says that "the attitudes Americans hold toward the presidency are psychologically as well as politically rooted."³⁶ To illustrate a psychological bond, he cites the Kennedy assassination as an example where a nation experienced the same emotional symptoms associated with grief over the loss of a loved one. Whether dealing with domestic or foreign issues, the nation looks to the presidency as a symbol of government.

As the presidency has developed into a national symbol for government, the public may hold one view of the office while the political scientist may hold another. Various presidential conceptions of the office have influenced its development and these influences may be categorized into three different conceptions according to a lecture on the presidency by Professor Roy Young, a political scientist at San Jose State University. One idea called the "Buchanan" concept suggests that the presidency is very limited in power

³⁵Hedrick Smith, The Power Game (New York: Ballantine Books, 1988), 11.

³⁶Thomas E. Cronin, Rethinking The Presidency (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1982), 77.

and thus weak in the ability to lead Congress towards any particular legislation. The Congress should be the most powerful of the two branches of government and the president should not be seen as too partisan as a representative of the people. The office should be administrative in nature instead of one wielding power to influence.

On the other hand, another idea entitled the "Lincoln" concept sees the presidency as strong with a liberal interpretation of the powers depicted in the Constitution. (This conception has been used by all presidents since Roosevelt.) Here the president is the cornerstone of the political system and the ultimate decision-maker elected by all the people, in contrast to Congress which represents local state interests.

Finally, there is the "Cleveland" conception which shuttles between the other two. The president is seen as more defensive, negative, reactive, utilizing veto power as a weapon.

Furthermore, Dr. Young's lectures emphasized that the presidency is influenced by incumbents and by social conditions such as the nomination process, the vagueness and ambiguity of the U. S. Constitution, by conditions of crisis or emergencies such as a war or the Great Depression, and the rise of the United States as a world power participating in

international political events.³⁷ The public's concept of the presidency may be one of national symbolism, while the political scientist may see presidential interpretations of the role and power of the office as a great influence on how it is shaped by incumbents.

Expectations of the Presidency

We may have different conceptions of the presidency and set a wide range of expectations for the office. We may see it as a fluid one influenced towards change by the individuals occupying it and by the changing of events. Yet, the office of the presidency had its beginning within the narrow confines of the Constitution.

Article I of the Constitution gives the president veto power over legislation while Article II spells out in very general terms the powers of the presidency. The elected official is required to take the following oath, "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."³⁸ The president is to be the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, have power to make treaties, appoint Ambassadors, Judges, and other Officers of the United

³⁷Roy Young, Lecture notes on conceptions of the presidency, Fall 1990, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.

³⁸Constitution, art. II, sec. 1.

States with the consent of Congress. It goes on to say that the president shall "from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the Union, and recommend for their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient . . . shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. . . ." ³⁹

According to Barbara Hinckley, the phrase about giving Congress information on the state of the Union has been used by presidents as "justification for submitting entire legislative programs to Congress and working to get their favored measures passed." ⁴⁰ Hinckley blames the openness of the Constitutional language as the reason for the growth in presidential authority and in the power the office holds due to "precedents that have been established, and from the resulting expectations about the office held by the public and Congress." ⁴¹

Stephen Wayne would concur with Hinckley that the presidency has been stretched beyond original considerations, and the expected presidential leadership has come to include playing the part of legislator. He says,

the framers had wanted to provide for the contingencies of government, not substitute in the long run and on a regular basis for congressional hegemony over domestic policy making. It is clear that the original design was intended to give Congress the legislative authority that

³⁹Ibid., sec. 3.

⁴⁰Barbara Hinckley, Problems of the Presidency (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1985), 6.

⁴¹Ibid., 13.

was, in fact, the power to determine national policy. The president had the capacity to stimulate the recommendations and to constrain or even negate it by his veto but not to assume it by virtue of any inherent or implied executive or legislative power.⁴²

Other writers would say that Congress has come up with many ways to diminish the presidency's powers. Examples are the War Powers Act of 1973, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974, and the numerous regulatory commissions which have been set up to control various functions of governmental activity such as the Interstate Commerce, the Federal Trade and the Securities and Exchange Commissions. Yet our expectations of the presidency are accountability and leadership which produces results.

Thomas Cronin says that a social issue such as crime in the streets may be a campaign promise by a candidate to find answers and solutions, but in reality, such promises are "quite out of proportion to presidential ability to effect solutions."⁴³ The public expects the presidency to produce results on national issues such as crime prevention, unfair taxation, no guarantee of medical care for the elderly and the poor, or the basic needs of its citizens such as food and shelter. Therefore we look to the one person in the presidency to give direction, provide leadership, and to produce results. When this does not happen we blame the lack

⁴²Stephen J. Wayne, The Legislative Presidency (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1978), 7.

⁴³Thomas E. Cronin, The State of The Presidency (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), 9.

of presidential leadership instead of ousting an ineffectual Congress and supporting qualified candidates for elected positions including the presidency.

Barbara Kellerman points out that we expect presidents to be skilled leaders on everything from "clean air to neutron bombs." She says we expect this person to be "skilled as a backslapper and military tactician; have moral fiber, vision, ambition, energy, brains, craftiness, and decency."⁴⁴ Burns would add to this list his own version of expected leadership with a "clear ordering of priorities, a well-formulated set of goals, and an explicit marshaling of ends and means."⁴⁵

Shaping the Presidency

Most people would recognize that there was a significant and permanent change in the presidency during Franklin Roosevelt's tenure. The office is now looked upon as the initiator of a legislative agenda for the Congress. One member of Congress allegedly told an Eisenhower staffer that it was the presidency's duty to draft the bills and it was Congress' job to "work them over."⁴⁶

With the presidency expected to set the agenda for the current session of Congress, it has become necessary for a

⁴⁴Kellerman, The Political Presidency, 13.

⁴⁵Burns, The Power to Lead, 34.

⁴⁶Richard Pious, The American Presidency (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1979), 148.

president to give early directive leadership to Congress. If this does not happen, the president is the one who gets the blame. The president must seize upon the most driving issues of the day and build a vision for the country and Congress. Jimmy Carter was criticized extensively for not doing this very thing. Burns says that Carter changed the course of his policy so often that the Democratic Congress did not know what he saw as top priority and thus could not work with him to make his legislation become reality.

Writers such as James David Barber and Richard Pious have suggested that the personal character of the president is the most important factor in shaping the presidency. Earlier we saw how an incumbent's conception of the powers of the office has influenced the presidency. Barber has gone so far as to categorize presidential characters into four types: active-positive, active-negative, passive-positive, and passive-negative.⁴⁷ He claims that how a president has oriented himself to life in the early stages affects the view of himself and thus how he reacts to such things as criticism and how rational a thinker he is and how well he learns from experiences. (This correlates well with Warren Bennis' ideas discussed earlier.)

Barber says that the active-positive personality type is one of energy, enjoys doing the job, adjusts well to new

⁴⁷James David Barber, The Presidential Character (Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1985), 9-10.

situations, and feels confident. To him, this type is best suited for the presidency. FDR, Truman, Kennedy, Ford, Carter, and Bush all fall into this category according to Edwards and Wayne in Presidential Leadership. That is not to say they will be successful as a national leader, but that these types of presidents shape the office to be one of high energy. Thomas Cronin calls them "power maximizers." He says they enlarge the office so they "can better provide economic, military, or other kinds of leadership."⁴⁸ FDR was viewed as a president who was not afraid of failure, who would listen to new ideas and who was willing to take chances with proposed legislation. The category in Barber's list which might be seen as the most detrimental to the presidency is the active-negative type. This type of person will tenaciously hold on to an idea or plan long after it should have been abandoned. Examples cited are Lyndon Johnson with the Vietnam war, and Richard Nixon with Watergate.

In The Political Presidency Barbara Kellerman indicates that the social exchange capabilities of the individual in the presidency are paramount to success and the extraverted personality is better equipped with the necessary social skills. Social extraversion means the President is able to "maneuver from within the world of other people" with a high level of energy.⁴⁹ The introverted person, on the other

⁴⁸Cronin, Rethinking The Presidency, preface.

⁴⁹Kellerman, The Political Presidency, 42.

hand, would usually depend on a small circle of people for interaction politically and socially. Lyndon Johnson would be an example of the extraverted personality while Nixon and Carter would be classified as introverts.

Kellerman indicates that the extraverted president will have an advantage politically over the introvert when it comes to getting results from Congress and other political groups (known as the political elite). An extreme of either personality will have an impact on the presidency while the individual is in the office.

Another view suggested by Kellerman is that the structure of the political environment impacts the shape of the presidency through the national character. In a chart titled The General Influences on the Nature of Political Skill, she says that such things as prevailing ideology, politics, socioeconomic structure, and patterns of interpersonal relations all impact the national character which influences or shapes the political culture and thus the political skills needed to function successfully in the presidency.⁵⁰ Whether it is from erosion of the legislative powers, presidential personal character types, or the changing national character, the presidency demands a leader with a variety of leadership skills.

⁵⁰Ibid., 33.

Types of Leadership Demanded by the Office of the Presidency

At this time a review of several writers and their ideas of what the office of the presidency demands in regard to leadership skills is in order. James MacGregor Burns proposes his transactional leadership style as one needed in the presidency. This type of leadership allows for what he calls "brokers, persuaders, and manipulators."⁵¹ He uses Carter as a negative example and says that the leadership skills needed in the presidential campaigning (which Carter used so successfully) are not the same skills needed in the presidency; one cannot depend on personality and one must be a relationship builder. Burns sees a successful presidency as one which builds broad policy coalitions, mobilizes continued support, and controls policy to produce results on the current problems most worrisome to the nation.

Barbara Kellerman has a list of leadership skills in The Political Presidency which she sees as vital to the presidency. According to Kellerman a president must use the cabinet members as "foot soldiers on behalf of presidential programs."⁵² Building personal relationships is essential, while being able to bargain, arm twist, and compromise (a good example here is LBJ) are also required skills. The president also must know when and how to do favors for supporters and perform various social courtesies such as

⁵¹Burns, The Power to Lead, 42.

⁵²Kellerman, The Political Presidency, 36.

invitations to the White House or Camp David. She also notes that the ability to detach oneself from perceived failures (an example might be Kennedy and the Cuban crisis), and when to apply pressure to outside sources (such as Kennedy and the civil rights issue) are skills which must be part of the president's abilities.

Paul Charles Light states in The President's Agenda to move from a no-win presidency to a winning presidency the president must "plan ahead, hire expertise, set priorities, and don't be an amateur."⁵³ Light purports that strategic planning is essential for success and that campaign time should be used to make plans such as a legislative agenda. He goes on to say instead of rewarding people who proved their loyalty during the campaign with appointments, the president should seek out experts as advisors and for appointments to vital sources of information such as the Office of Management and Budget.⁵⁴ Just as necessary, is the ability to set the legislative priorities as quickly as possible to give direction to Congress. Finally, Light feels that those who occupy the office of the presidency should be experienced in the workings of the Federal government. He says good candidates should come from Congress or the Vice-Presidency so they will understand the political process and

⁵³Paul Charles Light, The President's Agenda (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), 226.

⁵⁴Ibid., 228-229.

the Federal level which he says is very different from experience in State government.

In The State of the Presidency Thomas E. Cronin has a chart on the job description of what he calls the modern presidency. The chart lists six skills which must be applied to three "subpresidencies" identified as Foreign Policy and National Security, Aggregate Economics, and Domestic Policy and Problems. The leadership skills are: 1) symbolic leadership, 2) priority setting and program design, 3) crisis management, 4) legislative and political coalition building, 5) program implementation and evaluation, and 6) oversight of government routines.⁵⁵

Cronin says that this presidential job description is impossible for one person or even one office. Cronin concludes that the "essence of presidential leadership is the intricate relating of each aspect of the presidential job to the others."⁵⁶ In Cronin's analysis, the office of the presidency "must understand complex organizational systems and know how to operate effectively with and through numerous bureaucracies at all levels of government."⁵⁷ Neustadt would agree with Cronin in that one of the most important leadership skills is the power to persuade. This equates to the power to bargain or to give-and-take in working through

⁵⁵Cronin, The State of the Presidency, 251.

⁵⁶Ibid., 258.

⁵⁷Ibid., 11, 14.

and with all the political influences impacting the presidency. Neustadt concludes that the presidency now "controls the most encompassing array of vantage points in the American Political system."⁵⁸

Keeping in mind the leadership skills demanded by the office of the presidency, we shall look at some examples of these skills in action. Crisis situations such as offensive missiles in Cuba (Kennedy) or the recent Gulf War (Bush) are usually times when the president is under great pressure to act swiftly, so the usual politicking skills do not apply. During crisis management a president with an active-positive personality would have the type of personality best suited for adjusting quickly to changes in situations. The president should also have the ability to mobilize continued support from the public, and must have built good relationships within the political elite which will provide support during the crisis management.

On the domestic side, Lyndon Johnson is an example of a leader who knew the sources available to him and he knew how to use them expertly. In his fight to get anti-poverty legislation passed in Congress, Johnson made visible the issue of the poor to the public as a first step and then proceeded to convince the political elite of the value of his program. He had a vision of what he wanted and held that

⁵⁸Neustadt, Presidential Power, 27.

vision constant as he demonstrated to his followers that he was in command and under control. He used political skills such as educating the public and the political elite, persuading Congress to go along with his plan, compromising when needed, timing his legislation shortly after Kennedy's death, and using his staff to do all the leg work and follow-through on the details.

During Nixon's failed attempt to get the Family Assistance Plan through Congress, he did many things politically wrong such as not giving his plan consistently high priority, but the one thing he did was seek out professional advice--he talked to the experts. Jimmy Carter grasped his role as educator of the public on his energy plan. Reagan knew the only way to get the budget cuts he wanted meant he must have a vision and a strategic plan and stick to it. His plan included "selling his policy to the people and engaging key members of the political elite in two-way influence relationships."⁵⁹ He built a team spirit and kept those closest to him committed to the plan. Included in his political strategy was to be "bold, assertive, and firm rather than timid and yielding."⁶⁰

A final example of a type of leadership prevalent within the presidency is using the tactic of claiming ownership of legislative initiatives which may have been bounced around

⁵⁹Kellerman, The Political Presidency, 245.

⁶⁰Ibid., 247.

Congress for years before becoming a high priority issue or before being passed. One particular recent example was child care legislation. The Act for Better Child Care, or ABC as it was known, had been in the Congressional mill ever since President Nixon vetoed a child care bill in 1971.

Legislation was reintroduced time and time again in Congress with varying versions and authors until it was finally passed as a part of the budget reconciliation process in October, 1990. One year earlier President Bush had threatened to veto such legislation if it remained part of the budget reconciliation. Compromise had to take place in many instances and from all sides before this legislation made it out of Congress. Bush had initiated his own version of a child care bill, and in the end claimed that many of the aspects of the passed bill were part of his own original initiative. Richard Pious calls this tactic "preempting."⁶¹ It is another way of leading within our political system.

Illustrating the Leadership Needs in the Presidency

After a cursory look at the office of the presidency, we may look at the relationship between political leadership skills and what has been stated as traditional leadership characteristics. Barbara Hinckley indicates that the leadership power of the presidency changes with expectations. "With the office essentially undefined . . . the presidency

⁶¹Pious, The American Presidency, 148.

is what people expect it to be . . . and power and limits are defined by these expectations."⁶² Kellerman adds "once a President is in power, the extent to which he is able to exercise leadership . . . depends almost entirely on the quality of his interactions with influential members of the political elite."⁶³ She goes on to say that the vision the president brings to the office is equally as important as the interpersonal skills a president demonstrates. Burns summarizes political leadership:

The essential job of the President, and the classic test of his greatness is to mobilize support within government . . . behind a program that would realize the broader purposes and principles on which the President campaigned for his office.⁶⁴

These are just a few examples of the complexity of the expectations the public holds towards leadership in the presidency. Following is Figure 3.1 which summarizes the various leadership skills needed in the presidency. A comparison of Figures 2.1 and 3.1 will indicate that the office of the presidency expects an extensive and diverse set of leadership skills to be possessed by the person in the White House.

⁶²Barbara Hinckley, The Problems of the Presidency (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1985) 3.

⁶³Kellerman, The Political Presidency, 45.

⁶⁴Burns, The Power to Lead, 157.

FIGURE 3.1 Leadership Skills Needed in the Office of the Presidency

This list consists of a summary by author of the various leadership skills which they feel are specifically needed in the presidency. These skills would be relevant to a male or female president.

James David Barber:

Active-positive type
enjoys job
high energy level
interactive
adjusts well to new situations
feels confident

Thomas Cronin:

Not afraid of failure
Listens to new ideas
Willing to take chances
Symbolizes leadership
Sets priority/designs program
Crisis manager
Coalition building
Implementor
Oversight/overseer
Understands complex systems

Richard Neustadt:

Power to persuade

James MacGregor Burns:

Transformational leader
vision
Transactional leader
persuader
manipulator
coalition builder
mobilizer of support
controls policy
produces results

Barbara Kellerman:

Uses Cabinet members
Bargains
Arm-twists
Compromises
Favors/courtesies
Detach from failures
Interacts w/political elite

Paul Charles Light:

Win-win type
Plans ahead
Hires expertise
Sets priorities
Knowledgeable
Strategic planner
Experienced in government

Sources: James David Barber, The Presidential Character p. 9-10, Barbara Kellerman, The Political Presidency p. 36-42, James MacGregor Burns, The Power to Lead p. 42, Paul Charles Light, The President's Agenda p. 226, Thomas E. Cronin, The State of the Presidency p. 251-258, Richard E. Neustadt, Presidential Power p. 27.

Chapter IV

DEVELOPING A MODEL FOR A WOMAN PRESIDENT

Differences in Leadership Styles

In Figure 2.1 from Chapter II the leadership characteristics identified as more traditional include such items as having a firm mission or goal set in place, the actions of bargaining, accommodating, and manipulating. Also included are a keen mind and decision making skills. Team-building, influencing others, and a passion for leadership were also cited as part of the more traditional characteristics of leadership. Even though these are examples of traditional leadership skills the point must be made that the research literature does not conclude that these skills are only available to males who follow the traditional leadership style or that females do not also possess and use these skills. Most of the literature reviewed observes these skills from the male perspective. The supporting examples used in the literature are usually male political figures or male business executives because there are few female examples to be found.

On the other hand, leadership characteristics such as cooperativeness, intuition, consensus-building, empowerment, and the win-win approach are seen by researchers as more

natural to the female experience. They indicate that a woman has the edge over a man when it comes to what has been identified as "female leadership characteristics" in Figure 2.1. But, again, the writers are not saying that male leaders cannot possess and use these skills. Because of the males' socialization they may find such characteristics more foreign to their nature, whereas, women leaders will use these characteristics continually and comfortably.

Marilyn Loden's research indicates that the male perspective on leadership centers around the traditional military style of command and control. Her male leadership model shows a competitive, win-lose, analytical approach. She says that this leadership style is "alien to the majority of women in our society."⁶⁵ In contrast to the male model, Loden illustrates her female model as one centered around being cooperative, a team builder, intuitive, collaborative, and empathic. In comparing the two models Loden says men tend to be motivated by the "search for rational truth, the practicality and utility of things and ideas, and the desire for power and influence." (Harvard psychologist Carol Gilligan says of her own findings, "men tend to view the world impersonally, through systems of logic and law."⁶⁶) Loden goes on to conclude that for women "there is a higher priority placed on form and harmony . . . a concern for

⁶⁵Marilyn Loden, Feminine Leadership, 27.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, 67-68.

people . . . and [women] seem to be motivated by the desire to help and care for others. . . ."67

Are the Differences Functional and Significant?

We may find the need to ask two questions. One, is the leadership style which appears to be more natural to a woman functional in our society--in business and politics?

Secondly, if all characteristics of leadership are available and used by both male and female leaders, is there any true difference and, if so, is the difference significant? To help answer these questions, let us look at leadership in today's business environment.

Loden sums up what many writers have concluded is needed to be successful in our high-tech, fast-paced society today. She says, "organizations need the interpersonal perspectives, the people orientation that women provide."⁶⁸ Jack Welch, CEO of General Electric, feels that the old paradigm of management must be broken down and room must be made for a new model. He says his company is "breaking apart the executive power structure and passing responsibility down the ranks. . . ."69 This comes from the realization that companies in the '90s are forced into looking for ways to be more productive at less cost. The way leaders are finding that this works is the interactive involvement of the work

⁶⁷Ibid., 66.

⁶⁸Ibid., 149.

⁶⁹Mary Billard, "Do Women Make Better Managers?" Working Women, March 1992, 106.

force. In other words, using a consensus-building and participatory leadership style. James Autry, former president of the magazine group at Meredith Corporation in Des Moines sees this happening in his industry. He says women are quicker to empower others. "Women think of themselves as affiliated with their people--men think of themselves as the boss."⁷⁰ These men would agree that a participative and consensus-building leadership style has found a place in the business model of leadership. Loden also makes the point that the participative leadership approach usually results in people taking ownership in the final decision. An article in Business Week also supports the feminine leadership style in the modern corporation where change is needed to be successful in managing people and in remaining competitive. "Experts say that female personality traits, such as an ability to build consensus and encourage participation, are in demand today. . . ."⁷¹ Mary Billard agrees that a new approach to leadership--a paradigm shift--must happen because the rules of the business world are changing due to global competition which is now the norm in the business environment.

Is the difference between the traditional male-oriented leadership style and a feminine style significant? Loden

⁷⁰Ibid., 107.

⁷¹Laurie Baum, "Corporate Women," Business Week, 22 June 1987, 74.

says that the ideal corporation would be one which supports and encourages both styles. Judy Rosener says we should realize there are possibilities for differences between male and female leadership styles but that we should not forget that many women have made it into the executive offices using the old traditional male-oriented leadership style and that men also use the style more complimentary to the female's socialization. Mary Billard hastens to point out that stereotyping any style as oriented towards male or female is dangerous and may be a "form of sexism, one that will only shackle women to their traditional role as nurturer."⁷²

Still, everyone seems to agree that there is the need for the type of leadership in business and in politics which Marilyn Loden feels is the same as James MacGregor Burns' transforming leadership style. She interprets it as a leadership style which must

consist primarily of facilitating skills that bring out the best thinking within work groups, help to integrate different points of view, and encourage consensus problem-solving.⁷³

These skills correlate well with the participatory style of feminine leadership. A female leader may have the option to choose her style but the evidence indicates that she does have an advantage in the use of some of her more natural

⁷²Mary, Billard, "Do Women Make Better Managers?" 70.

⁷³Marilyn Loden, Feminine Leadership, 54.

skills. These skills are seen as very desirable in the business environment. Are they desirable in politics?

Women in Political Leadership

As of the 1991 elections, the United States Federal Government had 29 women in the House of Representatives out of 535 and only 2 in the Senate out of 100. There are a couple of women governors, some mayors, and a fair number of women in local governments, but we must look elsewhere if we are to find any examples of women who have lead or are leading a country's government. We can recall Indira Gandhi of India, Golda Meir of Israel, Corazon Aquino of the Philippines, Norway's, Gro Harlem Brundtland, and Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain.

Closer to home we can only look at state politics and the U. S. Congress for examples of women in political leadership roles. If you read a summary of Nancy Kassebaum's (Senator from Kansas) political history you will see a woman who feels confident in her abilities, who is willing to take chances, and who is known as a shrewd strategic planner. Carol Bellamy, president of the New York City Council, has been in politics for many years. She "understands the importance of balancing the rational and intuitive approaches [to leadership],"⁷⁴ according to Loden. Also from New York there is, of course, Geraldine Ferraro. She not only served

⁷⁴Ibid., 75.

in the House, but was on the Democratic ticket in 1984 as the Vice-Presidential candidate. Prior to that she served as the Democratic platform chairperson. A 1984 article in Newsweek depicted Ferraro as using some of her leadership skills:

Her strategy as platform chair is to make everyone feel part of the process--then persuade them to leave their special requests out of the document itself . . . she has a seemingly flawless blend of femininity and toughness, savvy and warmth. . . . Gerry knows how to do what the other politicians do--build I.O.U.'s.⁷⁵

It is difficult to find more than a sketchy few examples of the feminine style of leadership in U. S. politics. One reason for this may be contributed to the lack of leadership opportunity in the U. S. Congress for women. Although our initial assumption was that a woman had reached the presidency, the current political arena is still male-dominated territory. The woman in the presidency will most likely find herself dealing with a majority of males in Congress. Equality in Congress is a slow-arriving reality. As states work towards more equality in appointed offices and as laws force these equalities into reality, we are seeing more and more women in state government positions. This may facilitate eventual growth in the number of women in Congress.

We have given examples of women leading in the business world and mentioned a few women in the political world as

⁷⁵Melinda Beck, Gloria Borger, Howard Fineman, and Susan Agrest, "Bridge Over Troubled Waters," Newsweek, 9 April 1984, 36.

illustrations that a woman does have the capability to be a political leader. Additionally, women going into Congress and other political positions are going in more qualified to meet the challenge and become viable leaders. They are well educated and have often already experienced a significant amount of political and social activism. Instead of relying on family connections as a major source of power as did many of the women who preceded them, Irwin Gertzog says,

They have depended upon legal training and intimate elective experiences . . . have relied more upon discernible vocational and political achievements, merits suggesting virtuosity in such political skills as organization, communication, bargaining, and policy expertise.⁷⁶

The first woman in the presidency may be the catalyst which breaks the "glass ceiling" in Congress and expedites equality for women. Equal treatment for women in Congress will require a shift in perception and attitude of the vanguard of male Congress members.

The Challenge

In Sally Helgesen's book, The Female Advantage, she talks about an interview she had with a woman entrepreneur. The woman was looking out the window of her New York office and said, "If women ran the world, we wouldn't have all these ugly phallic towers!" Helgesen asks the obvious question: ". . . but how could we really know if this was true? There

⁷⁶Irwin N. Gertzog, Congressional Women (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1984), 45.

were no cities built by women that could be pointed to as evidence."⁷⁷ There have been no women in the presidency, and therefore, we cannot say without a doubt that a woman can lead this country as well as any man, but there is ample evidence in the business world, in Congress, and around the world, that women can lead; women have the skills and characteristics of a leader. Women are taking their places in local, state, and world governments. They are making an impact in their countries, in local government, and in the U. S. Congress. They are very successful in today's business environment. The ultimate challenge of a woman in the presidency is yet to be realized. At best, we may only speculate on her abilities to lead this nation through tough times domestically and internationally.

The Model for a Woman President

Be assured that a model for a woman president's leadership characteristics will also apply to a male president, but as we have shown, some of the characteristics come more easily or natural for women. Some of the leadership characteristics needed in the presidency are shown here with a commentary on their application by a woman.

⁷⁷Sally Helgesen, The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 6.

A Visionary Leader

To begin with, the model includes a vision or mission. In one sense she (the woman in the presidency) must be transformational in her vision for the nation. It must be a vision that is recognizable as one for the common good. She must communicate her vision effectively to the general public and to the political elite. She must have a passion for the vision and she must transport that passion to the people with an obvious high level of energy. She must set priorities for legislative action which encompasses her long range strategic plan of her vision, and she must not deter from the greater picture.

Her vision may be transformational in scope, yet she must be transactional to the extent that she is able to get results from her legislative direction since she will be judged as a success or failure on the results. To get the desired results which are significant to her vision she must work with the Congress. This will require the most diverse collection of leadership skills.

Transactional Skills

Not forgetting her personal values as a woman, she must use wisely the transactional skills of bargaining, accommodating, manipulating, persuading, and compromising when working with various congressional members on legislation.

Strategic Thinker

There is no doubt that she will have already proven her intellect in many areas, but she will continually have to prove she has a sharp mind. She must demonstrate her ability as a strategic and multidimensional thinker as she deals with a political world crisis similar to Desert Storm or a national crisis such as inflation. She must have proven that she is willing to take chances while able to understand complex systems such as the welfare system and work with those systems' constraints to produce results or to change directions.

Thomas Cronin and Paul Charles Light have said that the skills of strategic planning and understanding complex systems are vital in the presidency. It would seem that any woman who has reached the pinnacle of a country's leadership would serve as an example of women's ability to think strategically and to understand complex systems. An example is Golda Meir who faced a crisis situation when Israel was attacked by Syria and Egypt in 1973. Surely the action she took required strategic planning and understanding of a very complex social and military system.

Crisis Management

One of the greatest concerns of opponents to a woman in the presidency is a concern about how she will act or react under pressure in a crisis. Can a woman take command and

control of a situation? We may look for an example in Corazon Aquino who took over command of her government during a very volatile time. She did not back away from difficult decision-making. Also, Margaret Thatcher moved quickly to dispatch Britain's military forces during the Falklands crisis with Argentina. Norway's Gro Harlem Brundtland acted quickly to bring order to her country's economy after the collapse of oil prices. It is said, "she dazzled both friends and foes with a perilous high-wire act . . ."⁷⁸ which required many tough decisions in a short period of time. Another example of a woman functioning in a crisis management situation is Hanan Mikhail-Ashrawi who has emerged as a respected spokeswoman for the Palestinian peace negotiators.

The Empowerment Characteristic

The female advantage may come with a woman president's willingness to empower others. Instead of the desire to command and control, a woman president may use empowerment in addressing a national crisis such as providing shelter for the homeless or developing a tax reform plan. Although Loden and Rosener have said empowerment is more natural to a woman's style of leadership we have a good example of a male's use of empowerment when Lyndon Johnson gave Sargent Shriver the power to create the Peace Corp. Kellerman, Cronin, and Light would all agree that the ability to let go

⁷⁸Nancy Gibbs, "Norway's Radical Daughter," Time, 25 September 1989, 42.

of power and allow others to make decisions and hold power is sometimes needed in the presidency. One person cannot possibly make all of the necessary decisions. That is why Paul Light emphasizes the importance of a president hiring (appointing) experts. Kellerman says it is imperative that a president use his/her cabinet members during decision-making, and Cronin indicates that a president must be an overseer. As overseer the president is ultimately responsible for decisions which are made, but as an overseer the president may also empower others to act. A positive outcome of empowerment would be ownership and accountability by others for decisions and actions. The negative part of this characteristic would be the need to guard against a perceived (or actual) loss of control. During a military crisis or emergency situation, she would not choose to use this leadership skill to its full extent. She would consult the experts in her Cabinet and on her staff, but would then accept the role of a decision-making Commander-in-Chief.

Building Relationships

Barbara Kellerman indicates in her book that the most important skill in transactional leadership is the ability to build and maintain good working relationships with others. The ability to build strong win-win relationships within the political elite will be one of a female president's greatest assets. She will look for situations where she can

strengthen relationships. She will encourage interaction and participation from the relationships she has built among the elite, and even from those who express dissension. She will not hesitate to seek out the most qualified professional advisors. Additionally, she must be able to mobilize support from the greater population when desired legislation is in trouble in the House or Senate, or when the nation is embroiled in an issue such as Carter faced with the oil shortage. A win-win approach would require discussion, sharing of viewpoints, and creative problem-solving according to Loden. An example of the result of such leadership may be one where the oil companies and the public are both winners in a fuel crisis. It may include a creative solution such as developing alternative fuels and/or transportation.

The Consensus-Building Advantage

Marilyn Loden says that one of the female leadership characteristics is the use of consensus-building. A woman president may use this style of leadership when she has listened to both sides of an issue and knows there is the possibility of a win-win solution which will benefit the common good. An example might be a health care program that allows the free enterprise of the insurance supplier and control of costs for employers who pay much of the health care costs for their employees. Another example may be importing and exporting goods between the U. S. and another

country such as Japan where both countries benefit from mutual sharing in a fair exchange of goods.

Intuition

We have said that women have better intuitive, empathic, and sensing skills than men. Loden says that women have the advantage over men when it comes to using these skills in leadership. These skills may enhance a woman's ability to identify the solution to a major social problem such as proper and affordable health care for the aged. When George Bush was asked how he would implement his quickly presented election-year health care package, his response showed that he had not planned ahead or formulated an idea. With her leadership advantage, a woman president may be forward-thinking in her planning as she senses needs before they become critical.

Charting the Model

A chart of the leadership characteristics which a woman would bring to the presidency shows that she would possess the traditional characteristics found in a transformational and transactional leader plus qualities described as more natural to a woman. See Figure 4.1

=====

FIGURE 4.1

A Leadership Model for a Woman President

- Transformational visionary for the common good.
- Transactional interactive risk taker who produces results.
- Relationship and team builder with the political elite, her Cabinet and staff.
- Consensus-builder and participative decision maker.
- Empowers without losing control; hires and appoints experts.
- Seeker of win-win situations using intuition and creativity with empathy.
- Understands and is experienced in government with high qualifying credentials and high ethical standards.
- Strategic planner who thinks beyond the immediate win-win situations.
- Confident in self without fear of failure, and a passion for the job.
- Crisis manager domestically and internationally as a symbol of the nation's government in action.

Conclusion

This model sounds overwhelming when viewed overall. Of course, not all of the leadership skills discussed will be used on all occasions. One of the most important skills of a leader is to know what skills are needed for a given situation. A woman's socially developed ability to be intuitive and sensing will help her know what skills to use within particular circumstances. Her intuitive ability will also help her to know when to detach herself, and the Executive Branch, from failures and to press forward in a more expedient direction to garnish results. She must be willing and able to adjust to new situations which arise out of the fast-changing developments within the country or internationally. She will have developed long-lasting and vital relationships within the political elite and with other experts which will enable her to be successful in utilizing her more natural leadership skills of consensus-building and empowerment.

The paradigm shift towards political opportunity and equality in the United States for women began with people such as Mary Wollstonecraft and Susan B. Anthony. The shifting of our perceptions and thought processes towards a woman in the highest leadership role in the country has taken small and painful steps towards a greater height. There are

those who say it will be many generations before women experience this political equality, but the reality is that a woman has the leadership skills needed for the office. In fact, many researchers are convinced the feminine leadership style is capable of bringing even more to leadership than the traditional male-oriented style. Thus, the conclusion may be drawn that a woman in the presidency would have an advantage in using the skills she finds more suited to her through socialization.

It will be a challenging road for her to travel since the paradigm shift from the male oriented way of thinking has only begun, but the shift is happening and may be expedited in the near future as it becomes even more clear that a new approach to leadership in government (as in business) is necessary to deal with the needs of the nation and the ever changing political situations around the world.

A column in the Washington Post by Courtland Milloy expounds on what the world (or the United States?) might be like if a woman was in charge.

There would be air bags for all seats in a car and there would be day care not only on the job--but at grocery stores, shopping malls, and doctors' offices.

The degrading and deadly practice of trading sex for crack cocaine would be ended.

Women would address more vexing problems, especially the allocation of scarce resources.

[Military] dollars would be shifted to Aid to Families With Dependent Children, because women understand that babies--not bombs--are the future.

If a woman ruled the world, no child would graduate from high school unable to read, write, count--or think.

The streets of America would be filled with bicycles and Saddam would be choking on his crude.

If women ruled the world, there would be no need for things such as greedy corporate boards and intrusive global police forces, to say nothing of the men who run them. ⁷⁹

⁷⁹Courtland Milloy, "A Woman's World: Better," Washington Post, 4 September 1990.

WORKS CITED

- Barber, James Daniel. The Presidential Character, 3d ed., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1985.
- Barker, Joel Arthur. Discovering The Future: The Business of Paradigms, St. Paul, Mn: ILI Press, 1988.
- Baum, Laurie. "Corporate Women." Business Week, 22 June 1987
- Beck, Melinda, Gloria Borger, Howard Fineman, and Susan Agrest. "Bridge Over Troubled Waters." Newsweek, 9 April 1984.
- Bennis, Warren. On Becoming a Leader. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1989.
- Bethel, Sheila Murray. Making a Difference. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1990.
- Billard, Mary. "Do Women Make Better Managers?" Working Women, March 1992.
- Bluhm, William T., ed. The Paradigm Problem In Political Science. Durham, N. C.: Carolina Academic Press, 1982.
- Burns, James MacGregor. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- _____. The Power to Lead. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.
- Cronin, Thomas E. Rethinking The Presidency. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1982.
- _____. The State of The Presidency. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975.
- Crovitz, L. Gordon and Jeremy A. Rabkin, eds. The Fettered Presidency. Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

- Doyle, James A., and Michele A. Paludi. Sex and Gender, The Human Experience. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1991.
- Edwards, George C. III and Stephen J. Wayne. Presidential Leadership. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne. Myths of Gender. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1985.
- Gertzog, Irwin N. Congressional Women. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1984.
- Gibbs, Nancy. "Norway's Radical Daughter." Time, 25 September 1989.
- Helgesen, Sally. The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- Hinckley, Barbara. Problems of The Presidency. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1985.
- Jensen, Marlene. Women Who Want To Be Boss. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1987.
- Jung, Carl G. Man and his Symbols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1964.
- Kellerman, Barbara. The Political Presidency: Practice of Leadership. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Kelly, Rita Mae, Mary M. Hale, and Jayne Burgess. "Gender and Managerial/Leadership Styles: A Comparison of Arizona Public Administrators." Women & Politics 11 (1991): 19-39.
- Kotter, John P. The Leadership Factor. New York: The Free Press, 1988.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2d ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Leeper, Mark Stephen. "The Impact of Prejudice on Female Candidates: An Experimental Look at Voter Inference." American Politics Quarterly 19 (April 1991): 250-255.
- Light, Paul Charles. The President's Agenda. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

- Loden, Marilyn. Feminine Leadership or How to Succeed in Business Without Being One of the Boys. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Milloy, Courtland. "A Woman's World: Better." Washington Post. 4 September 1990.
- Morrison, Ann M., Randall P. White, and Ellen Van Velsor. Breaking The Glass Ceiling. Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1987.
- Neustadt, Richard E. Presidential Power. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1980.
- Pious, Richard. The American Presidency. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1979.
- Rosener, Judy B. "Ways Women Lead." Harvard Business Review, November-December 1990, 119-125.
- Rowland, Mary. "The Mastermind of a Media Empire," Working Woman, November 1989, 114-120.
- Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc. Men, Women, and Leadership in the American Corporation. New York: Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc., 1990.
- Smith, Hedrick. The Power Game. New York: Ballentine Books, 1988.
- Stineman, Esther. American Political Women. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1980.
- Wayne, Stephen J. The Legislative Presidency. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1978.
- Young, Roy. Lecture notes on conceptions of the presidency, Fall 1990, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.