Power and Gender in the "New View" Public Schools

C. Cryss Brunner and Paul Schumaker

"Power over" (involving social control and domination) is contrasted with "power to" (involving social production and collaboration). Three hypotheses drawn from feminist, democratic, and regime theories are developed and supported by ethnographic research: (a) women are more likely than men to understand power as social production, (b) social fragmentation and stronger forms of democracy in cities are encouraging the use of collaborative power, and (c) the application of collaborative power helps communities achieve policy goals.

Three developments are evident at the intersection of the study of urban politics and women's political studies. First, regime theory has emerged as a leading framework for studying urban politics, and its main premise is that policymaking processes of cities can be analyzed most effectively by focusing less on social control—on how some people exercise "power over" others—and focusing more on social production—on how stable political coalitions can be forged to generate the "power to" accomplish politically significant goals (Stone, 1989). Second, some feminists have argued for a similar reconceptualization of power, suggesting that thinking about power in social-control terms—as "power over"—has been a male preoccupation, but that the life experiences of women more often have prompted them to think of power in social-production terms—as "power to" (Hartsock, 1983). Third, although still underrepresented in positions of power, the number of women holding electoral offices (such as being mayors or city council members) and administrative positions (such as city managers and school superintendents) has increased significantly in recent years (MacManus & Bullock, 1993).

This paper is concerned with possible interrelationships among and implications of these developments. In the next section, we describe and distinguish the concepts of "power over" and "power to" as they have been discussed by analysts of community power and by women political theorists. The second section of this paper describes an ethnographic study of school leaders in a small midwestern community. Here we provide indicators for assessing the power orientations of political leaders. Such assessments are necessary to explore in the next section three questions regarding gender, power, and urban policymaking: (a) Are there significant differences between men and women in their orientations toward power? (b) Are there certain conditions that encourage the selection of women with "power to" orientations as leaders of political regimes? (c) Are persons (especially women) with social-production orientations toward power more effective at achieving significant policy goals than those with social-control orientations toward power? The exploratory nature of this study does not permit definitive answers to these questions, but it does suggest some refinements in regime theory that acknowledge the role that women, acting as collaborative leaders, can play in transforming power relationships in urban policymaking processes.

"Power Over" and "Power To"

The Prevalence of the Social Control Paradigm

In the history of political thought, the concept of power has had a rich variety of meanings (Clegg, 1989, pp. 21–38; Wartenberg, 1990, pp. 17–27), but during this century scholars have sought to give the concept specific and precise formulations to facilitate its scientific analysis. Believing that domination by authorities and obedience by subordinates were important requisites to social action and bureaucratic performance, Max Weber (1924) defined power as the imposition of one's will upon the behavior of others. Bertrand Russell (1938), Harold Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan (1950), Herbert Simon (1953), and Robert Dahl (1961) contributed to a social control paradigm of power that has dominated political science.

For example, Dahl and his associates insisted that power involved control over policy decisions and could be detected and analyzed only by measuring the participation and policy preferences of various actors and determining whose preferences were reflected in the outcomes of concrete political decisions. Even critics of Dahl's behavioral and pluralist approach continued to work within a larger social control paradigm. Bachrach and Baratz (1962) accused Dahl of examining only the "first face" of power (that which is exerted by controlling the resolution of issues in the policymaking process) and ignoring its "second face" (the ability to control the agenda of issues that are regarded as legitimate for political discussion and resolution). Lukes (1974) identified a "third face" of power that Dahl had ignored: the ability of certain actors to control the will (or policy preferences) of other actors. While such innovations and more radical formulations like Foucault's (1977) analysis of "disciplinary power" have generated intense theoretical controversies in political science, they each have continued along the "power over" trajectory that has dominated scientific studies.

The Reintroduction of a Social Production Alternative

While an alternative "power to" trajectory has a long history, Hannah Arendt is perhaps its most prominent modern advocate. For Arendt (1972), politics is more than a matter of domination; it is (or at least could be) a process by which free and equal agents create collective power, the capacity to act in concert to achieve collectively those common goals that individuals cannot achieve for themselves. Politics thus involves acts of communication and cooperation that establish collaborative relationships among people and that enable transformations of problematic social conditions. Power, then, is a capacity that a community of people attain when their acts of communication, cooperation, and collaboration have been successful. According to Nancy Hartsock (1983, pp. 210–229), such understandings of power are evident not only in Arendt but in most women who write about power. Kathleen Jones' (1993) work on "compassionate authority" and Cantor and Bernay's (1992) explication of "WomanPower" are recent efforts to view power in social production terms and to identify such a conception of power as feminine.

However, it is doubtful that "power to" is exclusively a feminine idea. Talcott Parsons (1969), Jurgen Habermas (1986), and Jeffrey Isaac (1992) have developed various aspects of what Thomas Wartenberg (1990) calls "transformative power"—cooperative and collaborative processes that result in a social capacity to

achieve various goals of a community. And in the field of urban politics, Clarence Stone has developed regime theory having as its centerpiece the distinction between "power over" and "power to." According to Stone (1989), comprehensive social control is no longer possible in increasingly fragmented political communities. "To get things done," collective power must emerge from "cooperation among disparate community elements" (Stone, 1989, p. 227).

Because the attainment of such transformative power is problematic, a primary concern of regime theory is the identification of factors that facilitate the emergence of governing regimes having cooperative and collaborative processes that "get things done." Drawing on a suggestion of Bryan Jones (1993) that regime theory should give increased attention to those ideas or "habits of the mind" that influence the emergence of regimes, we propose that the formation of effective regimes is dependent on how political actors and actresses think about power and how they act habitually in political situations. We suggest that regime theory should identify the kinds of people who view power in social production (rather than social control) terms and whose life experiences have engendered the habit of acting as collaborative (rather than controlling) power agents. While many types of people may have such power orientations, feminists suggest that the life experiences of women have made women especially likely to think and act as collaborative leaders, suggesting that the presence of women in central leadership roles of urban regimes may increase their effectiveness.

Differentiating Power Orientations

To study differences in human orientations toward power, clear understandings of "power over" and "power to" are needed. The top half of Table 1 summarizes the conceptual differences between these two notions of power as suggested by the literature we have just discussed. The bottom half of Table 1 suggests some indicators of whether particular people think and act in "power over" or "power to" ways.

In the "power over" conception, power is a property of individuals or groups, and such people have power if they have positions atop hierarchically structured communities and organizations and if they achieve control over their policies and programs. To attain such control, people draw upon various power resources at their disposal, issue unilateral commands, and often employ coercion to attain obedience from subordinates. Having power enables people to secure their personal preferences when decisions are made, to banish from the agenda those issues that threaten their interests, and to control the preferences of other actors, enticing them to want what those with power want, often instilling in them "false consciousness" about their real needs.

In the contrasting "power to" conception, power is a property of the social unit as a whole. The community has power when it produces some social product, such as solving a common problem or attaining a public good. However, particular individuals or groups—even elected and duly appointed leaders—have insufficient power resources to compel others to comply with their will, and thus they have difficulty achieving such products unilaterally. Given the diversity of interests and dispersion of power resources that exist in fragmented social units and the ability of recalcitrant groups to resist collective actions, the community most effectively empowers itself and achieves social production through multilateral discussions, negotiations, and compromise. The diverse members must cooperate as partners to discover mutually emerging problems and new opportunities, to

develop informed preferences about these problems and opportunities, and to search for policies that secure the common good for various groups.

While such conceptual differences in "power over" and "power to" are discussed frequently in the various literature on power, such literature has been less clear about how to operationalize these differences for research purposes. How do we know whether particular people think and act in "power over" or "power to" terms?

Table 1
Distinguishing "Power Over" and "Power To"

Dimension	Power Over	Power To
Conceptual Differences		
Main power agents	Individuals and groups	Social units, communities
Context of application	Hierarchical structures	Fragmented structures
Purpose of applying power	To achieve social control	To achieve social production
Modes of acting	Unilateral	Multilateral
	Command and coerce	Communicate and collaborate
Basis of compliance	Obedience by subordinates	Cooperation of partners
Results of applications in		
Policy formation	Secure personal preferences	Secure common good
Agenda setting	Suppress dangerous issues	Discover emerging problems
Preference formation	Create false consciousness	Achieve informed opinions
Ethnographically Observed Differences		
Overall perceptions of leaders by others	Dictatorial, authoritarian supervisor	Democratic, collaborative, facilitator
Perceived goals of leaders	Task oriented	Community oriented
	To get outcome they want	To get outcome others support
	To get credit for outcomes	To build relationships
	To enhance one's power	To empower others
Method of securing goals	Confront opponents	Build inclusive teams
	Draw on personal talents and resources	Motivate others to contribute their talents and resources
	Unilaterally decide	Decide by consensus or vote
Key resources of leaders	Position atop hierarchy	The aid of others in community
	Command of information	Respect of others
	Ability to control people	Ability to build consensus
	Ability to persuade	Ability to listen and compromise
Key behaviors of leaders	Limit discussion and debate	Seek and listen to diverse views
	Let others know who's boss	Convey importance of others
	Resist policies one opposes	Support policies one questions

An Ethnographic Study of the Public Schools in "New View"

To explore differences in power orientations, we conducted a case study focusing on leaders of the public schools in a rapidly growing midwestern "bedroom community" having 15,000 residents, which we have given the pseudonym of "New View." In 1989, "Mr. Hamilton"—who had been superintendent of schools in New View for 5 years, business manager for the district for several years before that, and a central figure in New View's power structure—retired. Two persons emerged as the primary candidates to be his successor: "Mr. Robinson," who had been assistant superintendent of curriculum and personnel in New View, and "Ms. Osburn," who had been the principal of New View High School. The selection of Ms. (Mary) Osburn and the differences in the power orientations between her and her male predecessor and competitor are the focus of this case study.

Method and Design

Over 1 year was spent in New View, employing nonparticipant and participant observation data collection procedures. Documents and records concerning the hiring of Ms. Osburn and of the major policy issues in the school district preceding and following her selection were reviewed and analyzed. However, the data collected by these methods proved useful largely to corroborate the findings from our primary data collection strategy—nonstandardized interviews with almost 50 participants in the governance of New View schools and informants about school issues. Multiple interviews were conducted with Ms. Osburn, enabling her to react to interpretations of previous interviews, elaborate upon existing understandings, and correct misunderstandings that had emerged. At least two interviews also were conducted with each of 15 members of Ms. Osburn's immediate circle of associates: Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Robinson, members of the board of education, and key coworkers. Interviews also were conducted with 30 informants drawn from four lists of community influentials identified by Floyd Hunter's (1953) "reputational method": (a) 4 women identified as most active and influential in New View school issues, (b) 8 women identified as most active and influential in the New View community as a whole, (c) 7 men identified as most active and influential in New View school issues, and (d) 11 men identified as most active and influential in the New View community as a whole. All of these participants and informants were interviewed using nonstandardized formats on at least two occasions to discuss their perspectives on events surrounding the hiring of Ms. Osburn, their understandings of the policy issues confronting New View schools at that time, their personal conceptions of power, and their perceptions of the power orientations of others. Multiple interviews were conducted to draw upon the understandings and perspectives of each participant (Lather, 1991; Patton, 1980). In brief, such an ethnographic methodology was deemed useful for assessing each person's orientation toward power in his or her own terms while ensuring that these assessments were accurate and reliable.

Assessing Power Orientations

The bottom half of Table 1 presents indicators that can be used to differentiate the power orientations of various people. To illustrate the

ethnographically observed differences in power orientations that were evident in New View, we draw on the interviews, presenting illustrative comments by and about Hamilton, Robinson, and Osburn. These interviews indicate that both Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Robinson acted under a social control model of power and that Ms. Osburn acted under a social production model of power.

As shown in Table 1, those who are oriented to "power over" are perceived as dictatorial, and when they are supervisors of others, they are regarded as authoritarian. In contrast, those who are oriented toward "power to" are perceived as democratic collaborators and facilitators. While both Hamilton and Robinson were considered domineering decisionmakers by all who knew them, Ms. Osburn was viewed as a consensus builder. Informants reported that "she is not confrontational, not frontal," that "she shares authority," and that "she empowers others."

Persons with a "power over" orientation usually are very task-oriented; generally they are perceived as wanting the outcomes of these tasks to reflect their own views and preferences, they want credit for these outcomes, and they hope that such credit will lead to enhanced personal power. Persons with a "power to" orientation also are task-oriented in that they want to solve problems, but compared with those having "power over" orientations, they are more concerned with the affective aspects of social units. Viewing the development of esprit de corps within and attachment to the community as very important, persons with a "power to" orientation seek a decisionmaking process that yields policies that everyone can support, that strengthens rather than weakens interpersonal relations, and that empowers others within the community.

In the New View schools, both Hamilton and Robinson were regarded widely as having particular goals that they wanted to accomplish, and others viewed them as more concerned with achieving their goals than including others. Both Hamilton and Robinson defined power as "the ability to influence people" and thus outcomes. Hamilton allowed that he used his position as superintendent to control policy. While Robinson said that he did not use his position as assistant superintendent to control decisionmaking, he confessed his willingness to rely on his own judgment when difficult decisions had to be made, and he sought to use his successes as an assistant superintendent as a stepping stone to career advancement. In contrast, Ms. Osburn stressed that the school should be "a community" where everyone felt supported and where everyone's participation was valued. She was reported as being involved actively in creating strong lines of communication among everyone, and she wanted credit for successful completion of tasks to be shared widely:

> I've always believed that we win when we quit worrying about who gets the credit. I want the project complete. If it happens by a coalition, then great. I am not interested in claiming that I did such and such. I think, as women, we have always known that we have to work with people to accomplish anything.

To achieve their goals, persons with "power over" orientations draw largely on their own talents and resources, are confrontational with persons who oppose their goals, and usually decide unilaterally (though such decisions often are made within the facade of a democratic process). In contrast, persons with "power to" orientations build inclusive teams to achieve the goals of the community, and they motivate others to contribute their talents and resources to the enterprise.

Instead of making decisions unilaterally, such persons seek consensus among everyone in the community or, if disagreements persist, put decisions to a vote, giving themselves the same single vote provided others. In New View, both Hamilton and Robinson stressed that their power was based on the authority granted to officeholders and on having and controlling information. Some informants talked about methods of intimidation employed by these men, and Robinson confessed his willingness to decide unilaterally when he thought it necessary, while others reported that Hamilton often did the same. In contrast, Ms. Osburn claimed to eschew the authority of office:

> I don't want to be seen in the position of supervisor. You must give
> people the tools to do the job, but you can get out of the picture if you
> train people and give them the tools.

As a superintendent, Osburn refused to act unilaterally, making it clear that all important decisions had to made by those involved.

Perhaps the key behaviors of leaders operating in a command-and-control mode is their impatience with extended discussion of issues and willingness to cut short debate, active resistance to policies that they oppose, and letting others know who's boss. In contrast, leaders operating in a collaborative mode convey to others than they are important members of the community. They do this by seeking out diverse views and listening actively to ideas that differ from their own, and they acquiesce to policies that seem questionable to them but are supported strongly by others. In New View, informants commented frequently on the tendencies of Hamilton and Robinson to "pull rank," "terminate discussion," and resist the initiatives of others. Ms. Osburn, however, was viewed as one who sought consensus and shared authority. Very revealing is her comment that:

> One of the harder things to do is to support a decision that you wouldn't
> have made yourself. Having given someone else the opportunity to
> make it, you need to support them. I think that the decision I make is
> the decision to make decisions collaboratively. Then, I give up the
> right to the final decision. I must support whatever is decided.

In summary, ethnographic research allows for the assessment of the different power orientations of people. Multiple interviews with participants and informants allow researchers to check their own interpretations of comments against the interpretations of others, and triangulating numerous perceptions (based on both self-reports and the assessments of others) ensures reliability of conclusions about particular persons. In some sense, the assessments are "reputational," based on recollections, judgments, and assessments of informants, but participant observation reinforced the validity of these assessments. Observing Ms. Osburn's actual behavior at school board meetings, in conferences with staff, and in various other interactions with students, faculty, staff, and citizens of New View reinforced the conclusion that she not only articulated the language of collaborative leadership and was perceived by others as a collaborative leader, but that she actively exhibited the behaviors of a leader with a "power to" orientation. Thus, ethnographic research enables political scientists to explore various questions about people's power orientations that are relevant to regime theory: (a) Are there gender differences in power orientations? (b) What conditions facilitate the selection of persons with "power to" orientations as leaders in governing

regimes? (c) Are governing regimes having persons with "power to" orientations more likely to achieve policy goals than are regimes led by those with "power over" orientations?

Theorizing About Power Orientations

Gender Differences

Based on the assertions of feminist scholars that women think differently about power than men and on our findings about the different power orientations of Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Robinson, and Ms. Osburn, the first hypothesis we wish to explore here is that men are more likely than women to understand power as a key element of social control, while women are more likely than men to understand power as a means of social production.

A growing number of studies have addressed gender differences in leadership styles of state and federal officials, but such studies do not address directly the power orientations of men and women in local communities, and there is little consensus about broader gender differences in leadership styles. One strand of research suggests that women political leaders adopt "the strategy of acting like boys" (Schlozman, 1990, p. 375), and that women "undercompensate their femininity" when they enter the male-dominated domain of political decisionmaking (King, 1995, p. 89). These studies suggest indirectly that women normally attempt to exercise "power over" in much the same ways that men do because they have been educated similarly and socialized to view politics as competition among competing interests, because selection processes recruit women who accept prevailing ways of thinking about and exercising power, and because women "can only succeed in politics by playing the game as it is currently played" (Verba, 1990, p. 568).

However, a second strand of research suggests that women use their power differently than men. Drawing on Ruddick's (1989) influential study of maternal thinking, Jean Baker Miller (1993) argues that women traditionally have experienced their power by producing change and by empowering others through their roles as mothers and teachers. As Miller puts it, "Women use power all the time, but generally must see it as used for the benefit of others." A woman's identity demands that her power be regarded as neither destructive nor selfish, for fear that she will be abandoned; thus women are encouraged to use their capacities in collaborative ways that serve the needs of broader communities. Studies by Jeane Kirkpatrick and Sue Thomas suggest that women may bring such power orientations to political office. According to Kirkpatrick (1974, pp. 143–145), women in state legislatures are less likely than men to view the legislature as an arena in which various actors compete to secure their own interests, and are more likely to view the legislative process as a search for solutions to public problems and programs that serve the common good. According to Thomas (1994, p. 6), the backgrounds of women legislators (often in community organizations, the helping professions, and family management) enhance their focus "on solving problems for constituents rather than on legislative battles." While neither Kirkpatrick nor Thomas employ the conceptual distinction regarding power stressed here, their research nevertheless suggests that women in positions of authority are more likely than men to act on a social-production, rather than a social-control, conception of power.

Our interviews with others in New View beyond those involved directly in the superintendency revealed an extremely strong link between gender and power orientations. When discussing power with men during our interviews, they spoke most often of the capacity to influence decisions. They tended to stress the resources that one needs to exercise control, such as "position" and "political connections." Most frequently, men stressed that knowledge is power. According to one man, "You influence because you work hard and know more than other people. If I have information and you don't, I have power in that particular area." Men did speak of power as the ability to get things done—a key element of the social-production model of power—and they discussed the desirability of consensus, but relative to women, they were more willing to invoke a command-and-control model of power when they thought consensus-building hindered actual accomplishment. Only one man in our interviews talked about collaboration, and he regarded the need for it as undermining one's power.

Men also claimed that they try not to dominate, pointing to their willingness to consult with others. According to one man, "I must work with others to get things done. Things aren't completely in my control, but I push in that direction. I don't accept 'no'." Another man asserted, "If you cannot persuade people to do what you want, then you use chain-of-command and make them do it." In general, what emerges from these interviews is that men usually view power as the ability to get done what they think ought to be done, but that such ends must be pursued through means that generally are thought to be more democratic than dictatorial. A power wielder must rely on legitimate resources—his office, his allies, his knowledge, his ability to persuade—to gain compliance with his wishes. In short, men tended to view the democratic use of power as using such legitimate resources to achieve their own conception of the common good rather than using their leadership position to facilitate others defining and pursuing the common good collectively.

In contrast, the women we interviewed in New View stressed aspects of the social-production model of power, and most defined power as the ability to get things done with others. They elaborated that such accomplishment involved consensus building, empowering others, enlisting the help of others, motivating others, and being a servant. Compared to men, women did not view power as a quality of particular persons—especially themselves. Rather, they considered it collective action taken as a result of collaboratively made decisions. Most expressed surprise that their names were provided by informants as among New View's top influentials. One typical comment was, "I think more of the responsibility of my position than the power of it." Another woman claimed that power "is teamwork." Various women claimed that important aspects of exercising power included "letting people know that they are important," "communicating with others," "letting others know that their experiences are valued," "listening," "giving rather than taking," "seeking multiple inputs," and "choosing your wars carefully and staying out of battles."

Further evidence of the link between gender and power orientations is forthcoming from a more extensive study of 47 school superintendents throughout the United States (Brunner, in press). Multiple interviews with the 25 male and 22 female superintendents in the sample, triangulated through interviews with two informants in each of their districts, revealed that 60% of the men, but only 9% of the women, had "power over" orientations. Conversely, 77% of the women, but only 24% of the men, had "power to" orientations. (The remaining 16% of the men and 14% of women in the sample had mixed conceptions.)

In short, our interviews in New View and those in the larger study of school superintendents strongly support our first hypothesis. Men seem more likely than women to understand power as an element of social control, while women seem more likely than men to understand power as a means of social production.

Community Fragmentation, Democracy, and Transformative Power

As our second generalization about power orientations, we hypothesize that communities are more receptive to having persons with "power to" orientations in leadership roles as they become more differentiated socially, evolve more dispersed power structures, and develop stronger democratic practices and norms. As communities grow and become fragmented, their citizens increasingly accept the idea that the formation and implementation of public policies that solve community problems require the development and maintenance of regimes having leaders who are committed to using power in a collaborative, rather than controlling, manner. Insofar as women are perceived as oriented toward "power to" while men are perceived as oriented toward "power over," women are increasingly likely to achieve leadership positions within urban regimes.

Regime theory claims that the development of urban regimes that effectively employ transformative power is rooted in social fragmentation and a functional need for policymakers to forge consensus from preexisting differences. However, it is questionable that the mere presence of a need to address the effects of fragmentation always will generate functional institutions and processes. Without criticizing regime theory's emphasis on fragmentation, we believe it also should focus on how communities respond to it. Political communities frequently respond to fragmentation with demands for centralizing and controlling leadership that can reestablish the old social order. However, communities also can respond to fragmentation by seeking "stronger" forms of democracy that facilitate broader public participation aimed at discovering and achieving the common interests of diverse people (Barber, 1984). Establishing governing regimes that contain collaborative leaders who are effective at creating social networks and mobilizing resources to achieve community goals may require that communities respond to fragmentation by seeking stronger democracy and those institutional arrangements that facilitate such democracy.

During the 1980s, New View became increasingly fragmented. Its population grew by more than 50%, and the fact that over 70% of its residents in 1990 had lived elsewhere 5 years earlier is evidence of the changing composition of the community. Whereas 50% of its citizens were natives of the state in 1980, only one-third were natives in 1990. About 20% of the newcomers were minorities. Most new residents also were relatively affluent and highly educated, and they often held social values that challenged the parochialism, traditionalism, and materialism of the old elite. Many of these residents commuted to the metropolitan center, and were less interested in supporting the economic interests of the old elite than in maintaining the aesthetic and environmental amenities of their "bedroom community." Such orientations conflicted with the values of longer-term residents who still worked in the community and supported more aggressive economic growth policies. Such social fragmentation may have contributed to a functional need for collaborative leadership, but the selection of Ms. Osburn was facilitated by changes in the community power structure, in democratic norms, and by democratizing methods for selecting leaders.

First, according to our informants, the selection of Mary Osburn and the development of a new educational regime in New View was facilitated by changes in the community's informal power structure. During the early years of its development, New View had an elitist or centralized power structure, an "old boys' network" that controlled most issues and the appointment of most administrative positions. However, as New View grew and fragmented during the 1980s, it developed a more decentralized, dispersed, or pluralist power structure—a process predicted by such analysts of community power as Trounstine and Christensen (1982). As projected by regime theory, the processes of fragmentation undermined the social control imposed by the previously unified and active power structure. New residents arrived who were unwilling to defer to "the old elite." For example, newcomers elected one of their own for mayor in a write-in campaign, regulations on economic growth were passed, and people outside of the old power structure were appointed increasingly to serve on governing boards. In this context, the power structure of New View became less a unified group that actively "ran the city" and more a diverse collection of individuals who had access to various power resources, who were generally informed about community (and school) issues, and whose cooperation helped accomplish various community goals when that cooperation could be secured. The previous "old boys' network" surely would have taken an interest in the school superintendency and sought to influence the appointment, but that network had more or less dissipated by the late 1980s and no longer stood in the way of Ms. Osburn's appointment. The new, more diverse power structure was less involved in the issue, but its members had little reason to protest the appointment of a woman as superintendent whose collaborative style promised their inclusion as part of New View's educational regime.

Second, our informants suggested that the selection of Mary Osburn and the development of a new regime was facilitated by changing ideas about the proper role of elected officials in urban governance. Specifically, many people came to believe that elected officials can share power with other actors in an urban regime, but that their power must be more than simply "overseeing" a policy process dominated by others. While school boards have extensive formal authority over educational policy, traditionally they have deferred to the professionalism and expertise of the administrative staff. At the time of Mary Osburn's selection, the board of education was led strongly by Mr. Hamilton. He and his staff played a major role in determining the agendas of board meetings. They controlled most of the information that was brought to bear on that agenda. Their recommendations were relatively unequivocal, giving board members few options to choose among. Indeed, the control that Hamilton held over the school board was enhanced by his playing an active role in soliciting board members. Such bureaucratic domination of the governing board was not necessarily undemocratic, because the board formally authorized the superintendent to act as a leader in educational policymaking and because the board could hold him accountable, override his recommendations, and even remove him from office. Nevertheless, policymaking procedures that stress mere formal authorization and accountability of governmental officials are clearly less democratic than those in which effective policymakers are elected representatives who encourage citizen participation and are responsive to citizens' concerns (Schumaker, 1991, pp. 23–29). The discomfort of the New View Board of Education with its largely overseer role can be seen not simply as a desire by board members to replace bureaucratic domination with their own, but rather as an attempt to democratize educational policymaking further. They thought that such democratization required a superintendent who operated

according to a social-production model of power. If the board and the broader public were to play a larger role in policymaking, it made sense to hire a superintendent who sought multiple perspectives on educational problems, who maintained open channels of communication with everyone involved, and who was comfortable supporting proposals that differed from those that she preferred.

Third, the appointment of Mary Osburn and her centrality in New View's educational policymaking regime was facilitated by the creation of a selection committee that was relatively representative and open-minded. In 1989, the school board abandoned the "old boys' network" as a method for hiring top administrative personnel. Procedures involving the aggressive recruitment of highly qualified candidates were developed. Formal qualifications were established that emphasized qualities predicting effectiveness on the job rather than "paper credentials." The appointed selection committee was composed of representatives of the various constituencies that the superintendent would serve. The fact that women comprised half of the selection committee illustrates its representative nature.

In sum, while social fragmentation was an important factor in the development of an educational regime in New View centered on Mary Osburn's collaborative leadership, other factors also were important. Based on our study of New View, we suggest that the emergence of urban regimes having the effective power to address community-wide problems will be enhanced by various factors associated with stronger forms of democracy. Most generally, citizens experiencing social fragmentation must become disillusioned with command-and-control power arrangements, and instead believe that widespread participation is necessary to accommodate the various interests that are affected by the problems that plague their communities. Such disillusionment must prompt them to challenge elite and bureaucratic domination and replace it with more open and inclusive procedures and institutions and with public authorities who are more committed to accommodating styles of leadership. Elected officials must recognize that they should do more than oversee bureaucrats; they should develop their own policies that respond to and reconcile various public constituencies. Additionally, leaders of urban regimes who are committed to exercising transformative power must be selected through processes and institutions that represent and are open to the diversity that exists in the broader community.

The Effectiveness of Collaborative Leadership

As a third generalization about power orientations, we hypothesize that participants with social-production orientations toward power are more likely to achieve politically significant policy goals than are participants with social-control orientations toward power. If women are more likely than men to hold transformative conceptions of power, then the achievement of policy goals will be facilitated by having women play central roles in urban regimes.

This hypothesized effectiveness of collaborative leadership is based on theory and research regarding the increased fragmentation of urban life, and is thus conditional. Centralized command-and-control power structures and practices may be relatively efficient and effective and thus well suited to the pursuit of goals for which there is a preexisting consensus, such as enhancing community wealth (Peterson, 1981), but many issues that arise in more fragmented communities have diverse and controversial goals and thus are poorly addressed through command-and-control techniques. Regime theory claims that achieving significant policy outcomes in the absence of consensus is most likely to occur when regimes

are led by persons who exercise transformative, rather than command-and-control, power (Stone, 1989).

To explore this hypothesis, we examined the effectiveness of Mary Osburn's use of transformative power on two major school issues that arose during Mr. Hamilton's tenure but whose resolution awaited the leadership of Mary Osburn.

The most important and controversial issue in New View during the period of this study was public approval of a bond to finance a new high school. For several years before Ms. Osburn's appointment, the issue had divided the community. Of course, many parents with children in the system favored the new school. Additionally, most members of the governing regime in New View favored passage of the bonds, because the overcrowded conditions at New View High were threatening the growth of the community. Historically, the excellent reputation of its schools had attracted affluent families, but the mobile classrooms around its high school disturbed many potential newcomers. However, voters had rejected two previous proposals, and informants attributed these defeats to resistance to increased property taxes, declining voter confidence in the public schools, and opposition to the proposed location of the school.

Superintendents and other community leaders cannot command and control the public to finance their projects. The process of getting the public to approve bonds involves building a large enough coalition so that the requisite votes are attained. Leaders must attend to what various segments of the voting public want and will support. They need to incorporate various interests and constituencies in developing a proposal that will succeed with a majority of voters. They need a spokesperson who is effective at communicating with various constituencies about how the proposal serves both community-wide needs and the interests of particular groups. In New View, previous bond proposals were neither developed nor promoted in this manner, leading board members to understand the need for a new approach. As one part of that approach, they sought to repackage their bond proposal so that "there was something in it for everyone." As a second part of that approach, they sought a superintendent who would build public confidence in the schools by serving as a bridge between the public and the board, communicating public concerns to the board and explaining to the public how the board's proposal served vital needs of the students.

After her selection, Mary Osburn applied her social production approach to the task. She sought out various constituencies to understand their reservations about the school proposal. She maintained an open-door policy, welcoming the suggestions of all comers. As the administration developed its proposal, she sought consensus among her staff and other constituencies. As the school board considered the proposal, she remained in the background, allowing others to present ideas and findings. Voter approval of the school bonds in 1993 suggests the effectiveness of her social-production approach.

The second most important issue in New View at the time of Ms. Osburn's appointment was the school board's decision to impose unilateral contracts on teachers. Such an approach to dealing with teacher's salaries was deemed necessary by the school board to demonstrate that they, and not the teacher's unions, controlled the schools. Whatever the merits of this policy—which had been implemented at the end of Mr. Hamilton's tenure—it had affected teacher morale negatively throughout the district. Rebuilding teacher morale clearly was not a problem that could be addressed by a domineering superintendent. According to our informants, the collaborative approach that Ms. Osburn brought

to school matters, which involved consulting extensively with teachers, actively affirming their importance, and seeking to empower them in various ways, was effective at alleviating this problem.

In summary, Ms. Osburn's collaborative leadership style was effective at dealing with the two main issues confronting the educational regime in New View. Both men and women informants agreed that she acquired strong support in the community and the public education system, and this support stemmed largely from her definition of power and her effective use of it.

Conclusions

The limited scale of our exploratory study prohibits us from reaching firm conclusions about the interrelationships among conceptions of power, gender, and urban policymaking, but it does provide suggestive evidence in support of our three hypotheses. Men may be relatively inclined to regard power as social control, while women may think more often of power in terms of social production. As communities become more fragmented, they may develop more democratic political norms and practices that facilitate the selection of leaders who are oriented toward and skilled at the exercise of transformative power, and such persons may be most successful in producing policies that address complex social problems.

Our research supports the view of regime theorists that effective policymaking in fragmented urban areas requires the development and maintenance of regimes that produce social power through collaboration and cooperation. Our research extends regime theory by suggesting that women may play especially important roles as collaborative leaders within urban regimes and that social fragmentation must be accompanied by commitments to strong democracy if it is to lead to the development of effective regimes.

If regime theory remains in the early stages of development and verification (Stoker, 1995), our extensions of it are even more preliminary. The differences between men and women in their power orientations should be examined more widely in a variety of political communities and policymaking circumstances. The effectiveness of both men and women who engage in collaborative forms of leadership should be explored in the many kinds of policy issues that confront the modern city. The factors that prompt communities to place collaborative leaders in the center of their urban regimes need further study. We believe that Mary Osburn was thrust into the center of the governing regime of the New View school system by broad social changes involving social fragmentation, opposition to command-and-control power structures, the development of more representative selection committees, and emerging cultural norms holding that democratic development involves selecting leaders who employ transformative, rather than command-and-control, modes of power. However, perhaps the main reason that Mary Osburn acquired her leadership role was simply the desire of the school board for a person it could control more easily. Until further research on such questions is completed, our understanding of the processes that lead to transformations in urban regimes and the kinds of power that are employed by these regimes will remain incomplete.

However, our research does suggest some important possibilities about urban transformation. As our political communities grow and age, they seem to become more heterogeneous and pluralistic; such developments may prompt

changes in ideas and institutions that lead to the selection of leaders who use power in a transformative manner. Thinking about power in the social-production terms emphasized by feminists and exercising the kind of collaborative leadership exhibited by Mary Osburn may lead to the development of urban regimes that achieve public policies solving divisive community problems.

***

C. Cryss Brunner is assistant professor of educational administration at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Related work on women in superintendent roles has appeared in *Journal of School Leadership* (March, 1997), *The Journal of Educational Administration* (forthcoming), and *The Journal for a Just and Caring Education* (forthcoming). Her edited book, *Sacred Dreams: Women and the Superintendency,* is also forthcoming. She is the recipient of the National Academy of Education Spencer Fellowship for 1996–97.

Paul Schumaker is professor of political science at the University of Kansas. His previous work on women in local politics has appeared in such places as *American Journal of Political Science* (November, 1988) and the *Southeastern Political Review* (forthcoming).

Note

References

Arendt, H. (1972). *Crises of the republic: Lying in politics, civil disobedience on violence, thoughts on politics, and revolution.* New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). Two faces of power. *American Political Science Review, 57,* 947–952.

Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brunner, C. C. (in press). The new superintendent supports innovation with collaborative decision-making. *Contemporary Education.*

Cantor, D. W., & Bernay, T. (1992). *Women in power: Secrets of leadership.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of power.* London: Sage.

Dahl, R. A. (1961). *Who governs?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish.* New York, NY: Vintage.

Habermas, J. (1986). Hannah Arendt's communications concept of power. In S. Lukes (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 75–93). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Hartsock, N. C. M. (1983). *Money, sex, and power.* New York, NY: Longman.

Hunter, F. (1953). *Community power structure.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Isaac, J. (1992). Beyond the three faces of power. In T. Wartenberg (Ed.), *Rethinking power* (pp. 32–55). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Jones, B. (1993). Social power and urban regimes. *Urban News, 7,* 1–3.

Jones, K. B. (1993). *Compassionate authority: Democracy and the representation of women.* New York, NY: Routledge.

King, C. S. (1995). Sex-role identity and decision styles: How gender helps explain the paucity of women at the top. In G. Duerst-Lahti & R. M. Kelly (Eds.), *Gender power, leadership, and governance* (pp. 86–104). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Kirkpatrick, J. J. (1974). *Political woman.* New York, NY: Basic.

Lasswell, H. D., & Kaplan, A. (1950). *Power and society.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart.* New York and London: Routledge.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A radical view.* London: Macmillan.

MacManus, S. A., & Bullock, C. S. (1993). Women and racial/ethnic minorities in mayoral and council positions. In *Municipal Yearbook, 1993* (pp. 70–84). Washington, DC: International City Managers Association.

Miller, J. B. (1993). Women and power. In T. Wartenberg (Ed.), *Rethinking power* (pp. 240–248). Albany, NY: State University Press of New York.

Parsons, T. (1969). On the concept of power. In R. Bell, D. Edwards, & R. H. Wagner (Eds.), *Political power: A reader in theory and research* (pp. 251–284). New York, NY: Free Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Peterson, P. (1981). *City limits.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ruddick, S. (1989). *Maternal thinking.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Russell, B. (1938). *Power: A new social analysis.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Schlozman, K. L. (1990). Representing women in Washington: Sisterhood and pressure politics. In L. A. Tilly & P. Gurin (Eds.), *Women, politics, and change* (pp. 339–382). New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Schumaker, P. (1991). *Critical pluralism, democratic performance, and community power.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Simon, H. A. (1953). Notes on the observation and measurement of power. *Journal of Politics, 15*, 500–516.

Stoker, G. (1995). Regime theory and urban politics. In D. Judge, G. Stoker, & H. Wolman (Eds.), *Theories of urban politics* (pp. 54–71). London: Sage.

Stone, C. (1989). *Regime politics.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Thomas, S. (1994). *How women legislate.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Trounstine, P. J., & Christensen, T. (1982). *Movers and shakers: The study of community power.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Verba, S. (1990). Women in American politics. In L. A. Tilly & P. Gurin (Eds.), *Women, politics, and change* (pp. 554–576). New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Wartenberg, T. E. (1990). *The forms of power.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press

Weber, M. (1924). *The theory of social and economic organizations.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.