

*What's Feminism Got to Do With It?:
Women's Leadership for Social Change*

Adele Ramos Salzer Lecture: Newcomb College Institute
Mary K. Trigg
April 7, 2014
Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA



Good evening. I want to begin by thanking Professor Sally Kenney for inviting me to Newcomb College Institute, and to those of you who worked to arrange my visit. I extend my gratitude to the friends and family of Adele Ramos Salzer, whose funding has made my visit possible. I thank Assistant Provost Ann Salzer: your mother seems to have been an incredible woman, and I am honored to be the Salzer lecturer and to share my thoughts on women's leadership and women's education here tonight. Finally, I also want to thank those of you in the audience for coming out to hear me, despite your busy schedules. I look forward especially to the question and answer session later, when I can hear and learn from some of you. In my talk tonight I want to share some of my thoughts on women's leadership, and the relevance that feminism might have for its practice and conceptualization.

I.

I never thought I would find myself teaching or writing about leadership. It is not a concept or practice to which I was naturally drawn as a young person. (Actually, I never considered being a historian, either—yet here I am, a historian of women, a teacher of leadership, and a creator and director of leadership programs.) How this came to be is about serendipity, and the power of role models and mentors—all factors I consider important to leadership development and charting our own paths and journeys as leaders. My change in philosophy is also related to common misperceptions about leadership, both its practice and its meanings. I held misperceptions, and perhaps some of you did in the past as well (or still do). Although this is changing, there are certain ideas and stereotypes associated with the ways people envision leaders. First and most importantly for our shared interests here tonight, we may expect that leaders are male. We may expect that they are older. We may expect that they operate at the helm of organizations or groups, and that their authority radiates downward from the top, in a hierarchical way. We may expect that they are loud, forthright, and dominant. We may expect that they are the ones who know all the answers.

Before I return to these ideas let me begin, if I may, by telling you a little about my own background and experiences. I was told there would be students and young people in the audience, so I address many of my remarks tonight to you. I imagine I was not drawn to leadership as a girl or a young woman because I considered it to be difficult, a natural space for assertive people, those with overweening ambition and a desire to run for class president and later public office. I identified with none of these attributes or goals. I was interested in reading

and books, enjoyed people as well as solitary pursuits, loved learning and education, and was drawn to social change, especially for women. I found my way from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (via Maine and two years at Bates College) to the University of Michigan in the mid-1970s and took a women's studies course—when the field was just beginning—and discovered I was hooked. Women's studies led me to American studies which led me to a Ph.D. program. (There were no Ph.D. programs in women's studies then. There are a number of fine ones now, including one at my own department at Rutgers University.) When I went to Brown University in 1980 for an initial meeting with a potential advisor, a women's historian named Mari Jo Buhle, my ideas about what I wanted to study in graduate school shifted. In that one-hour meeting, this seminal scholar turned my mind on to the excitement and importance of studying American women's history. Although I am certain neither of us considered it at the time, in that meeting she exhibited a kind of intellectual leadership that ignited my own passion. That passion has stayed alive for the thirty plus years since our fateful consultation. Leaders ignite passion in others. And gifted educators can change the life paths of their (our) students, as this wonderful and brilliant woman changed mine.

From Rhode Island and Brown—with my husband and then two young daughters—I next found my way to New Jersey and to Rutgers, and was fortunate enough to have another crucial conversation. When I first met Mary Hartman, she was dean of Douglass College, then the women's college of Rutgers. Coincidentally, Hartman was another pioneering scholar in women's history, publishing one of the very first collections of essays on the subject in 1975, titled *Clio's Consciousness Raised*. Like my first encounter with Mari Jo Buhle, as soon as I met Mary Hartman I knew she was someone with whom I wanted to work, and from whom I could learn a great deal. Part of leadership development is seeking out, and learning from, role models and mentors who inspire us. If you are given the opportunity to work with an amazing person whom you admire, take it. That experience and education might matter as much, or even more than, the content of the work. Mary Hartman had a great passion for women's leadership and women's education. That passion was contagious.

After being dean for fourteen years Mary Hartman decided it was time for her to advance women's education from a different angle, and created an institution at Rutgers that she named the Institute for Women's Leadership. This was in 1991. Mary had a few subversive ideas in mind when she launched the Institute. First, she believed that Rutgers women administrators, faculty, and students would have more power and synergy if they joined together under one collaborative umbrella. When the Institute for Women's Leadership was launched it had two member units—the then women's studies program (now a department, the Department of Women's and Gender Studies) and the Institute for Research on Women. Today, there are nine units within the Institute for Women's Leadership consortium. Founding director Mary Hartman has retired and former Ford Foundation vice president and historian Alison Bernstein is at the helm. We are planning our 25th anniversary celebration for 2016. Institution building like this is another expression of leadership.

Although changing internal university politics is always more difficult in reality than in imagination, it is true that the Institute has given Rutgers women a collective platform, a forum for shared conversations and strategy, and a breeding ground for the entrepreneurial creation of programs and centers to advance women's leadership. I am honored to have been a part of that work. Mary Hartman's second subversive idea—also relevant to the topic of my talk tonight—was that leadership is a canopy under which more students, donors, and supporters would be willing to gather than women's studies. She believed we could draw students and others into

women's studies and women's education through the doorway of leadership. Leadership had been studied in political science and business for many years, and sounded neither dangerous nor feminist. (Even though many of us here know that it can be both.) Indeed, the question of what feminism has to do with women's leadership is at the heart of my talk tonight. Couldn't we draw students from the sciences, business, social sciences and humanities together under the innocuous label of leadership and introduce them to gender as a lens for viewing—and changing—the world?

II.

Mary Hartman hired me in 1998 (I was already at Rutgers teaching in the women's studies program) to direct a newly created certificate program in women's leadership, which is similar to your Newcomb Scholars Program. Called the Leadership Scholars Certificate Program, ours is a nineteen-credit, two-year program that combines seminars in women's and gender studies with a practicum that includes an internship and social action project. I have directed the program for the past fifteen years. It too has subversive potential, in the same way that women's colleges and all-female institutions have always had subversive potential. They aim to educate and develop women leaders who can contribute to society, and in our case we have been explicit that we hope to develop women leaders who are committed to social change.

The Institute for Women's Leadership at Rutgers strives to actualize a vision of leadership that has been articulated in feminist thought, but rarely realized. As founding director Mary Hartman has stated: "Women's leadership does not begin with the world 'out there' and with attempts to educate women to become equal players in existing political, social, and economic structures. Instead, through approaches rooted in women's and gender studies, it encourages women and men alike to perceive the world differently, to become capable of making different judgments because their view of the world includes a more complete picture of women." This is a feminist goal and the philosophy fueling the creation and mission of the Leadership Scholars Program.

One of the highlights of my experience directing the program has been the opportunity to work with my former students on an anthology titled *Leading the Way: Young Women's Activism for Social Change*, which was published by Rutgers University Press in 2010. *Leading the Way* considers how we think about and define leadership, women's leadership, and leadership for social change. The book is a collection of twenty-one essays by young women in their twenties, representing the Millennial Generation. I noticed that these inspiring young women (my students)—many of them first generation college students, immigrants, and/or women of color—were practicing leadership in diverse sites. They were also taking what appeared to me to be a feminist approach to leadership. I was moved to share their autobiographical and leadership stories with a broader audience. Professor Kenney told me that she has used the book in teaching the second year seminar in the Newcomb Scholars Program, which is most gratifying. So perhaps some of you have read it. For those of you who have not, I want to spend a little time talking about the stories, and leadership journeys, of these young women.

Although the wave metaphor that charts the history of U.S. feminism has been criticized and may be reconceptualized by scholars, a number of the contributors to the book placed themselves within this continuum and considered the ways that third wave (or contemporary) feminism differs from earlier understandings of feminism. For example, in considering her decision to apply her undergraduate women's studies major to a career in nursing, one author stated: "Third wave feminism has not taken a stand on nursing specifically, but in general this

generation of feminists is more inclusive of women making radical *or* traditional decisions for themselves, including the decision to parent or in this case to choose a field of work that is still dominated by women.” Another perceptive author noted the more inclusive nature of youthful feminism: “We remain trapped in the feminist agendas and acts of the past, unable (and perhaps unwilling) to step outside the tactics and styles of our predecessors and develop our own...As a new generation, we must cease to be controlled by the media, by the generation gap, and wider society as a whole. We must define our own feminisms, our own ways of acting as feminists as more inclusive, individual, and personal.”

What were the sites of leadership where these young women were operating? The ways in which women in their twenties are expanding the issues, bringing a global and multicultural perspective to them, and enlarging what we consider to be leadership work, is central. Those writing described political campaign work, health education and the crafting of health policy, anti-poverty work, nursing, human rights activism, music scholarship, filmmaking, independent media, urban education, gay marriage advocacy, and the development of work/life policies in corporations as sites for leadership and, significantly, sites for feminism. One author asserted: “As I read more and more accounts by third wave feminists, I am drawn to a common message: we need to stop questioning what is and is not true feminist activism, what counts and what doesn’t count, which acts are the most important and which don’t matter at all. We need to ignore charges that young women (and our generation as a whole) are inward-looking slackers, and follow our own passions, whether they fit into the socially constructed boxes of ‘feminist action’ and ‘social change’ or not.”

These rousing young women reject the media-fueled conflicts between younger and older women. Instead they are interested in and appreciative of mentors: they point to the importance of role models of earlier generations in helping them learn who they are, and who they can become. These include their mothers, grandmothers, internship supervisors, professional colleagues, professors, writers, scholars, and public and historical figures. They are watching the women around them closely, to see what is possible, how far they can strive, how they should define success. They demonstrate the ways in which contemporary young women like yourselves are reaching not just across differences of race, class, and communities, but also working with, and learning from, women of other generations. Although not without their challenges, I believe the voices of these young Rutgers alumnae articulate new ways we can envision and define twenty-first century women’s leadership. One way to do this is by expanding our notion of what we consider leadership to be. One of the contributors suggested that leadership must include social roles that do not involve titles, money, or power. When thinking about women’s leadership in particular, the definition must make room for the ways that mothers, sisters, grandmothers (and first ladies) have been organizing their families, and communities throughout history. We should be able to apply the term to teaching fifth grade classes, balancing the family checkbook, demanding a cross walk at a dangerous school crossing, or increasing profit margins of a corporation.

In addition to an exploration of women’s leadership, these authors also write about women’s studies, the potential and power that the women’s studies classroom has to open eyes, change consciousness, and transform lives. In educating high school and college students about the history of feminism, the efforts that have gone into securing hard-fought gains are often assumed as givens, and the inequities that women continue to face nationally and globally overlooked. Women’s studies has reshaped the ways that young women (and men) live their lives, make choices, and perceive themselves as actors in the world. A former finance major

described taking a women's studies class as a sophomore because it would fill an elective requirement and she thought it would be an easy "A." Instead she found it to be a pivotal experience in her undergraduate education: "it taught me a great deal about women's rights and gender differences that I never heard in history classes or on the news," Megan Pinand writes. "I left the semester with many questions around the status of women in this county, how they are treated in the workplace, and how they are treated in their home lives." Another contributor recalls first understanding feminism, and herself, in a women's studies class that was offered by her progressive suburban high school. In "Practicing Leadership: The Unexpected Plunge into Politics," this contributor writes of her awakening and the memorable high school teacher who inspired it. "She was the one who taught me the fundamental meaning of feminism: the belief that men and women should be considered equal: financially, professionally, politically and socially....While learning about women's suffrage, the first and second wave feminist movements, and how that applied to current events, I found my niche. I realized that I didn't have an attitude problem; I just had a different attitude."

Now physician and immigrant rights activist Carol Mendez, who was born in Colombia and immigrated to the United States at age two, describes feminism providing her with an expression and a unifying concept for the ideals that had guided her throughout her life. "I did not know what the term feminism meant until I went to college and sat in weekly discussions with other IWL scholars. I always believed in equality, fair treatment for all and social justice. However, in those weekly discussions I was able to place a name and a scholarly theory behind the values that had been driving my life for as long as I could remember. It was feminism that empowered me and allowed me to analyze my life, the life of my family, and the women I wanted to serve and strengthen in my community."

These young authors describe women's leadership in multiple and inclusive ways: as collaborative, community-based, intergenerational, and fueled by passion and humility. A collaborative model of leadership involves teamwork, affiliating and cooperating with others, and learning from those whom programs and initiatives intend to serve. These contributors believe that leadership should be linked to action and social change, and connected to the real lives and circumstances of people. At the same time, they recognize that leadership requires specific skills—a few they name include public speaking, listening, self-reflection, modeling, mentoring, collaborating with local knowledge, fundraising, and organizing a group—and that a multitude of activities can be considered leadership, from conducting interviews, research and writing, to building consensus and contributing to social movements and organizations. One author concluded from her research on dislocated Iraqi youth: "I learned that leadership often means knowing when to take an active role in informing others and when to actively learn from others." An urban high school teacher who wrote for the volume agrees that leadership often requires more humility than hubris. "Being a leader does not mean knowing everything all at once," she writes. "It doesn't even mean you will always have the answers. Much of the time you may never have the "right" answers, however leadership means being willing to take risks by putting yourself out there, even if it means not getting it right the first few times you try."

The new models of leadership these Rutgers graduates propose involve bridging differences of all kinds that separate us. "In addition to being able to empathize," one wrote, "wanting to be a social change agent also includes a shift from living solely for self-preservation to working for the preservation of the community, as we grow to see these as inextricable from each other." This is a hopeful image of future leadership that challenges traditional, masculine notions of leadership which often center on the acquisition and leverage of power, authority,

resources, and that celebrate the cult of the individual. These authors suggest that leadership looks different when women practice it, and that gender can be a powerful element in viewing and changing the world.

These twenty-somethings are asking new and different kinds of questions about leadership. If activists do not belong to a particular community, should they join and play leadership roles in an organization that represents that community? Must a leader hold a formal position or title within an organization? Must leaders have a staff or a following? Must they produce something quantifiable like money or laws? Must they be well known? What is the best way to enact leadership for social change? Is it by reshaping existing social institutions by entering and eventually transforming them, or is it by working for change from outside of the mainstream? Is it possible to pursue both approaches at once?

III.

At the same time that I was learning about leadership from my Rutgers students, I was working on a second book manuscript, a collective biography of four American women who were feminists in the early twentieth century. They were all courageous path breakers who believed in the advancement of women, but they exhibited their leadership in a diversity of ways. One was a historian who wrote books that changed minds. A second was a psychologist who was also an author, and aimed to transform the individual psyche as well as the ways the culture thought about women, work, and family. A third was a best-selling novelist who began a woman's suffrage organization for college graduates and realized the importance of involving young women in this historic movement for social change. Only the fourth was someone we might immediately consider a "leader"—she was a guiding light in the National Woman's Party for many years, headed the Inter American Commission of Women for over a decade—and was gifted in organizing and leading symbolic acts of activism that changed people's consciousness about women's rights. All four used their personal lives as "laboratories" to explore and critique social norms about female sexuality, marriage, and motherhood. When I began the book, I had no intention of writing about women's leadership. I was simply interested in the history of feminism in the United States in the years after woman suffrage was won in 1920 and before the commonly understood rebirth of feminism in the late 1960s and 1970s. By the time I was well into the book, I knew it was about leadership as well and the different social locations for leadership. Feminism is one of them.

The story of so-called "leaders" has served as a major motif in history. Part of the rewriting of history in the 1970s and 1980s by scholars like my own two mentors whom I described earlier was to critique the "Great White Man" model of U.S. history. Feminist and women's historians aimed to reinsert women and their myriad contributions into the historical canon, and also to challenge the top down, hierarchal way that history had traditionally been told. Social historians and women's historians investigated the lives of slaves, poor women, immigrants, mothers, and factory workers, the disenfranchised and powerless, along with policy makers, war commanders, and the powerful. Part of what they argued is that women have been acting and leading through the centuries, in a variety of contexts, both inside and outside the home.

But if women have been leading for centuries, why is there concern about the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions? Why do we need leadership programs for women, like the Newcomb Scholars Program and the Leadership Scholars Program? And what's feminism got to do with it? After all, in the U.S., women now outnumber men on college

campuses, and their labor force participation rates are approaching men's (58% to 70%). We had a viable female candidate, Hilary Clinton, in the historic 2008 presidential election, who may again be a candidate in 2016. There are five women governors in the U.S. in 2014. Women are currently presidents and prime ministers of 19 countries around the world, including Germany, Brazil, South Korea, Liberia, Argentina, and Costa Rica.

Yet there is still a long road ahead to gender parity. According to the United Nations, a disproportionate percentage of the 1.3 billion people in poverty worldwide are women. Only 18.5% of the U.S. Congress is women; half of lawyers may be women, but fewer than 20% are partners; women still earn only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men. As I recently heard House minority leader Nancy Pelosi say, this means that women work the first three months of the year for essentially no pay. Why are we still there? In my home state of New Jersey, women are only 17% of board of director members among Fortune 500 companies headquartered there.

One of the most basic, least threatening definitions of feminism has to do with this issue of equal access. According to Merriam-Webster's dictionary, feminism is defined as "the belief that men and women should have equal rights and opportunities; and also: "organized activity in support of women's rights and interests." I echo the call for the importance of a twenty-first century feminism that addresses the lack of women in leadership positions. In their book *Catching a Wave: Reclaiming Feminism for the 21st Century*, editors Rory Dicker and Alison Piepmeier write, "The scarcity of highly placed women in university administrations, corporate America, and government—to name only the most obvious institutions—demonstrates our very real need for continued feminist activism." To identify as a feminist could mean the kiss of death for individual women leaders, whether heads of corporations or aspirants for elective office. But advocating feminist goals can be a very different matter.

Studies about the lack of gender parity in the United States suggest that the reasons for this are linked to multiple factors including women's greater responsibility for family and care giving; policies that make leadership more difficult for women to achieve; and often unconscious stereotypes and biases that equate leadership with men's abilities and attributes. The problem isn't that women haven't been leading (in informal, grass-roots community settings or in their role in families). The problem is that they haven't made their way into enough of the public arenas where far-reaching decisions are made that affect their lives and the future direction of societies. Studies also show that many women do not seek leadership roles. Some scholars and journalists suggest that young, college-educated women are choosing not to move in traditional leadership directions because the pressured, often brutal environments of political life or corporate leadership are simply not appealing to them. In addition, women are more likely than men to want to balance career and family.

Yet we probably would not be here tonight if we did not believe that the leadership of women matters, that it might even be a vital, untapped resource for society and the world. Why do we need women leaders? We need women leaders because their leadership can be an essential source for change in a world that desperately needs it. As Charlotte Bunch, founding director of Rutgers' Center for Women's Global Leadership has noted, women bring new perspectives and values to the table that can revitalize and transform debates. New models of leadership, such as those described by the young women authors in *Leading the Way*, often challenge stereotypes about leadership and enable men and women to consider new ways of exercising power. Women in leadership positions can change the structure and culture of organizations. We also need women leaders because women's life experiences are distinct, and research demonstrates they

are more likely to consider the impact that policies have on women. Women in elective office influence public policy to include women and children's interests and represent their needs.

Two very recent examples demonstrate this, and if I can digress I would like to describe them. There has been an effort over the past decade to build a national women's history museum on or near the National Mall in Washington, D.C. Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York first proposed the project in the late 1990s. Although several bills have been brought before Congress to advance the effort, all have been either blocked or voted down. But now the initiative has been given new life by a declaration of support from the House majority leader Eric Cantor and, significantly, the ascension of women to key committee posts in the Senate. Two women—Representative Maloney, a Democrat, and Representative Marsha Blackburn of Tennessee, a Republican, are the main sponsors of a bill that would authorize exploration of a site for the museum. Your own Senator Mary L. Landrieu of Louisiana is a long time co-sponsor of the bill, and she is now in a powerful position leading the Energy Committee, which gives her even more clout. Women in leadership positions can advocate for women's issues and women's rights. Although not without its critics, a national museum of women's history would serve as an inspiration to future generations of girls and women, and if it is realized, it is women who will raise the funding and steer the legislation to victory.

I would like to share a second current example of women leaders influencing debates that affect the health, lives, aspirations, and opportunities of women. Two weeks ago the U.S. Supreme Court heard the argument in the Hobby Lobby case. Briefly, the Affordable Care Act requires employers who provide health insurance to their employees to include coverage for contraception. The owners of Hobby Lobby, a large privately held chain of stores, regard certain kinds of birth control (like the I.U.D. and morning-after pills) as forms of abortion, which is against their religious principles. The court took up the question: Does the employees' right to choose and obtain birth control trump the employers' right to religious freedom? There are now three women Justices on the Supreme Court—Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Sonia Sotomayor, and Elena Kagan. The three women Justices left little doubt where they stood on the issue. They dominated the questioning of the attorney for Hobby Lobby, and they considered the case from the perspective of the women employees. They regarded the employer as the party with the money and the power. Elena Kagan, for example, stated, "Congress has made a judgment and Congress has given a statutory entitlement and that entitlement is to women and includes contraceptive coverage. And when the employer says, 'No, I don't want to give that,' that woman is quite directly, quite tangibly harmed." Although this case will not be decided until the end of June and its outcome is far from certain, it is significant that the women on the court (who make up one-third of the nine justices: it takes five votes to win a case) spoke with a united voice on a topic which primarily affects the lives of women. When we remember that women in most states did not even have the right to vote in our country until 1920, and in 1927, only nineteen states allowed women the right to serve on juries, the progress that has been made is astounding. But there is much that we have yet to achieve.

It is important to note, of course, that not all women leaders are progressive or advocate social change. There is currently a controversy swirling at Rutgers because former National Security Advisor and Secretary of State (under President George W. Bush) Condoleezza Rice has been selected as the 2014 commencement speaker and will be awarded an Honorary Doctor of Law degree by the university. Over three hundred and fifty faculty members have signed a petition protesting this, on the basis of Rice's role in the invasion of Iraq, and the subsequent war there. But I believe it is important to hear from representatives of multiple points of view, and to

learn from leaders whose models of leadership might be very different from our own. Interestingly, the fact that Condoleeza Rice is a woman leader, and an African American leader, has not entered into the dialogue.

We can learn about leadership from leaders whose causes, and points of view, may diverge from our own views. I am currently working with others on a series of volumes of women's leadership case studies, based on the famous Harvard case study model. At the moment, case studies on leadership are overwhelmingly produced by graduate schools of business. Harvard Business School faculty members publish 80% of cases sold in the world. Our quick search of the Harvard Business School publishing database revealed fifty cases that used the word gender out of almost fifteen thousand available cases. We seek to redress this imbalance and are being careful to include anti-feminist, anti-progressive women leaders in the volumes along with progressive leaders, since like men, women leaders come in all varieties. Still I do believe, as I stated earlier, that women's gendered experiences influence the ways that they (we) see the world and may seek to influence it.

IV.

I want to end my talk tonight by circling back to the question with which I chose to frame my remarks. What's feminism got to do with women's leadership? As I hope you can tell, I believe it has a great deal to do with it. One of the projects I have been working on with others over the past three years is an initiative between our institute at Rutgers, Barnard College's Athena Center for Leadership Studies, and Spelman College's Women's Resource and Research Center, that takes up this question. After collaborative conversations at each of our institutions about the potential connections between women's studies and leadership studies, we wrote together what we are calling "Guidelines for Feminist Leadership Studies." I have brought copies to share, and I ask that they be distributed now. Moving from women's leadership to feminist leadership was intentional, and may be provocative to some. As you can see, we created eleven guidelines to describe what we believe feminist leadership (and feminist leadership studies) are about. I would like to share a few of these guidelines with you.

1. Feminist Leadership examines the connection between feminisms, leadership, and social justice. It strives to bring a feminist lens to the study of leaders in order to bring new models of leadership into focus. (#1 on document.)
2. Feminist Leadership includes an ethos of accountability. It advocates for more diverse leadership, especially more women and people of color, in decision-making positions who understand and practice feminist approaches. It challenges the notion that leadership is male/masculine. It is inclusive and considers strategies to make leadership more diverse. It strives to bring marginalized voices to the center of the conversation. (#5 on document.)
3. Feminist Leadership recognizes and promotes young women's innovative leadership and activism. It fosters and creates spaces for intergenerational exchanges. (#6 on document.)
4. Feminist Leadership examines the practices and contexts within established structures where leaders act to transform, both from the inside out and from the outside in. (#7 on document.)
5. Feminist Leadership uses a gendered lens to consider the ways that leadership is constructed and experienced by those most disadvantaged economically, socially, and politically. It investigates various sites of leadership, including the family, the

community, the state, the private sector, social movements, and cultural and religious organizations, always with attention to systems which privilege certain groups over others. (#8 on document.)

We are not certain what our plans for this document are, or what the next steps for our collaboration will involve, but I believe this effort represents new ways scholars and practitioners are thinking about women's—or what we have called feminist--leadership. Perhaps your fine Institute will be interested in joining us in our efforts. I thank you for the opportunity to share my evolving thoughts on leadership, women's leadership, and its great transformative potential, with you tonight. You have been a wonderful audience, and I am eager to hear your questions.