

**Historical Concepts and Paradigms of Leadership
and their Relevance to
Strengthening Women's Transformational
Leadership in the Caribbean**

**Background Paper
Transformational Leadership Project
UNIFEM Caribbean**

*©Violet Eudine Barriteau, PhD
Head
Centre For Gender and Development Studies
University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus
July 2001*

Historical Concepts and Paradigms of Leadership and their Relevance to Strengthening Women's Transformational Leadership in the Caribbean

Abstract

In this paper I provide an analytical background to the concepts and paradigms of leadership and examine why leadership and in particular, women's leadership has been, and continues to be, a contentious, problematic issue for women and organisations. I establish an historical context to ideas about leadership to isolate and define the key components of women's transformational leadership. I then relate these to the social and political economy and developmental needs of Caribbean society. I critique and assess women's leadership styles and roles including examining the thorny issues of accountability and grappling with power relations. In the process I isolate the alleged differences in leadership styles between women and men, and if qualitatively different, that of young women and men.

The main objective of my analysis is to provide a conceptual and research framework for recognising and promoting women's transformational leadership. In essence I concentrate on making explicit and delineating the core concepts that are usually taken for granted in discussions of leadership. Towards achieving this objective, I set out the preconditions that are required at the individual and institutional levels to facilitate the practice of transformational leadership. I identify power, authority, and decision making as critical components of leadership. Women's ability to handle these in non traditional ways are pivotal to promoting transformational leadership. I indicate how these are to be used to produce leadership that will challenge inequities arising from unjust social relations, but especially those that seek to continue to maintain the subordination of women and deny them full relevance and participation in Caribbean societies. I view transformational leadership as a necessary goal, a vision that leaders must pursue but that is not easily achievable. Finally the paper provides a set of research questions to guide the discovery of practices that are conducive to the promotion of women's transformational leadership.

Historical Concepts and Paradigms of Leadership and their Relevance to Strengthening Women's Transformational Leadership in the Caribbean

The problem is neither how, as women we can disassociate ourselves from power nor how we can find ways to grasp it. Instead, we must determine the way in which power can itself be purged of its own crippling effects: destructive both of those who dominate and those who are subordinate to it. [Helene Moglen 1983: 132].

When you apply the word powerful to a man, it means strong and bold, very positive attributes, when you use it to describe a woman, it suggests bitchy, insensitive, hard. [Jill Barad in Susan Estrich 2000: 130].

Introduction: Devising a Conceptual Framework on Women's Transformational Leadership

Women's Leadership

Although the international literature on women and leadership is extensive, the issue of what *is* women's leadership is taken as a given and never defined. The literature provides examples of women's leadership or strategies for enhancing it, but it states very little about exactly what is women's leadership. If I could identify a core characteristic of leadership, I would say to lead is to be in charge. That is, it is to be responsible for the decisions taken, to lead is to introduce the action points in a social setting that produce or are intended to produce, a set of anticipated outcomes. The exercise of power and authority forms the nucleus of leadership. In other words the leader's capacity to make a decision, to initiate a course of action arises from the exercise of power and authority.

I define a woman leader as a woman who exercises power and authority in a wide variety of arenas. A woman leader exercises power and authority in homes, schools, communities, clubs, political parties, international organisations, informal networks or any social interaction where others accept the decisions and activities of that woman and thus enable her to influence or determine outcomes. I use organisation in this paper to refer to the arena in which the woman leader operates. Therefore the organisation is formal or informal, it may have a rigid, bureaucratic structure or it may be a loose network of socially sanctioned and agreed upon rules for pursuing some common goals. Women's leadership occurs

whenever and wherever women using power and authority make decisions, exert influence, or use a capacity to alter outcomes or initiate activities on behalf of others.

However women's leadership, or women exercising power and authority tells us nothing about the quality or value of the outcome created by that exercise of power and authority. It reveals no clues to the degree of, or direction of change the activity initiates. We cannot automatically identify the objectives of the leadership and the intended or desired outcomes of the decision taken. More significantly we cannot determine or assume that women's leadership will automatically promote gender justice or democratic practices. In fact the concept of women's leadership tells us more about physiological, biological make up of the leader and leaves us to impute or anticipate certain kinds of behaviours. Women's leadership is therefore a generic term that identifies the sex of the person who exercises authority without indicating the qualitative changes anticipated from that leadership. It is true that institutions and individuals hold a set of expectations of women as leaders. They believe women bring a different bundle of characteristics to leadership and based on their socialisation women often do. However knowing that a woman is a leader does not guarantee or predict a particular outcome, even though many will perhaps lead in similar ways within similar organisations or environments.

In terms of comparing and contrasting how women's leadership differ from women's transformational leadership, women leaders, women's leadership, women as leaders are all biologically based classifications. This classification assumes that the traditional traits, both positive and negative, associated with women will manifest itself in women's leadership styles and decisions. In fact the literature that explores differing leadership styles for women and men attempts to refute or substantiate this (Estler 1975; Denmark 1977; Crosby 1998; Rosener 1990; Calas and Smircich 1991).

On the other hand the idea of women's transformational leadership introduces substantively different qualitative criteria to the practice and understanding of women's leadership. Like traditional experiences of women's leadership, women's transformational leadership can be found everywhere. It exists in domestic, professional and public activities in which women are the pivotal decision makers. Unlike traditional leadership, when women are engaged in transformational leadership they are committed to creating changes that radically alter existing practices and processes, and introduce new strategies and outcomes at the local, national, regional, and global levels.

I agree with UNIFEM's definition of transformational leadership as a visionary process that starts at the individual level and transcends the personal to express itself at the group and institutional levels. According to UNIFEM this process leads to the redefinition of gender and power relations and the

strengthening of leadership that is bold and innovative and builds on the skills of women and men in societyⁱ.

UNIFEM qualifies its definition of transformational leadership by identifying its inputs, context, scope and desired outcomes:

It is leadership that depends on people participation and challenges the beliefs, practices and structures of inequality, including gender inequality, that are detrimental to women's dignity, health, safety and well-being. It is leadership that seeks to ensure the empowerment of women. Transformational leadership is grounded in the principles and values of equity, equality, justice, democracy, caring, non-violence and co-operation.

UNIFEM makes it clear that transformational leadership is not associated with a unique, particular style, innovative, management techniques, getting the job done, nor being a decision maker who is a spokes person for the latest business management mantras and practices. The first distinguishing criterion that emerges is that women's transformational leadership engages with power, especially gendered relations of power. It is concerned with where power exists, how it is used, for what purposes and who benefits. The woman who practices transformational leadership is reflective. It is a process that requires the individual to evaluate her or his behaviour and actions against the principles and values of justice and democracy.

A transformational leader is not as concerned with equipping women to compete at the highest organisational levels of the state and civil society as she is with transforming the gendered discourse, practices and experiences of power and authority in these arenas. Put differently, although transformational leaders would see it as critical that **women** are leaders in the state and civil society, they would regard this as an insufficient condition for transformational leadership to exist. Women's leadership begins to be transformational when it seeks to alter the conventional practices and experiences of authority and power and it has a vision of the new practices and processes to be put in place.

Vision is another characteristic that sets transformational leadership apart. Transformational leadership does not only want to make the delivery of services and goods better, but it wants to change what is delivered as well as the environment in which this delivery takes place. It breaks out of the mould of, and is not content with the status quo. Transformational leadership is an ideal and not easy to achieve but very necessary to strive for. Very few women will achieve transformational leadership (one such woman was the late Ruth Nita Barrow) but all women who are leaders should strive to develop the characteristics of a transformational leader.

In creating its definition of transformational leadership, UNIFEM is distinguishing the kinds of leadership it is committed to cultivating from other types in existence. What are these other types of

leadership? And why do we need to understand them as a precursor to promoting transformational leadership? The idea of women's leadership is often treated as an oxymoron in the every day world. Yet women's leadership is both a reflection and outgrowth of, but not exclusive to, feminist activism, and societal changes.

The decade 1975-1985 was particularly significant for women's leadership in the Caribbean and elsewhere in the South. Although Caribbean women have a long tradition of leadership (Brodber 1986; Reddock 1994; 1998; Vassell 1995; Barriteau 2001A; Barriteau & Cobley 2001), the first United Nations decade to focus attention on the economic and political well being of the world's women, was pivotal to the emergence, recognition and validation of women's leadership internationally. The decade served as an incubator for the growth and expansion of organized, politicized, women's organisations led by a dynamic group of women leaders. It marked the rapid regeneration of women motivating other individuals and organisations to achieve specific goals.

Much of the historical resistance to women and leadership yielded to the pressures of women having to do more, to take advantage of the momentum created by a decade long focus and two international world conferences on women. In the Caribbean, rapid changes in its political economy forced by a combination of national, regional and global developments facilitated the rapid expansion of leadership opportunities for women.

Women were either thrust up as leaders or stepped forward to fight for more just societies. New women leaders in the Caribbean emerged or gained recognition in their efforts to; stem conditions of economic deprivation, curb the effects of shrinking welfare state systems, organise and unionize women as domestic workers, contain and combat the increase in violence against women, influence the drafting of legislation to protect basic civil and economic rights, develop and institutionalize research and teaching programs on women, and create and implement policies to channel adequate resources for reproductive, maternal and child health. Women such as Nita Barrow, Lucille Mathurin Mair, Hilda Bynoe, Eugenia Charles, Nesta Patrick, Peggy Antrobus, Magda Pollard, Joycelin Massiah, Joycelin Dow, Rhoda Reddock, Clotil Walcott, Portia Simpson, Billie Miller, Kamala Bissesar, Rawwida Baksh-Sooden, Joan French, Neva Edwards, Linette Vassell, Roberta Clark, Hazel Brown, Carmeta Fraser and Nalita Gadjaharⁱⁱ are only some of the Caribbean women who have worked or continue to provide leadership on these issues critical to Caribbean women and societies.

Resistance to Women's Leadership

Women continue to lead but the historical ambivalence and ambiguities surrounding women and leadership lingers. The resistance to women's leadership exists in two overlapping arenas:

- **Ideological;** this is the strong, resilient belief that women and leadership constitute a contradictory, oppositional pairing rather than a complementary coupling. There is a widespread view that women and leadership do not go well together and do not belong together. There is substantial evidence that many of the qualities traditionally associated with women are meaningful, effective inputs into leadership, yet the ideology persists that the idea of women and leadership is like oil and water, they do not mix. In a comprehensive study of differences in management styles of men and women, Anne Statham cites evidence from Meeker and Weitizel-O'Neil (1977) that substantiates this point. She reports that Meeker and Weitizel-O'Neil in, "an extensive review of small group research that women were actually equally effective in moving the group toward its goal (providing leadership), though they were *perceived* to be less effective because of certain style of behaviour differences they exhibited" (Statham 1987: 411). These ideas are partly the residue of beliefs in predetermined roles for women centering on women's traditional reproductive roles.
- **Theoretical\Analytical;** this refers to a frame of reference that explains women's leadership in comparison to how men lead. In a review of the literature on leadership Marta Calas and Linda Smircich examines how the traditional literature is biased and lacking a specific analysis of women's leadership (Calas and Smircich 1991). Male leadership in all its variations, and male ways of leading are used as the norm to explain women's leadership. Within this arena ongoing attempts are made to explain how women leaders operate, make decisions, or introduce new procedures by mapping women's leadership behaviour on a masculinist grid. Leadership is seen as fundamentally a male quality and women's leadership is understood with the masculinist model as the frame of reference.ⁱⁱⁱ

One of the earliest conditions challenged by feminist theorizing and activism was masculinist leadership or masculinist ways of leading. Feminists want to change patriarchal practices and deployments of power. Yet the combination of women and power proves to be very problematic for both androcentric and feminist perspectives on leadership. However the exercise of power is the currency of leadership.

To practise transformational leadership women need to understand power. The initial step towards that understanding is recognising the history of ambivalence women have had towards admitting we are

powerful and can be powerful. This does not negate the adverse, gendered, societal practices of denying power for women.

Far too many men and women are uncomfortable with women being politically, economically and socially powerful. These detractors assign specific roles and domains within which women's power is accepted. Women can be powerful as mothers, or in any roles associated with the private domain or reproductive work. Women are not supposed to be powerful in the arenas of the public. Additionally many women as leaders tie themselves in knots before they would admit that particular posts or responsibilities they hold are in fact powerful (Statham 1987; Pohlmann 1995; Moglen 1983; Kitzinger 1991). Often when outstanding women are appointed to very visible and powerful positions in the state or civic society they quickly make statements denying that they are powerful women. In response to a hypothetical question such as, "As the first President of The Caribbean Development Bank, you are the most powerful woman involved in. . .". In reply they would make a statement such as, "I just happen to be a woman as the first President. . ."iv They negate the power they hold as women and choose to emphasize their professional qualifications. Contrast this to the approach of Ruth Nita Barrow, late Governor General of Barbados and a woman I identify as a transformational leader. On being elected the first black woman to lead the World YWCA in 1979, Nita Barrow praised her predecessors and claimed her leadership role and power. Among other comments, she said, "I carried on where they left off" (Barriteau 2001B: 169; Seymour-Jones 1994: 330). I state of Nita Barrow's acceptance of the power inherent in her leadership role:

Nita Barrow harboured none of that skepticism about her leadership qualities. She saw herself as an outstanding leader who understood what decisive leadership of a woman's organisation required. She was not afraid to take decisions and recognised in the process of leading she would make mistakes. She saw this as part of the dynamic of leadership (Barriteau 2001B: 169).

Celia Kitzinger discusses the highly controversial suggestion that much feminist [and feminine] behaviour can be interpreted as efforts to avoid power (Kitzinger 1991: 113-114). She identifies behaviours such as downward mobility, opposition to leadership, and insistence on collective leadership as examples of attempts by women and feminists to resist claiming or acknowledging their power (Kitzinger 1991: 114).

Kitzinger tracks that ambivalence about power within feminist theory. She argues that on the one hand feminists often characterize power as something evil, dangerous and corrupting - a male activity or preoccupation with control and domination which results in violence, rape and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons (Kitzinger 1991: 113). On the other hand, feminists often theorize women's power as positive, creative, and life affirming (Kitzinger 1991: 114). I reject the notion that men's power is negative and

women's power is positive even though we can discern distinct patterns in how women and men have used and continue to use power. There is enough evidence to refute an essentialist, biological reading of power. Instead it is more helpful to acknowledge that power is deployed differently by different types of male and female leaders for different purposes.

In the context of unearthing women's transformational leadership we want to discover how women leaders challenge the status quo, and how the policies they devise, the activities they undertake, and the programs they implement seek to enhance the material and spiritual quality of living for women, children and men. Women's transformational leadership can exist in a wide variety of fields, but it should be distinguished by the promotion of gender justice, and the tackling of a range of dominating, unequal relations such as , racism, sexism, ageism, and other forms of political, economic and social abuse.

Research Questions on Women's Transformational Leadership

In examining the leadership approaches of women leaders, analysts should be aware that women leaders may or may not have the conceptual vocabulary to articulate a particular philosophy of leadership. This is unimportant. What matters is that when researchers analyse women's approaches or the activities of the 'organisations' which they head, or the environment in which they practice leadership, we can map their work on to a new conceptual framework that enables us to determine the transformational worth of their actions and behaviours, their leadership approaches.

Towards outlining the contours of a conceptual framework for developing transformational leadership, researchers should ask the following questions:

- What is the social vision, political commitment, values and beliefs of the leader?
- How comfortable is the woman leader with the idea of holding and exercising power?
- Do the women or the 'organisations' which they head seek to promote practices that challenge gender inequities?
- Do these activities maintain the organizational and/or societal status quo?
- Are the policies and activities socially, politically and economically regressive? That is, do they promote behaviours and outcomes that restrict the citizenship rights, privileges and general choices of women?, of men?
- Are the policies and activities socially, politically and economically progressive - that is do they go beyond what is , to what could be?
- Do these policies maintain existing inequalities or create new ones for either women or men?

- Is there an hierarchical ranking within policies of who matters that is related to those who suffers the most harms?
- Do the practices and policies of women leaders and their organisations seek to increase women's autonomy, and to eradicate abuse and violence in their lives?

The conceptual grid for mapping transformational leadership is plotted on the axes of promoting gender justice, challenging the status quo, and working with or towards a vision of a just, democratic, equitable society.

Transformational leadership occurs simultaneously in two environments and efforts to promote it will fail if only one aspect is focussed on. In the external environment, or the physical setting in which leadership is exercised, the leaders and members of the 'organisation' interpret its vision and implement its mandate through engagements with the 'public'. The external environment can be a beauty parlour, a fish market or a corporate board room, it can be a home, a school or a community group. The public would be the clients of the parlour, customers of the fish vendors or both members and clients of the corporation. The public or members include relatives, student, teachers and general workers, or community members. Transformational leaders have to continuously reflect and monitor the exercise of authority and power and the structures and channels through which these are experienced. This is the internal environment. It refers to the processes through which leadership activities are undertaken.

Historical Concepts of Traditional Leadership

Authority and Leadership

Who or what is a leader? At its core how can we recognise or distinguish what leadership is? The concepts of authority, legitimacy and power are foundational to the conventional concept of leadership. An early definition of a leader is one who has authority to act, that is to make or carry out decisions on behalf of others. Authority is central to the practice of leadership because authority conveys legitimacy to formulate and implement decisions. A legitimate action has authority. A decision may be questioned as reflecting poor judgement, as being unreasonable, impractical, infeasible, or poorly conceptualised, but once the decision maker has authority it will not be, and should not be challenged as illegitimate or illegal. Authority legitimises the action of the leader (the decision maker). Authority conveys to the leader the consent (and willingness to give that consent) on the part of those whom the decision will affect, or on whose behalf the decision is explicitly or implicitly made.

Consent marks the other critical component of authority. A legitimate decision, that is one taken with authority, suggests that the decision maker does not have to resort to the use of sanctions such as

force, and if these have to be used they are accepted as legitimate.^v The leader therefore has power because she can deploy a range of activities to ensure compliance and these are generally accepted. There is a direct, complementary, relationship between leadership, authority and power. The decisions of a leader are legitimate because those who are affected by the decisions give to the leader the power to act on their behalf.

The concept of authority originates in political theory and has been and continues to be very problematic for women both as leaders and as persons affected by decisions taken. Kathleen Jones traces the concept to the social contract theories of Western political philosophy. The traditional definition of authority view it as a form of legitimate control that is exercised over others with their consent (Jones 1993: 4). She sees authority as a form of social coordination that occupies a space between coercion and persuasion (Jones 1993: 4). Jones states that contract theorists from Thomas Hobbes to John Rawls identify authority as the exercise of sovereign, social control by legitimate rulers on behalf of the public welfare (Jones 1993: 33). In exploring the relationship between leadership and authority, she demonstrates that Western political philosophers theorised authority as masculinist, hierarchical, and exclusionary (Jones 1993).

This indicates one of the reasons why the exercise of authority has proved problematic for women. In its original formulation, meaning, and application, the concept is very contradictory in the way it conceives of women, and women's capacity to wield authority, and by extension, power. In turn this has complicated the relationship between women and authority, and affected women's exercise of authority. In social contract theory, men willingly contracted to be governed by giving their consent and authority to a political sovereign (leader) to govern on their behalf. In political theory the social contract marked (for men) the demise of a social order structured on kinship and the rule of the father, or the divine rights of kings. Political theorists stated, that with the social contract, *men gave authority or permission to other men to govern on their behalf*. The right to be in charge or to rule shifted from being anchored in a divine right (sovereignty of king over subjects), or patriarchal (rule of the father over women, children, males not yet twenty one years). This became the basis for political leadership - with a significant exception.

While the social contract became the foundation of authority for men, Carole Pateman argues that patriarchalism continues to function as the source of authority over women because of the existence of a 'sexual contract' (Jones 1993: 42). Kathleen Jones cites Carole Pateman that men continued to claim to the right of sexual access and command over the use of women's bodies, thus instituting a new contractual basis for women's experience of authority.

As it related to women, patriarchy continued to define men's relationship with, and rule over women. Men gave themselves authority over women based on patriarchal claims, while they consented to share leadership and governance with each other. Wendy Brown notes that in the nineteenth century, the English jurist Blackstone, "argued that it was reasonable for women to be politically represented by their husbands because 'women have no civil personality' - they exist only as members of households, while personhood is achieved in civil society" (Brown 1995: 182).^{vi} Women therefore experienced authority not as something they had consented to create, but as objects of its practice. Before many of the political and civic changes that finally allowed women to participate as citizens, women experienced authority as the rule of men over the public and private dimensions of their lives, without their consent.

This contradictory, hierarchical relationship with authority has lingered for women long after women were recognised as also having a right to contract with the state to create authority based on consent. Because of its political and ideological genealogy, authority is a gendered concept. It contains gender biases against women. As it relates to women, authority is still frequently perceived as authority over women, and still too many women and men have difficulty in accepting women's authority in their exercise of leadership. Jones reasons that authority as conventionally exercised is masculinized, not because men are in authority (and that is an important distinction to emphasize) but because in its origins authority was constructed as authority over women (Jones 1993: 42). The idea of women exercising authority, having a right to be legitimate leaders remains deeply traumatizing in the psyche of states, civil institutions, citizens, and far too many women.

It does not have to be so. Kathleen Jones argues that in spite of its origins, authority is too critical a component of leadership to be avoided or abandoned. She states the concept does not have to be masculinist, hierarchical nor exclusionary. She argues that authority can be exercised with justice, and without domination. She created the term *compassionate authority* to reflect that kind of authority. Compassionate authority facilitates leadership that is just. Drawing on Jones' analysis we want to reformulate authority from being understood only as command and control to being more inclusive, more consensual.

If authority lies between coercion and persuasion we want compassionate authority to include cooperation. Jones believes authority can be exercised as a gender neutral practice but to be deployed like that it has to be purged of an inherent understanding of women as only subjects of authority, of only being the objects of the exercise of power. Transformational leadership has to practise the exercise of authority informed by a non-corrosive use of power. A central question for women's transformational leadership is to separate authority from authoritarianism (Honor Ford Smith 1989).

The Borderlands: Within\Without Power

Because women who hold power are resented, and women and power have an ambiguous, uneasy relationship, women's leadership occupy a contradictory, often tension filled, political space. Women who are leaders exist and operate in the borderlands of power. They are within the paradigms of leadership because of the positions they hold. Simultaneously they are on the borders because ideologies of gender encode their sex to be the objects of power and not the initiators of decisions. The concept of the borderland requires new rules for operating. These rules enable us to refine further the conceptual frame for a feminist, transformational leadership. They include:

- 1. A commitment to equity, gender and organisational justice, internally
- 2. A commitment to equity, gender and social justice, externally
- 3. A recognition that authority to act is a legitimate source of power that should be used responsibly to advance the goals of the organisation, to empower workers, and to be committed to seek to effect social change
- 4. A commitment to developing an oppositional consciousness that seeks to use positions of power in creative and different ways
- 5. Encouraging engagements among women and feminists working from different positions or standpoints, but committed to the same goals of transforming unequal and dominating relations of gender or other social exclusions

Power and Leadership

As Figure One illustrates, power is the bedrock of authority and leadership. The original source of power for authority is a social contract. The social contract creates authority which in turn legitimises the decision taken and ensures the consent of those affected by the decision. So the leader of a market vendors

association gets her power and authority from the fact that the other members have agreed (socially contracted) to allow her to make key decisions on their behalf. The challenge to transformational leadership is to have the source of authority, (the power that legitimises the decision) include the cooperation of others in the social environment. Doing this works towards ensuring that power is no longer power over, but power with.

With traditional leadership roles, the leader is at the pinnacle of a pyramid with decisions flowing down to the base. It reveals power over. The power of the leader is over arching and almost unassailable. As depicted in Figure Two, power in transformational leadership is power with. It does not negate that the leader is powerful but it introduces feedback, cooperation and consultation in the internal environment. Power remains at the nucleus of the internal environment. In Figure Two consent exists not because individuals, members, clients or the public believe they have no choice, but rather because they have vetted the decision and believe it to be appropriate or the best in the circumstances. The key distinction is that they have participated in the exercise of power and authority. There are many mechanisms by which consensus can be obtained and will differ according to the 'organisation', its environments, and its objectives. For women's leadership to be transformational these must exist and be operationalized. In evaluating whether the internal environment of organisations facilitate transformational leadership, we would ask:

- What are the mechanisms in a trade union, a youth organisation or a community based NGO that facilitates feedback, consensus building and reflection on the organisation's activities and output?
- What is the source of power and authority for the leaders of these respective organisations?

Jean Baker Miller defines power as the capacity to produce a change (Baker Miller 1992:241). While we recognise a certain utility in this definition we want change in a particular direction. I add a Foucauldian understanding of power that also sees power as a productive and positive force (McNay 1992: 3), and not only as a zero-sum phenomenon. "Foucault reveals the pluralities of power" and how power exists in myriad layers in multiple sites (Barriteau 1994: 86).

It is equally important that we insist on seeing the potential for women's transformational leadership as occurring everywhere. This approach negates the bias in the conventional literature that locates women's leadership only at the pinnacles of state and civic organisations. More important from a feminist perspective, by recognising that transformational leadership is not limited to a particular site, we negate the public/private divide that sets up an automatic ranking of the activities of the public over the private.

The relationship between power and authority is crucial to understanding leadership generally. It is even more so for women leaders. Helene Moglen concludes that women cannot and will not genuinely be empowered until we understand our need for power and our deep fear of it (Helene Moglen 1983: 132). Authority implies the use of legitimate power and there is a direct relationship between authority and some forms of power. Judith Bardwick inquiry into different forms of power and the relationship between power and authority is particularly useful for our purposes. She concludes that the issue of women and power is under explored in Western societies (Bardwick 1977: 327).

As was established earlier, in patriarchal societies women are not conceptualised as holding power, wielding power, or being powerful, unless it is in relation to aspects of the domestic or private domain which as I stated already, is seen as the ‘natural’ location for women. For example, many individuals believe that ‘feminine wiles’ is a type of negative power that women have over heterosexual men arising from women’s manipulation of their sexuality. Historically the kinds of power that women have held that have transcended the private domain has been increasingly contained and limited with the development of modern, industrialized society. The regulatory powers of state and civil institutions and the homogenization and masculinization of knowledge are examples of how women’s power in Western society has been circumscribed. For example, healing, midwifery, and the practice of traditional medicine are all areas of power for women that have been removed or severely reduced with the growth and institutionalisation of medicine as a scientific, regulated sets of practices.

The four types of power Judith Bardwick identifies are relevant to a discussion of power and authority and how these can inform the internal environment in which leadership is developed and practised.

Legitimate Power\Power of ‘Office’

Legitimate power is the power that comes with holding a particular position or ‘office’ within an ‘organisation’ or decision making environment^{vii}. Its base is institutional with the ability to act, or the source of its authority coming from one’s position in the hierarchy of an organisation (Bardwick 1977: 327). The institution and the individual’s office within it conveys authority. Legitimate power is similar to Max Weber’s power of ‘office’. Responsibility for a set of tasks and functions and the authority to act, to lead, comes from being identified institutionally as the person in charge. One example of legitimate power derived from office would be the position of Pro Vice Chancellor held by Professor Marlene Hamilton of the University of the West Indies. Her legitimate power as a PVC with a specific portfolio denotes a

particular position and sets of responsibilities. The UWI expects a definitive set of roles flowing from the power of that office.

Another example of legitimate power derived from office would be the Coordinator of The Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action, CAFRA, a position held by Nelcia Robinson. CAFRA has internal and external transformational leadership environments. It is an organisation dedicated to promoting practices that challenge gender inequities and promote gender justice. It has a democratic, organisational structure and is not rigidly hierarchical and formal as the University of the West Indies. It has several mechanisms for facilitating feedback and consensus on major decisions. But in terms of our key example here both Nelcia Robinson and Marlene Hamilton hold legitimate power of office. The responsibilities and sets of roles flowing from the 'office' of the Coordinator of CAFRA are no less than that flowing from the 'office' of a Pro Vice Chancellor.

Legitimate power derived from 'office' is structured, hierarchical, and flows from a unique position in the organisation with a formal, known set of rules, sanctions, responsibilities, and roles^{viii}. One can refer to CAFRA's mission statement or the UWI's charter to determine the responsibilities of the Coordinator or a Pro Vice Chancellor. One learns that both positions are very senior. The Coordinator and PVC are institutionally more powerful than a project officer or dean respectively. In fact the Coordinator of CAFRA has greater power of office than a PVC since that position is the most senior while in the UWI, the position of PVC ranks below the formal power of a Vice Chancellor or Chancellor.

Towards understanding how women leaders can develop transformational leadership through the use of the power that comes from 'office', ask the following questions:

- How do women leaders exercise power of office?
- Do they retreat to, or hide behind 'office', hierarchy, or position?
- Do they deploy this power in creative, innovative ways that may or may not be contained by office, but still derives its authority from office?
- Do they seek ways to have the power of office serve the vision of the organisation?

TABLE ONE

TYOLOGY OF POWER WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

TYPES OF POWER	SOURCES OF AUTHORITY
Legitimate Power	Position, office, rank in organisation's hierarchy
Expert Power ¹	Knowledge, Skills
Coercive Power ²	Manipulation, Force
Personal Power	Ego integration, self-actualization

Source: Based on a discussion of power by Judith Bardwick, "Some Notes About Power Relationships Between Women". In *Beyond Sex Roles* Alice Sargent. Ed. 325-335. St Paul, West Publishing, 1977.

Notes:

1. Potentially a source of conflict and friction
2. Negative type of power, authority derived from forced compliance or manipulation

© V Eudine Barriteau, September 2000

Expert Power

The second type of power Bardwick describes is power derived from skills and expertise. Individuals who hold expert power are often expected by others to lead because of their expertise. Their authority to lead comes from their knowledge while the authority of legitimate power comes from one's position in an organisation's hierarchy (Bardwick 1977: 327). Table One presents the types of power and their sources of authority. This is a very potent source of power and potentially very contentious since the power of expertise is a tremendous personal and organisational resource.

There are several dimensions to situations of conflict arising from a disjuncture between legitimate power and expert power and they span both the internal and external environments of transformational leadership. For example, imagine an 'organisation' in which the holder of the power of 'office' does not have the power of expertise. She has to rely on someone ranked less senior in the organisation's hierarchy for expertise on fund raising, devising a media campaign, negotiating with the

minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, project development, lobbying local government representatives, determining house rules, marketing, and a host of other skills necessary to sustain and maintain the viability of the organisation. Unless that office holder has ego integration or personal power along with her legitimate power, the work of the organisation can be thwarted and the leadership mandate severely impaired by excess time spent on defining turf, or preventing the holder of expert power from gaining too much prominence within the internal environment.

When women lead or within women's organisations expert power can be used to challenge legitimate power. Because women are reluctant to talk frankly about or acknowledge the power they hold, when they assume it is under threat it becomes even more complex to address that situation. Without a clear understanding of the dynamics involved, this development can produce very negative behaviours by the parties involved at the personal and organisational levels. Women leaders are challenged in marking out the boundaries of what they believe to be their legitimate terrain without wanting to admit that terrain is important and will be fiercely guarded.

Another complexity of a mismatch between expert and legitimate power can affect the development of youth leadership. For example, this may occur when the holder of expert power is younger than the 'office' holder. The misreading of power may occur for both. The young experts are tempted to believe all difficulties arise because they hold expert power, and the more 'senior' office holders are jealous of their youth, energy and of course their skills. This often happens and in my opinion is fuelled by an artificial demarcation between young and old on almost every prominent issue. In the context of developing transformational leadership, transition and other strategies have to be created to share methodologies of leadership and appraisals on how each individual strengths and skills fits into the overall organisational mandate.

What also often happens that the young expert is often unaware of, or lacks an appreciation of, is the dynamics of leadership that arises from the power of office. There are several differing, often competing constituencies to serve including ensuring the organisation maintains its vision. The young expert may only see a curtailment of a proposed course of action and not be aware or appreciate the wider implications of the decision. In some cases she may be dismissive of the office holder because the latter does not possess a particular skill. A critical input into developing youth leadership is creating strategies for appreciating what occurred before. Why is this person the office holder? What skills did he or she bring to the organisation? Where do my skills or expertise fit?

Another dimension of the potential conflict between expert power and legitimate power happens in the external environment. For example, the expert power of women in countries in the South is often

questioned or denied. Their ability to speak with a definitive voice on issues in developing countries is often delegitimized as a mechanism of control (Barriteau 1986). In this scenario it is often assumed that legitimate power conveys expert power. For a very long time in the field of Women-in-Development or Gender and Development, the *idea* of the expert has been an expatriate from an industrialized country. The WID or GAD ‘expert’ determines relevance or legitimacy. To promote transformational leadership the questions to be asked are:

- How do women leaders use expert power when they do not hold it themselves?
- How can they utilise this power within organisations without alienating the individuals who hold that power?
- If they also hold expert power how do they deploy it? Do they guard it jealously or do they create opportunities to share it?

Coercive Power

This type of power is based on force or manipulation. It may involve playing people off against each other or other types of manipulative behaviour. By definition and the ways it can be used, it is a negative type of power. Coercive power has a problematic relationship with authority since authority is a legitimate use of power. In this instance the capacity to act is gained not from consent but rather forced by compliance.

From the previous discussion on the potential conflict that could arise from different individuals holding expert power and legitimate power, very disruptive practices can arise if an ‘office’ holder chooses to use coercive power as a basis for leadership. The power of the office provides additional weight to the manipulative, coercive actions that can be undertaken. Transformational leadership rejects coercive power since it runs counter to the ethical values that demarcate this leadership. Yet we must be aware that there would be organisations and institutions committed to transformation and its leaders may still utilise coercive power. When we examine the intersection of women’s leadership with coercive power we ask:

- Do women leaders rely on coercive power as a basis of achieving consensus?
- If they do, what are the strategies to be developed to move them away from these behaviours?
- Is there a role for coercive power in the external environment?

Personal Power

The fourth type of power Judith Bardwick discusses is personal power. Personal power comes from ego integration, that is the security of one's relationship with others and the confidence in one's impulses. According to Bardwick women who hold this type of power have high ego strength, are relatively autonomous, decisive, and have a strong sense of responsibility (Bardwick 1977: 327). The source of personal power as Bardwick describes it is similar to Abraham's Maslow's self actualisation in his hierarchy of needs.

This is a very positive type of power and it is imperative for both junior\younger and senior\older women to develop and experience in organisations dedicated to practising transformational leadership. In terms of the interior dynamics of leadership, a transformational leader who holds power of office coupled with expert and personal power is well placed to exploit the external environment to produce visionary leadership. Nita Barrow possessed and utilised these three sources of power (Barriteau 2001B).

When we examine the practices of women who are leaders in the Caribbean we can use this typology of power outlined in Table One to evaluate the authority underlying their leadership. In terms of developing training to enhance transformational leadership, we want to emphasize leadership that arises in personal and expertise power that is strengthened by the organisational power of office holders. The questions we want to about women leaders in relation to personal power are:

- Do women have high personal power based on ego integration?
- Can strategies be developed to promote this type of power?
- What can be done internally in the organisation to encourage and empower members of the organisation to experience this type of power?

Different Styles of Leadership

While the conventional literature on leadership is dominated by an overwhelming focus on male leadership (Denmark 1977; Lipman-Blumen 1983), there is still an understanding that there are distinct male and female styles of leadership (Statham 1987; Denmark 1977; Lipman-Blumen 1983; Rosener 1990) even though most feminist researchers in this field either reject the rigidity of the distinctions or see them as grossly exaggerated. More worrying from the perspective of validating women's ways of leading, is the persistent, gendered belief that so called female qualities of leading are implicitly inferior and of little value to organisational culture. Florence Denmark reports that the Harvard Business Review in 1965 surveyed 2000 business executives and 41% of the men in their sample were against women being executives. "Many felt women were not 'suitable' in this role and both women and men in the sample felt

that women's opportunities were limited (Denmark 1977: 101). That was thirty five years ago. Has that view changed substantively or are people less willing to voice it openly?

The mythology on women and leadership insist that women display distinctly female patterns of leadership even when this is not what the organisation needs. Women are supposed to be more people or relationship oriented, more supportive of junior colleagues, and more unwilling or incapable of delegating (Statham 1987; Lipman-Blumen 1983). Lipman-Blumen reports that research conducted in the 1950's and 1960's suggested that women make poor leaders and subordinates allegedly dislike working for them. She states that two qualities of effective organisational leadership emerge with considerable consistency - task orientation and people orientation. This reinforces or re-echoes the analysis offered by Talcott Parsons in 1955 when he stated that men are more task oriented and women are more people oriented (Lipman-Blumen 1983: 64). Lipman-Blumen adds that although several studies have suggested effective leaders combine task and people orientation, traditional organisations primarily reward task orientation (Lipman-Blumen 1983: 61).

Lipman-Blumen reports the literature on leadership behaviour contains three major generalizations about male and female behaviour in mixed sex groups that affect how women's leadership is perceived.

- **Men talk more than women** - There is widespread research supporting this. However she cites research that in a friendship groups without a task orientation a study found that women college freshmen talked more than men (Lipman-Blumen 1983: 64-65).
- **Male opinions are more likely than women's to influence the opinions of both males and females** - The research shows that men are less likely to acquiesce or be influenced in mixed sex groups than in all male groups. In other words, in all male groups men, were more likely or willing to go with the flow, while in mixed groups they stood their ground, or clung to their positions more. On the other hand, women were more heavily influenced in mixed groups and yielded less in all female groups. Additionally, "female opinion leaders evoked considerable resistance from subject of both genders (Lipman-Blumen 1983: 65). Citing a number of studies, Lipman-Blumen concludes that resistance to women's analyses creates serious obstacles to female organisational leadership.

- **Men are more task oriented and women are more socio-emotionally oriented** - This reinforces the analysis offered by Parsons and reflect many of the more popular beliefs about women and emotion contrasted with men and autonomy.

While advocating that more research is needed to resolve these conflicting results, Jean Lipman-Bluman juxtaposed the implications of these generalizations and their supporting research to state:

If, in mixed-gender situations (as in day-to-day organizational life),

- the more active members are seen as leaders;
- men are given more opportunities to talk and act;
- men actually do talk more than women;
- men's opinions tend to evoke positive group reactions, while women's opinions spark negative or resistant responses;
- male, more often than female, subordinates express dissatisfaction with their leader, regardless of the leader's gender; and
- the most powerful informal group consists of men
- then the current structure of organizations serves as a serious barrier to the acceptance of female leadership (Lipman-Blumen 1983: 65).

In a study published five years after, Anne Statham found differing results. Her study focussed on gathering information about the management styles of men and women managers. Interestingly she concluded that while the findings revealed that women were both task and person oriented, "men frankly seemed to be neither" (Statham 1987: 415). In conducting the research, Statham was very careful to avoid imposing the existing stereotypes on these women leaders.:

Because I was open to the possibility that women managers have styles not previously delineated in the literature, I hesitated to rely on popular management typologies. Since they have been derived chiefly from observations of men, these typologies may fail to tap or may distort any distinct styles women might use (Statham 1987: 412).

While all but one of the secretaries of the women managers described them as people oriented, the women themselves had a different assessment of the leadership approach they brought to their organisations. The women managers described themselves as both task and people oriented, while half of the sample of twenty two women said they were only task oriented. So while the secretaries of the women

leaders stated the leaders cared more about their employees, for these women, “they were as much (if not more) task oriented”(Statham 1987: 417).

These women stated efficiency was the most important thing, it was their secretaries who described them as more concerned with organisational relationships. This is a very significant finding in terms of the internal environment in which leadership is played out. It indicates that the dichotomy between task and people orientation may be quite false and it is possible to lead and display both. Much of the literature discuss this as if it has to be one or the other. The secretaries would not describe their bosses as caring if they were not^{ix}. What these women leaders were demonstrating was that it is entirely possible to focus on the goals of the organisations and still be concerned about the well being about its workers. ***These are the kinds of approaches a transformational leadership strategy would encourage.*** By gaining her information through open ended interviews with women and men, both leaders and workers, Statham was able to avoid imposing the stereotypical readings of organisational behaviour and culture.

Similarly of the eighteen men interviewed, there was one male leader who led like most of the women, much to the pleasant surprise of his secretary. She described him as “very unusual.” Statham notes he was the only male manager who did not make self-aggrandizing statements during his interview, and his secretary was very impressed with his involvement with his wife and children (Statham 1987: 424). Note although that man’s organisational behaviour was not seen as the norm, his secretary seem predisposed to accept it since she expected him to be only task oriented.

Another important finding in relation to leadership styles was how the women and men approached their organisational responsibilities. Statham found that women used people orientation to accomplish the tasks but they were not averse to task orientation as the earlier studies suggested. She concluded that women saw themselves as task engrossed but people invested while men were image engrossed and autonomy invested. She found men cared more about how what they were doing appeared to the rest of the organisations and invested heavily in others knowing the importance of their responsibilities. Most seemed unaware that what they viewed as delegation was perceived by junior workers as leaving them to struggle on their own (Statham 1987: 422, 425).

Still junior respondents preferred men and women to lead in what they saw as a sex appropriate style. That is men and women preferred male and female managers to lead in ways that fitted the stereotypes of that leadership. Two women were the exception and they were resented heavily by their women subordinates. Similarly male subordinates were less respectful of men who paid attention to people oriented strategies. Overall however there was less tolerance for women who deviated from the sex appropriate model. This means that although the secretaries appreciated the person invested styles of their

women managers they also expected it. Finally Statham concludes that her research contradicts some of the lore about women managers, especially the idea that they are [only] people oriented and secretaries do not like to work for them. Statham's analysis emphasises the importance of the organisational climate in which women lead and how women's leadership is received compared to that of men. She notes that when women behave in non traditional ways and 'lead like men' it is greatly resented by women. When men lead in non traditional ways and 'lead like women' it is greatly accepted by women. There are key questions for reflection and further analysis:

- Do women prefer the ways women lead whether that approach comes from men or women?
- Or, is it that women are more unforgiving of women?

In the Caribbean we do have inadequate research on the internal environment in which leadership is exercised and experienced, and the organisational cultures in which these are played out. We do have anecdotes about women working for women and contrasting leadership styles. These are part of the folklore of Caribbean organisations and society. We need to upgrade them to at least oral histories to determine the extent to which the myths mirror the complex realities.

Conclusion

Promoting transformational leadership for Caribbean women is a major undertaking and requires the analysis of the internal and external environment of a wide range of 'organisations' in which leadership is exercised. In the internal environment we must pay attention to power, authority and decision making. We need women to reflect on how they feel about power, to recognise that they hold and wield power and that being powerful is not necessarily a negative condition. What is more critical is the deployment of that power, that is the purposes to which it is put. Because there is so much fear about claiming power, the truly transformational capabilities of this resource is under utilized for women in leadership. I look forward to the time when a woman leader can admit her position is powerful and not have her statement generate fear and loathing by members of the public.

The ambivalence women hold about power create unnecessary stressful complications beyond what would be produced from attempting to achieve their organisational goals. Everything can be done to enhance leadership skills but we must recognise and accept that there are leaders who are created 'naturally' and therefore there are followers. By the natural creation of leadership I refer to the small group of women and men who combine all the skills and traits of leaders without being exposed to a structured program designed to promote their acquisition. The existence of 'natural' leaders should not be a license

for organisational abuse. Rather it enables us to recognise what are the strengths and limitations players bring to the organisational culture. By pretending, “all of we is one” in terms of identical skills and expertise, fosters confusion then resentment and even chaos. This becomes transparent when certain skills are required to accomplish certain tasks and the egalitarian principle cannot deliver equally shared expertise or outcomes.

This was a major source of complication in the women’s transformational organisation, Sistren (Ford Smith 1989; 1997). The members were all committed to the goals of the organisation. It seems that there was respect for every member and to the egalitarian principles of operating and to the principle of sharing all responsibilities. Through the organisation of meetings and the collective decision making members strived to honour this (Ford Smith 1989; 1997).

Yet, in spite of these commitments members did not come to the organisational table as equals. Some were more educated than others giving them a skills base (power of expertise) that made it much easier to juggle and complete multiple tasks. The fact that the more educated members respected the members with less education did not erode the advantages and power ‘the degree holders’ brought to the table. They came from different socioeconomic classes and even though the women from a middle class background clearly displayed a consciousness of working class oppression and were opposed to it, they lived and worked in a society, an external environment, driven by class cleavages and one that would ascribe different values and hierarchies to the members of the organisation irrespective of the internal organisational dynamic.

Understanding the dynamic interactions of the internal and external environment, the organisational culture and the wider, societal culture is very necessary for the politics of survival especially for organisations going against the grain and disrupting the status quo. It is insufficient to assume a commitment to democratic principles internally would negate the impact of hierarchies existing in the external environment. By not recognising or dealing openly with the inherent power of expertise in a setting like that, created additional complications for other women whose ego integration would begin to be challenged, and who were coming from backgrounds and a society that would have provided no validation for their experiences. It is vital that women do not remain naive about power- whether it is power of office, of expertise, of manipulation, or personal power.

Caribbean societies and Caribbean women’s organisations are in transition (Barriteau 2001C; ECLAC 1998). Caribbean economies are being dragged, ready or not into the web of new economic relations represented by globalization (Massiah 1999). Local, national and regional challenges have not been solved, neither have they gone away. With political leaders struggling to keep abreast of international

developments, it means these old challenges are left to fester. They become layered over by new economic and political nightmares. The high levels of unemployment in the majority of countries are now joined by the reverse migration of our criminal population from the USA and Canada and the accompanying social terror they unleash on us. Our regional common market is not functioning optimally but the rules of the global economy are compounding our economic activities. Super trade and economic blocs like the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development are threatening the viability of the regional offshore banking industry.

Women experience longer life expectancies and greater social mobility than three decades ago, but the lower presence of men in tertiary education and the general problems young men experience with crime and the lucrative drug culture are offered as opposite sides of the same coin (UNDP 1999; Barriteau 2000). Yet there is too much evidence of continuing economic, physical and social violence against women. About forty percent of Caribbean households are still headed by women and while that statistic is often interpreted to mean too many women do not want men in their lives, what needs no interpretation is the fact that these women are the main providers and decision makers for their households. Women's organisations and women's machineries in state structures exist in a hostile climate of renewed gender wars in which there is a recurring tendency to blame women for societal ills. This is the social and economic background against which women's leadership exists. This is the social context in which UNIFEM will promote women's transformational leadership.

Whatever is done to develop women's leadership has to be undertaken against this social, political and economic backdrop. Any effort that ignores this reality would prove meaningless. Transformational leadership cannot only mean visionary women operating with a commitment to democratic structures. It has to involve ongoing attempts to end non democratic, exclusionary practices in everyday life. It means that the training and research that should flow from such a venture must engage with the preconditions of leadership at the individual and institutional levels to facilitate transformational leadership.

Select Bibliography

- Acker, J. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society*, Vol .4 (2), June: 139-58.
- Astin, Helen S. & Carole Leland. 1991. *Women of Influence, Women of Vision: A Cross-Generational Study of Leaders and Social Change*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Azbug, Bella & Devaki Jain. 1996. *Women's Leadership and the Ethics of Development*. Gender in Development Monograph Series No. 4. New York: UNDP.
- Baker, Andrea J, 1982. "The Problem of Authority in Radical Movement Groups: A Case Study of Lesbian-Feminist Organization." *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, Vol. 18 (3): 323-341.
- Bardwick, Judith. 1977. "Some Notes about Power Relationships between Women." In *Beyond Sex Roles*. Alice G. Sargent. Ed., 325-335. St. Paul. West Publishing.
- Barriteau, Eudine & Alan Cobley. Eds. 2001. *Stronger, Surer, Bolder: Dame Nita Barrow Social Change and International Development*. Kingston: Centre for Gender and Development Studies, Cave Hill and the University of the West Indies Press.
- _____. 2001A. "Before WID Beyond GAD: Caribbean Women Creating Change." In *Stronger, Surer, Bolder: Dame Nita Barrow Social Change and International Development*, eds, Eudine Barriteau & Alan Cobley, 3-16. Kingston: Centre for Gender and Development Studies, Cave Hill and the University of the West Indies Press.
- _____. 2001B. "The Challenge of Innovative Leadership of a Traditional Women's Organisation: The World YWCA and Ruth Nita Barrow." In *Stronger, Surer, Bolder: Dame Nita Barrow Social Change and International Development*, eds, Eudine Barriteau & Alan Cobley, 155-176. Kingston: Centre for Gender and Development Studies, Cave Hill and the University of the West Indies Press.

- _____. 2001C. *The Political Economy of Gender in the Twentieth Century Caribbean*. London and New York: Palgrave International.
- _____. 2000. *Examining the Issues of Men, Male Marginalisation and Masculinity in the Caribbean: Policy Implications*. Working Paper no.4. Centre for Gender and Development Studies, UWI, Cave Hill, September.
- Barriteau, Eudine. 1986. "Expatriate = Expert: A Review of Tulane University Operations Research Project Conference." *Bulletin of Eastern Caribbean Affairs*, 12 no. 2 (May-June): 34-39.
- _____. 1994. 'Gender and Development Planning in the Post Colonial Caribbean: Female Entrepreneurs and the Barbadian State.' PhD dissertation, Howard University.
- Bell-Scott, Patricia & Beverley Guy-Shaftall. 1998. "Editorial: Black Women and Leadership." *Sage A Scholarly Journal of Black Women*. 5 no. 2: 3.
- Brasileiro, Ana Maria. Ed. 1996. *Women's Leadership in a Changing World: Reflecting on Experience in Latin America and the Caribbean*. New York: UNIFEM.
- Brodber, Erna. 1986. "The Pioneering Miss Bailey: Erna Brodber talks to Amy Bailey." *Jamaica Journal*. 19 (2): 9-14.
- Brown, Wendy. 1995. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Bunch, Charlotte & Beverley Fisher. 1976. "What Future for Leadership?" *Quest*. Vol II (4), Spring: 3-13.
- Calas, Marta B. & Linda Smircich. 1991. "Voicing Seduction to Silence Leadership." *Organizational Studies*. Vol.12 (4): 567-602.
- Cantor, Dorothy W. and Toni Barney with Jane Stoess. 1992. *Women in Public Power: The Secrets of Leadership*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Crosby, Barbara C. 1998. "Women: New Images of Leadership." *Social Policy*. Fall: 40-44.
- Denmark, Florence. 1977. "Styles of Leadership." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Vol. 2. (2), Winter: 99-113.
- Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. 1998. "The Institutionalization of Gender Equity in the State: A Diagnosis for Latin America and the Caribbean." LC/R. 1387. Santiago: ECLAC.
- Estler, Suzanne E. 1975. "Women Leaders in Public Education." *Signs Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Vol. 1 (2), Winter: 363-386.
- Estrich, Susan. 2000. "The Trouble With Hillary." *Harper Bazaar*. August: 130-131.
- Ford Smith, Honor. 1989. "*Ring ding in a tight corner: A Case Study of Funding and Organizational Democracy in Sistren, 1977 - 1988*." Toronto: Women=s Program ICAE,.
- _____. 1997. "Ring Ding in a Tight Corner: Sistren, Collective Democracy, and the Organization of Cultural Production." In *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. Eds. M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 213-258. Routledge: London and New York.
- Ferguson, Kathy. 1984. *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Goetz Ann Marie. 1995. "Institutionalizing Women's Interest and Gender-Sensitive Accountability in Development." *IDS Bulletin* Vol. 26 (3) July: 1 -11.
- Greaves, Thomas C. 1986. "The Woman's Voice in Andean Labour Unions." *Urban Anthropology*. Vol. 3 (4): 355-376.
- Hackman, Michael Z., & Craig E. Johnson. 1996. *Leadership: A Communication Perspective*. Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.

- Hall, Nora & Karen Gray. 1998. "Leadership for Black Women: Strategies for the Future." *Sage A Scholarly Journal of Black Women*. 5 no. 2: 53-55.
- Hartman, Mary S. Ed. 1999. *Talking Leadership: Conversations With Powerful Women*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Home, Alice M. 1991. "Mobilizing Women's Strengths for Social Change: The Group Connection." *Social Work With Groups*. Vol 14 (3-2): 153-173.
- Jain, Devaki, with Supriti Bezbaruah. 1997. *For Women to Lead... Ideas and Experiences from Asia: A Study on the Legal and Political Impediments to Gender Equality in Governance*. UNDP: New York.
- Jain, Devaki. 1993. 'The Leadership Gap: A Challenge to Feminists'. Paper Presented to The Sixth Annual Conference of The Indian Association for Women's Studies, Mysore, India, May 31st - June 3rd.
- Johnson, Paula. 1976. "Women and Power: Toward a Theory of Effectiveness." *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol.32 (3): 99-110.
- Jones, Kathleen B. *Compassionate Authority: Democracy and the Representation of Women*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Kabeer, Naila. 1999. "Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurements of Women's Empowerment." *Development and Change*. Vol. 30 (3): 435-464.
- Kanango, Sukla Deb. 1996. "Panchayati Raj and Emerging Women Leadership." *Social Action*. Vol. 46 (1): 76-91.
- Karl, Marilee. 1995. *Women and Empowerment: Participation and Decision Making*. London and New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd.

- King, Joyce, Elaine. 1998. "A Black Woman Speaks on Leadership." *Sage A Scholarly Journal of Black Women*. 5 no. 2: 49-52.
- Kintz, Linda. 1997. *Between Jesus and the Market: The Emotions that Matter in Right Wing America*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Kitzinger, Celia. 1991. "Feminism, Psychology and the Paradox of Power." *Feminism and Psychology*. Vol. 1 (1):111-129.
- Le Veness, Frank P. & Jane P. Sweeny. Eds. 1987. *Women Leaders in Contemporary U. S. Politics*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reinner Publishers.
- Levy, Marion Fennelly. 1988. *Each in Her Own Way: Five Women Leaders in the Developing World*. Colorado: Lynne Reiner Publishers.
- Lipman-Blumen, Jean. 1983. "Emerging Patterns of Female Leadership in Formal Organizations: Must the Female Leader Go Formal?" In *The Challenge of Change: Perspectives on Family, Work and Education*. Eds. Matina Horner, Carol C. Nadelson, and Malkah T. Notman, 61-91. New York: Plenu Press.
- Made, Pate. 1997. Feminist Global Leadership Development: Summary Minutes of the Conference, September 22-27, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey. 1990. "Rethinking Feminist Organisations." *Gender and Society*, Vol 4 (2), June: 180-206.
- Massiah, Joycelin. 1999. 'Sixth CARICOM Triennial Award for Women Acceptance Address'. Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, July 4.
- Masterson, Lorraine. 1976. "Feminist Leaders Can't Walk on Water." *Quest*. Vol. 30 (4), Spring: 29-40.

- McNay, Lois. 1992. *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Meeker, B. F. & Weitzel-O'Neil P.A. 1977. "Sex Roles and Interpersonal Behavior in Task-Oriented Groups." *American Sociological Review*. Vo. 42,: 91-104.
- McCorduck, Pamela, & Nancy Ramsey. 1996. *The Futures of Women: Scenarios for the 21st Century*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Miller, Jean Baker. 1992. "Women and Power." In *Rethinking Power*. Ed. Thomas E. Wartenberg, 240-248. New York: State University of New York.
- Mitchell, Jacquelyn. 1998. "Three Women: Cultural Roles and Leadership Roles in the Black Community." *Sage A Scholarly Journal of Black Women*. 5 no. 2: 9-19.
- Moglen, Helene, 1983. "Power and Empowerment." *Women's Studies International Forum*. Vol. 6 (2): 131-134.
- Molina, Natacha. 1997. "Leadership in Building Equality and Citizenship." *Lola Press International Feminist Magazine*, No. 6. November 1996-April 1997: 28-30.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1955. "Family Structure and the Socialization of the Child." In T. Parsons & R. F. Bales, *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Pateman, Carole. 1980. "Women and Consent," *Political Theory* vol 8 (2): 149-168.
- Pohlmann, Lisa. 1995. "Ambivalence About Leadership in Women's Organizations - A Look at Bangladesh" *IDS Bulletin* Vol 26. (3), July: 117-124
- Rai, Shirin M. 1995. "Women and Public Power: Women in the Indian Parliament." *IDS Bulletin*. Vol. 26. (3), July: 110-116.

- Rao, Aruna & Michelle Friedman. 1999. *Transforming Institutions: History and Challenges an International Perspective*. UNIFEM/NOVIB Donor Roundtable on Building Women's Leadership for the 21st Century, February 2-3, New York.
- Ramphela, Mamphela. 1990. "AWomen and Rural Development: The Debate About Appropriate Strategies". *Sage: A Scholarly Journal on Black Women* . Vol. 3 (1): 9.
- Reddock, Rhoda E. 1994. *Women Labour and Politics in Trinidad and Tobago A History*. Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers.
- _____. 1988. *Elma Francois: The NWCSA and the Worker's Struggle for Change in the Caribbean*. London: New Beacon books.
- Reingold, Beth. 1996. "Conflict and Cooperation: Legislative Strategies and Concepts of Power among Female and Male State Legislators." *The Journal of Politics*. Vol. 58 (2): 464-485.
- Rosener, Judy B. 1990. "Ways Women Lead." *Harvard Business Review*. November-December: 119-124.
- Russell, Diana. 1998. "Fatima Meer: South African Community Leader and Fighter Against Apartheid." *Sage A Scholarly Journal of Black Women*. 5 no. 2: 69-73.
- Sacks, Karen Brodtkin. 1988. "Gender and Grassroots Leadership." In *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*. Ed. Ann Bookman & Sandra Morgan, 77-93. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Shepard, Herbert A. 1977. "Men in Organizations: Some Reflections." In *Beyond Sex Roles*. Alice G. Sargent. Ed., 387-335. St. Paul. West Publishing.
- Sternweis & Betty L. Wells , 1992. "The Missing Perspective: Leadership in Rural Women's Terms." *Social Development Issues*. Vol. 14 (2\3): 41-49.

Statham, Anne. 1987. "The Gender Model Revisited: Differences in the Management Styles of Men and Women." *Sex Roles*. Vol 16 (7/8): 409-429.

Stewart, Sheelagh & Jill Taylor. 1995. "Women Organizing Women - Doing it Backward and in High Heels" *IDS Bulletin*. Vol 26. (3), July: 79-85.

Stogdill, Ralph. M. 1974. *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York & London: The Free Press.

United Nations Development Program. 1999. *Human Development Report 1999*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Van Nostrand, Catharine Herr. 1993. *Gender Responsible Leadership: Detecting Bias, Implementing Interventions*. London: Sage Publications.

Vassell, Linette. 1995 "Women of the Masses: Daphne Campbell and 'left' Politics in Jamaica in the 1950's." In *Engendering History: Caribbean Women in Historical Perspective*, eds. V. Shepherd, B. Brereton, & B. Bailey, 318-336. Kingston and London: Ian Randle & James Curry Publishers.

Wieringa, Saskia. 1995. *Subversive Women: Women's Movements in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean*. New Delhi and London: Zed Books Ltd and Kali for Women.

Woosley, Lorette K. & Laura-Lynne McBain. 1987. "Issues of Power and Powerlessness in All Woman Groups." *Women's Studies International Forum*. Vol 10 (6); 579-588.

-
- i. UNIFEM Caribbean Office, Transformational Leadership Project Document, May 2, 2000.
- ii. This list is partial and reflects my ready knowledge of the activities of these women. A goal of this project is to unearth the women leaders in the Commonwealth Caribbean, paying particular attention to the smaller countries of the Eastern Caribbean and the countries of Belize and Guyana .
- iii. I am not suggesting that there is anything intrinsically or inherently wrong or pathological about male leadership in and of itself. What I am critiquing is the belief reflected in research, practice, and every day folklore that leadership is fundamentally a male quality and women and leadership can only, and should only be understood through those lens.
- iv. I can provide two recent examples of this but would prefer not to do so, however we do know and see the interviews throughout the region where women try to minimize any recognition that they indeed are powerful women.
- v. For example policewomen and men have the authority of citizens to carry out law enforcement decisions on behalf of the state. When they resort to the use of force this is not automatically or normally seen as illegitimate unless it is perceived as excessive and contravening the authority conveyed in the original consent to have a police force.
- vi. Brown goes on to cite in a footnote a quotation from Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England* which states: "By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law;. . . The very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended." [which is a citation from Carole Pateman, "Women and Consent," *Political Theory* vol 8, 1980: 152,155] (Brown 1995: 182).
- vii. Office here means a position of leadership and not a formal, physical space. The head of the Mothers' Union of the Anglican Church has the power of office whether or not the Union has a physical space for its head.
- viii. Structured and hierarchical here refers to a formal, known set of responsibilities of the Coordinator which are markedly different to that of a secretary in CAFRA. How CAFRA may be more democratic and less rigid in its internal environment than UWI would be in the NGO having built in provisions for a secretary to provide feedback on the leadership decisions of the Coordinator. This would not happen in a formal, hierarchical institution such as the University of the West Indies. However the expectations of the Coordinator, her accountability for the organizations' well being are much greater than that of a secretary in that she is held accountable to both internal and external constituencies.

ix. In fact one woman's secretary described her as being totally focussed on her work, behaving like a man, and not caring about people in the organisation.