Florida Atlantic University

From the SelectedWorks of Mirya R Holman

2011

Gender and Power in American Cities: Investigations of the Effect of Mayoral Gender on Deliberation, Representation, and Policymaking in U.S. Cities

Mirya R Holman, Florida Atlantic University

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/mirya_holman/16/
Gender and Power in American Cities:
Investigations of the Effect of Mayoral Gender on Deliberation, Representation, and
Policymaking in U.S. Cities

Mirya R. Holman
Assistant Professor
Florida Atlantic University
mholman5@fau.edu

Abstract: The representation of historically marginalized groups in the democratic policy process serves many purposes, including introducing new and differing perspectives to the policymaking process, opening the policymaking process up to disenfranchised groups, and changing the deliberative process of urban policymaking. In this paper, I investigate the effect of gender on policy priorities and policy outcomes of mayors in U.S. cities. Using a combination of interview data and coded city council minutes, I examine the effect of mayoral gender on the discussion of issues of importance to female constituents, the nature of deliberation in city councils, and the engagement of the public in policymaking. Studying these questions at the local level allows a unique examination of the effect of gender on deliberation and policymaking, as well as urban policymaking. The nature of municipal representatives allows a new examination of principals of deliberation, representation, and power in politics.
Introduction:

Group representation unravels the false consensus that cultural imperialism may have produced, and reveals group bias in norms, standards, styles, and perspective that have been assumed as universal or of highest value. By giving voice to formerly silenced or devalued needs and experiences, group representation forces participants in discussion to take a reflective distance on their assumptions and think beyond their own interests.

Young 1994, 136

A principal argument for increasing the representation of historically marginalized groups is that representatives from these groups will bring new and differing perspectives to the policymaking process. In particular, the representation of groups like women and racial minorities serve as a signal to members of these groups that the policymaking process is fair and democratic, that their opinions are represented, and that the policy produced through the deliberative process is legitimate. In addition, members of marginalized groups approach or understand issues and policies through a different lens. In this article, I use eight case studies of cities in California and North Carolina to examine relationship between descriptive characteristics and deliberation and leadership. I demonstrate that the gender of a representative can affect the both the substance and process of policymaking. Generally, I find the gender of a mayor effects the discussion of policies of importance to female and minority constituents, but that this finding is constrained by the nature of local politics. I also find the presence of a female mayor results in changes to the process of policymaking, including an increase in the public participation in policymaking, changes in the deliberative structure of policymaking, and the level of discussion about policies. These findings suggest that women influence policymaking in ways that have gone – until now – unmeasured.
Descriptive Characteristics and Deliberation:

Deliberation matters only because there is a difference. If some freak of history of nature had delivered a polity based on unanimous agreement, then politics would be virtually redundant and the decisions would already be made.
Phillips 1995, 151

The nature of a deliberative democracy requires that political representatives with varying opinions on the correct approach and outcome to policy engage with each other in a mindful deliberation over the merits of a variety of policies. The “giving, weighing, acceptance or rejection of reasons” (Parkinson 2003, 180) produces policy. Scholars have argued that the deliberation process requires adequate representation by members of historically marginalized groups (Williams 1998; Guinier 1994; Habermas 1996; Phillips 1995; Williams 2000).

Generally, there are both normative and empirical reasons that historically marginalized groups, such as women and racial minorities, should be included in deliberative processes. There are three normative reasons and two empirical reasons that policymaking improved in quality and fairness if marginalized groups are included. Looking at the first of the normative reasons, the inclusion of minority groups in the deliberative process lends an air of legitimacy to the policies produced by the body (Dryzek 2001). Thus, if policies affect women, and women are unrepresented in the process, the policies created are illegitimate.

Second, descriptive representation by members of historically marginalized groups is of particular importance in the deliberative process when the interests of the groups are unclear, uncrystalized, or cross-cut party lines (Wolbrecht 2000). Non-descriptive representatives may provide representation to members of historically marginalized groups when the desires of the minority group are clear and precise. However, when the interests of marginalized groups are complicated, unclear, unknown, or contrary to partisan demands, a descriptive representative
may be required. Mansbridge (1999) argues that “When legislators are engaged primarily in introspective representation, descriptive representation will enhance that representation most when interests are relatively uncrystalized; that is, when party identification and campaign statements provide poor clues to a representative's future actions” (Mansbridge 1999, 646). The argument that leaders from underrepresented groups may have a better understanding of policies is especially relevant to the urban arena, where a low level of information about constituency opinions and representative actions permeates the political process (Lieske 1989), political parties lack control (Saiz and Geser 1999), and issues often do not correspond with party platforms. The application to women is of particular interest, as many issues that have a direct effect on women are changing and developing without a consistent right answer. In these situations, a female representative is better equipped to understand the effect that a policy will have on other women, or to suggest how the political body can address a problem. She may explain to men how the nature of domestic violence reduces the ability of women to leave abusive relationships, or how sexual discrimination and harassment lead to a decrease in workplace productivity. These issues cuts across party lines, so male representatives are unable to look to party cues for information on how to vote; in addition, a woman’s perspective on these issues allow men to understand it as a problem that requires political intervention.

Third, representatives are often afforded the opportunity to engage in “introspective representation,” where they consider what they believe to be right for their constituents and the nation (Mansbridge 1999; 644). As John Stuart Mill posits, “Very few facts are able to tell their own story, without comments to bring out their meaning” (80) or, as articulated by Phillips, “Ideas [cannot be] treated as totally separate from the people who carry them” (1995; 25). Others

---

1 Issues like public works, transportation issues, and development are not “owned” by either party, so leaders are not bound to a party platform when working on these issues.
have argued that the individual values of representatives will affect policies, as “officials are likely to use this discretion to maximize their own political values” (Meier and England 1984; 393). Similarly, participants in policy deliberation maybe influenced by “general upbringing, parental values, personal experiences, the views of friends and acquaintances, influential teachers, partisan attachments, social class, economic status, etc” (Bessette 1994, 49). The ability of representatives to engage in personal representation is particularly true at the urban level, as urban political structures in the United States are either non-partisan or involve very little control by parties over their members (Cutright 1963; Welch and Bledsoe 1986; Bledsoe and Welch 1987; Adrian 1959; Hawley 1873).\(^2\) The lack of partisan control at the local level allows urban leaders to use their personal beliefs in policy decisions on a more frequent basis.

Looking next at the empirical reasons that an inclusive deliberative process is better, first, representation by historically excluded groups may produce better public policy, as these members will introduce new insights into the process. “When policies are formulated without the active participation of members of such groups, they are likely to be biased or incomplete in various ways” (Williams 1998, 124). Members of these groups may approach or understand policies in a different manner than white, male representatives, as a diversity of representatives leads to a diversity of viewpoints (Walker et al. 1996; Habermas 1996; Williams 2000). The argument that the perspectives of marginalized group members may lead to better public policy was used by suffrage movement advocates for arguing for the extension of the franchise to women (McDonagh 2002). At the time, activists argued that women were naturally suited for politics because social functions, like hygiene and health, which had been under the domain of the household were becoming issues of the public sector. As women had controlled many of

\(^2\) Approximately two-thirds of all cities larger than 5,000 inhabitants have nonpartisan elections (Saiz and Geser 1999).
these social functions in the household, activists could argue that “Women should have an equal place in politics, therefore, because the formulation of good public policy depending crucially upon their input into the decision-making process” (Williams 2000, 132). The rich history of marginalized groups bringing better ideas to public policy creation suggests that the introduction of descriptive representatives enhances deliberative democracy.

Second and finally, due to persistent sexual discrimination in society as well as different socialization patterns, women may conceptualize the deliberative and policy-making process differently than their male counterparts. Here, Young (1994; Williams 2000; Acker 1992) argues that effect of the integration of historically marginalized groups often serves to confront the majority with “interests, needs, and opinions that [are] derived from very different social positions and experience” (Young 199b, 136). The presence of new ideas serves to reveal “bias in norms, standards, styles, and perspectives that have been assumed as universal or of highest value” (ibid).

Looking at women in public office, scholars have found that women can influence the policy process. For example, Congresswomen sponsor bills relating to women’s issues more often (Swers 2001; Tamerius 1995; Vega and Firestone 1995; Wolbrecht 2003), participate in floor debates on women’s issues (Swers 2001; Tamerius 1995; Cramer Walsh 2003; Levy et al. 2002), and serve on committees that deal with women’s issues (Norton 1999; Gertzog 1995; Dodson 2003, 1998; Dodson et al. 1995). Similarly, at the state legislative level, women participate in women-focused policymaking more often than their male colleagues, through debates, committee membership, and voting (Carroll and Taylor 1989; Diamond 1977; Dolan 1998; Rosenthal 1998; Thomas 1994; Welch and Thomas 1991).
If the introduction of representation by members of historically marginalized groups leads to a change in the focus and substance of policy deliberation, then I should find that changing from a white to a minority or a male to a female mayor will change the subject of policies discussed. As such, I propose two hypotheses relating to the effect of descriptive representatives on the policy process:

H1: The presence of a female mayor will lead to an increase in the discussion of policies effecting women.

**Differential Viewpoints:**

A representative’s conceptualization of power and approach to power has the potential to influence the nature of policies. Research by Gilligan (1977, 1982), Antolini, (1984), Kathleen (1989, 1995b), Blair and Stanley (1991), Duerst-Lahti and Johnson (1990), and Tilly and Gurin (1990) has shown that women, as compared to their male counterparts, have a unique conceptualization of power and decision-making. Politically, even when research fails to identify policy differences between male and female leaders, women speak “of their distinctive conceptions of power and politics” (Flammang 1985, 114).

Carol Gilligan’s work suggests that women have a different conceptualization of morality than men do, approaching moral values from the perspective of caring and fairness, while men see morality as a strict dichotomy of right or wrong. Specifically, Gilligan argues that women have a “more contextual mode of judgment and a different moral understanding” (1982, 22). Through focus group and interview research, Gilligan demonstrates that women’s understanding of integrity and morality is “centered on activities of care” (62) and “conceptions on responsibility and care” (105). Further research has found that women and men have distinct and
varying views of morality, goodness, and social roles (Langton and Cohen 2008; Kathlene 1995a, 1989; Lang-Takac and Osterweil 1992). Generally, women see themselves as caretakers, and their definition of goodness is “equated with helping and pleasing others” (Kathlene 1989, 400). Men, however, have a sense of success tied to their actions as autonomous individuals, not members of society (Kathlene 1989). Similarly, Chodorow and others argue that men develop an “irreversibly established” identity of independence and self-actualization, while women are socialized to have a relational and caring identity (1978; Towns 2003).

Developing tangentially to the scholarship on the relationship between gender and morality is a substantial literature on the relationship between gender and leadership styles. Generally, women are more likely to engage in a more open, transformation style of leadership, where a leader works with and motivates subordinates to act on their own. Women tend to adopt a more democratic and participatory style of leadership, while men adopt a more directive or autocratic style (for a meta analysis of the relationship between gender and leadership, see Eagly and Johnson 1990). Generally, Rosener (1990) finds that men view leadership as transactional, or the process of giving out rewards and punishments for performance successes and failures. Women, on the other hand, view leadership as transformative; they feel a duty towards getting subordinates to change their behavior and self-interest. Women seem to engage in inclusive leadership actions more often, including encouraging participation, sharing power and information, enhancing the self-worth of others, energizing others, and leading without formal authority (Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt 2001; Eagly and Johnson 1990).

Applying these concepts of morality to public officials, scholars have found that gender effects how individuals approach the task of leadership. Findings include that women are more likely to report being motivated by an altruistic concern when making policy (Lee and Waters
2009), more concerned with consensus (Jewell and Whicker 1994), and interested in bringing an “integrative and collaborative dimension to leadership” (Rosenthal 1998, 5). Other research has found that female leaders “stress cooperation rather than conflict, maintaining relationships rather than achieving abstract justice” (Tilly and Gurin 1990, 556). Kathlene (1989) analyzes leadership through a variety of policy actions in the context of state legislative action in Colorado, and finds interaction with the political environment can be classified along two axes: Instrumentalists (who see strict boundaries and focus on individual rights) and Contextualists (who see “life as a series of interrelations,” where boundaries are less formal and perspectives are malleable). Kathlene (1989, 1995a) finds that female and male legislators view policies very differently; women see a problem like crime as society’s problem and seek preventative measures, whereas men “emphasized individual responsibility and sought reactive measures” (1995, 721). From these differing perspectives, women see the answers to political questions as complex, living organisms, with multiple solutions, where men see a concrete answer to each problem (Kathlene 1989).

Other scholars have found gender differences in relationship with constituents, motivation for public service, and attitudes towards policymaking. Diamond (1977) and Kirkpatrick (1974) examined the goals of legislators and found that female legislators cited serving the public interest more often as a primary responsibility than male legislators did. Research on city councils has produced similar findings: Thomas (1992) and Beck (1991) found that female city council members were more responsive to constituency demands, while Flammang (1985) and Johnson and Carroll (1978) found that women emphasized helping the

---

3 Kathlene also argues that men tend to be more instrumental, where people are viewed as “self-centered and self-serving,” and women are contextual, where the world is seen as inter-connected and people’s lives are “a continuous web of relationships” (Kathlene 1995, 698).
community more often than male city council members did. Thomas (1992) found that, because women view themselves as more trustworthy and connected to the community, “constituents are more important to women, not because they need votes, but because they have strong commitments to community service and representing community needs…” (170). Examining city managers, Fox and Schuhmann (1999) find that women are more likely to say that they are in office to help the community, work with and serve the citizens, and “embrace a style of management that relies on citizen input” (231). Women are also more likely to feel that they have a responsibility to communicate with citizens and elected officials, and to motivate staff.

H2: The presence of a female mayor will lead to an increase in community participation in policymaking.

Data and Methods:

In order to examine the effect of gender on the policymaking process at the urban level, I identified six cities in Southern California and North Carolina where the gender of the mayor changed from a white male mayor to a female or female minority mayor.\(^4\) I also examined two cities that changed mayors but did not change the race or gender of the mayor as a control group. The group of cities includes a city in North Carolina and a city in California that changed from a white male mayor to a white female mayor, cities in both states that changed from a white male mayor to a Hispanic female mayor, a city in California that changed from a white male mayor to an Asian female mayor, a city in North Carolina that changed from a white male mayor to an

---

\(^4\) As I promised confidentiality to the leaders in each city during the interview process, I will not refer to the cities by actual name. In addition, I have rounded some of the descriptive characteristics in order to prevent identification of each city and their leaders.
African American female mayor, and cities in both states that changed from one white male mayor to another white male mayor. Details on each city are available in Table 1.⁵

In order to select the cities for my research, I considered several variables. First, it was important to me that the cities matched as much as possible on their form of government (Hayes and Semoon 1990). To this end, all of the cities studied in the policy process chapter have a strong mayor (or mayor-council) form of government. By choosing cities with a strong mayor form of government, I hope to examine cities where the mayor has some control over the policies discussed in city government. Second, I only examined cities that have an independent election for mayor; none of the cities have a mayoral office that is rotational.⁶ Here, I am attempting to examine the effects of a leader who chooses to run for and serve in an executive position.

I chose two nests of cities (one in California and one in North Carolina) that match as much as possible on population and demographics. As the scholarship on the provision of services at the local level suggests that demographics will affect the behavior of leaders, I match cities on these variables (as much as possible) to eliminate socio-economic factors as the driver for policymaking (Sharp and Maynard-Moody 1991). The cities in California are all located in the suburbs of Los Angeles. The cities range from 37,000 to 47,000 residents and are diverse, with large Hispanic and Asian populations; on average, these cities are smaller and about as diverse (ranging from 42% to 61% white) as the average city in the Los Angeles metropolitan statistical area.⁷ The residents of the cities studied range in median household income from

---

⁵ Data in Table 4 is rounded to protect the identity of the leaders interviewed.

⁶ None of the cities examined in this chapter have mayors that are selected from the city council members, either through a rotational system or through election by the members of the city council.

⁷ The average size of a city in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Statistical Area is 108,939 residents, and the average city is 52% white.
$53,000 to $67,000; the median income of these cities is slightly below the median household income of $68,000 in the Los Angeles area. The cities studied from North Carolina range from 69,000 to 77,000 in population, which is slightly smaller than the average North Carolina city (with population average of slightly fewer than 80,000) and larger than the California cities. The North Carolina cities, with 64% to 81% white, are less diverse than the California cities and less diverse than North Carolina cities in general.\(^8\) The residents of cities in North Carolina have a lower income (ranging from $38,000 to $48,000) than the cities studied in California and a slightly lower income than North Carolina urban residents (who have a median income of $48,000).

For each city, I obtained ten years of city council minutes, focusing on the five years prior and five years after the change in mayor, which resulted in a time-period of roughly 1993 to 2003. I then coded the city council minutes from each city for four specific patterns: first, the substance or subject of policies discussed by the city council; second, the participants in the policymaking discussion; third, the duration of the policy process; and forth, the results of each policy deliberation. Each city has slightly different patterns of deliberation, so I attempted to make the categories in each of these patterns as broad as possible, while retaining significant detail in the information collected.

To start, I coded the subject matter of each discussion into one of seventeen categories: affordable housing, children, community development block grants, development, domestic violence, education, general government, health, library, public works, parks and recreation, race and ethnicity, public safety, transportation, environment, welfare, and gender. These categories were developed through coding a random sample of council minutes from all the cities in my

---

\(^8\) White residents make up an average of 59% of the population of cities in North Carolina.
dataset, and condensing that coding into the eighteen general categories. For an example: coding the original random sample of city council minutes revealed that the library was a very frequent subject of discussion in each of the cities; in both California and North Carolina, public libraries are under the funding umbrella of local cities (as opposed to counties or states). Thus, after coding the initial city council minutes, the category of library emerged as an obvious choice, as a wide variety of topics relating to libraries were evident in the initial coding, including a capital works project, honoring a retiring librarian, summer reading series, and lengthy discussions of funding for library services. For details on the substance in of each subject matter, please see Appendix A. Next, I examined who participated in each policy discussion, condensing the participants into general four general categories: ceremonial, public participation, city employees, and the city council. Next, I coded what happened to the item – the number of people discussing the item and whether the issue was passed, voted down, tabled for further research, or held for further discussion. Appendix B is an example of the coding of a few items.

In addition to coding ten years of city council minutes for each city, I also contacted as many of the leaders from each of the cities as possible for interviews. For the female and male mayors, I attempted to engage each leader in a series of three or four shorter interviews (approximately 40 minutes to an hour each), asking leaders a variety of questions about their actions in office, their attitudes towards leadership, their policy choices, and their policy actions. I also interviewed members of each city council once, with particular attention paid to those city council members that were in office during both the male and female mayors’ tenure. For all leaders, I engaged in a very free form interview process, where leaders were asked general

9 Ceremonial participants (also called “presentations” or “special orders”) included two general classes of actions and individuals: religious figures that were invited to give a blessing or prayer at the beginning of the meeting or those participants that were either being recognized or recognizing an event, such as a birth, death, birthday, or accomplishment.
questions and I followed up with probing questions if necessary. Approximately 40% of the interviews were conducted via telephone; the remainder were done in person. The list of interview questions asked of each leader is available in Appendix C.

Profiles of Leaders:

Studying each city in such detail, from city council minutes and budgets to electoral returns and interviews allowed me to develop a profile of the female leaders in each city, including identifying commonalities and differences; Table 2 presents basic information for each leader.

Insert Table 2 about here.

First, each female leader faced a competitive election to become the mayor of her city. Three-fourths of the women (four of six) were city council members prior to becoming mayors and all had some political experience prior to serving as mayor. All of the mayors – male, female, white, or minority – had a professional career. All six of the female leaders relied on informal networks to gain office, including “friends from work,” “other mothers,” and “my women friends.” The leaders split in their ambition for higher office; two of the mayors sought and won higher office (including a seat in the California House of Representatives and a statewide office) and the remaining four women expressed no interest in holding any additional office. The leaders split in their party identification, although all the leaders ran in non-partisan elections. When we discussed why each leader had run for mayoral office, the theme was common and persistent: these women felt that the current mayor was ignoring the perspective that they represented. These perspectives included the idea that “giving the city away to developers wasn’t the solution to everything,” that “the underdog sometimes get a say in what
happens in government,” and that “city government should have hand in providing a higher quality of life for all residents – not just the rich.”

The principal difference between the white and minority leaders was that the minority leaders offered that they ran for office to represent their racial or ethnic community. The Black woman went on to say she ran “to represent ALL the Blacks in the community. The other [Black] leaders are only interested in the middle class. Someone has to say something about the needs of poor Blacks in my community, even if it is unpopular.”

The male mayors that served in my control cities also won in competitive elections, had formerly been city council members, and split in their ambition for higher office. However, when asked to list their supporters, the men listed formal, business oriented groups like the Chamber of Commerce as their principal backers. Asking the men why they served, these leaders said they “were asked,” or “felt it was time” to be mayor; none of the male leaders cited an underserved perspectives.

In general, the qualitative information from these mayors suggests male and female – and white and minority – leaders have similar backgrounds, but are motivated and supported by different groups. The finding that leaders have similar backgrounds but different conceptualization of politics is consistent with both the scholarship on deliberation and on leadership – a different background or socialization produces a different perspective in policymaking.

**The Substance of Policymaking:**

The first hypothesis that I examine is whether female mayors influence the subject matter of deliberation and introduce a larger discussion of issues that relate to women. To determine
whether hypothesis 1 is correct, I averaged the number of items discussed that relate to women per month in each council.\textsuperscript{10} Issues relating to women included policies relating to gender, gender equity, sexual discrimination, sexual harassment, sexism, women’s health (breast cancer in particular), female leaders, and providing leadership or mentoring to women or girls specifically. Figure 1 is a graphical depiction of the average number of items per month that related to women and the status of women in each community. I have divided the display of the results into California and North Carolina cities for clarity sake. Each figure depicts the three cities of interest and the control city over time. Each line changes color as the mayor changes. Keep in mind that all the cities from California changes mayors sometime in 1998.

Insert Figure 1 about here.

Figure 1 displays support for hypothesis 3a in the city with a white female mayor. However, in the cities with Hispanic and Asian female mayors, changing the gender of the mayor does not lead to a change in the focus of the discussion of issues; indeed, the control city has a higher rate of discussion of issues relating to women.

Insert Figure 2 about here.

North Carolina cities demonstrate a bit more evidence for hypothesis 1, although the patterns are far from conclusive. As Figure 2 shows, the change from a male to a female mayor in cities with a Black female mayor and a Hispanic female mayor led to an increase in the discussion of issues that relate to women. However, the change in the mayoral gender in the city with a white female mayor is indistinguishable from the change in mayor in the control city.\textsuperscript{11} In

\textsuperscript{10} I use a “per month” measurement, as the councils met at varying frequencies; one council met every week, other met once a month, five councils met ever two weeks, and one council met once a month and had a “special” meeting once a month.

\textsuperscript{11} As a reminder, in the North Carolina cities, the change in mayor for all three cities occurs in 1998, while the change in mayor in the control city occurs in 1999.
the North Carolina cities with Black and Hispanic mayors, the change in mayor is a statistically significant predictor of discussions relating to women; the mayoral change is insignificant in the North Carolina cities with a white female mayor. In the rare circumstances that cities discuss issues relating to women, the gender of the mayor can have an effect on deliberation; one mayor, in discussing a sexual harassment policy, commented “…I don’t think that it even occurred to [the former mayor] that a sexual harassment policy was necessary for city employees.” I next use a time-series cross-sectional model with fixed effects for each city, with a variable for each female leader and city level controls to estimate the effect of changing the race or gender of the mayor on the discussion of items relating to women. Here, the model is estimating the effect of a change in mayor; essentially, the gender of the mayor is the time variant variable, while the city is the time invariant variable, which allows me to estimate the effect of the change in mayor without controlling for city-specific values, as the these values changed very little over the ten years in question.\(^\text{12}\) As Table 3 shows, the change in mayors produces varying results.\(^\text{13}\)

\[ y_{it} = \beta_0 + X_{it}\beta + Z_{i}y + a_i + u_{it}, \]

Where:

- \( y_{it} \) is the dependent variable observed for individual \( i \) at time \( t \),
- \( X_{it} \) is the time variant regressor,
- \( Z_{i} \) is the time invariant regressor,
- \( a_i \) is the unobserved effects,
- and \( u_{it} \) is the error term.

The citation for a fixed effect cross-sectional time series model is as following:

\[
Y_{it} - \bar{Y}_i = (X_{it} - \bar{X}_i) \beta + u_{it} - \bar{u}_i,
\]

where:

\[
\bar{X}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} X_{it} \text{ and } \bar{u}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} u_{it}
\]

\[
\beta_{FE} = \left( \sum_{i,t} \tilde{x}_{it}\tilde{x}_{it} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i,t} \tilde{x}_{it}\tilde{y}_{it}
\]

Where: \( \tilde{x}_{it} = (X_{it} - \bar{X}_i) \) and \( \tilde{y}_{it} = y_{it} - \bar{y}_i \)

---

\(^\text{12}\) The population of all but one city changed less by less than 2000 residents in the ten-year period; the sole city (with an female Asian mayor in California) that changed more had a population increase of 4600 over the ten years. None of the principle demographics (racial composition, median income, employment rates, or education rates) of any of these cities shifted dramatically over time.

\(^\text{13}\) The full model citation is:
Table 3 reveals data consistent with Figures 1 and 2; the white female California mayor and the Black and Hispanic mayors for North Carolina have a statistically significant effect on the discussion of issues relating to women. The effect of these mayors is generally small; changing mayors results in a one-tenth of one item increase per month. However, given that the overall average level of discussion of items relating to women under their predecessors less than two percent of a point per meeting, the substantive effect is large.\textsuperscript{14}

One possible reason for the lack of substantial changes in the level of discussion of issues relating to women is that municipal governments simply do not routinely handle issues relating to women (Weikart et al. 2007). Cities have little control over policies that are explicitly women’s policies. In the California city with a white female mayor, the mayor focused some attention on instances of sexual harassment in the city’s police force; after several meetings involving a discussion of the issue, attention waned and the council moved onto other items. In the city with a Black female mayor, the mayor promoted and passed a policy that protected city employees from sexual discrimination. The majority of discussions in the other cities surrounded symbolic policies, like the city honoring Women’s History month, or recognizing a local woman for her efforts to provide scholarships to female students. When I asked the female mayors to discuss what they considered “women’s” issues, they brought up policies that are under the control of local government but are not explicit women’s issues: domestic violence, child safety, good schools, and low crime. The general lack of opportunities for leaders to act on items relating to women in local government suggest that it may be better to examine issues that are of importance to women but are also policies that cities have some control over.

\textsuperscript{14} As I use Stata’s xtreg command, coefficients are easily used to calculate substantive effects, because xtreg averages each year’s coefficient to give a single standard coefficient.
In an effort to examine issues that cities regularly address, I turn to the issues of domestic and sexual violence. Because of localized control of public safety, city governments have a great deal more discretion over policies relating to domestic violence (including police procedure, funding of support services, court and justice management, and issues relating to privacy and safety) and sexual violence (including police procedure, crisis response, health care, prosecution and justice, and prevention). Furthermore, women are much more likely to be the victims of domestic\footnote{Women are the victims in 98\% of domestic violence incidents (Justice 2005).} and sexual violence.\footnote{Over 90\% of rape victims are women, and women are six times more likely to be the victim of an assault of a sexual nature (Justice 2005).} Thus, I examined the effect of changing gender on the discussion of issues relating to domestic and sexual violence, anticipating that female mayors may be able to deliberate over these issues more easily than issues generally relating to women. Furthermore, as both rape and domestic violence were considered “issues of the home” for centuries, women may be necessary participants for deliberative bodies to consider these issues as actionable.\footnote{Some scholars have posited that the term “domestic violence” is an indicator that society sees domestic violence as different from normal forms of violence, a form of violence not within the domain of the public sphere.} As shown in Figures 3 and 4, the expectation that female leaders will lead to an increase in the discussion of issues relating to domestic and sexual violence is correct.

Insert Figures 3 & 4 about here.

In each of the cities that changed to a female mayor, there was a marked increase in the discussion of issues that relate to domestic and sexual violence. At the same time, cities that changed from a male mayor to another male mayor experience no change, which allows me to rule out that a state or regional event had prompted the increase in discussion of issues of domestic and sexual violence.

Insert Table 4 about here
As Table 4 shows, in a cross-sectional times series model with fixed effects, the change from a male to a female mayor has a significant, positive effect on the discussion of issues relating to domestic and sexual violence in every city. The substantive effect of changing from a male mayor to a female mayor varies widely, from 0.72 of a point (Asian mayor in California) to 0.02 of a point (white female mayor in North Carolina). The widely varying substantive effect of changing the gender and race of a mayor is largely due to the opportunities that each mayor was afforded in discussing issues relating to domestic and sexual violence. For example, in the North Carolina city with a white female mayor, a sexual harassment policy for city employees already existed, and a local battered women’s shelter had been able to enact most of the changes in police policy (such as automatic arrests of domestic violence offenders and training police in the proper methods of preserving DNA evidence in sexual assault cases) that a female leader might have raised in discussion. Thus, the mayor had few avenues available, in terms of policy changes to pursue.

Figures 3 and 4 also demonstrate a pattern of a marked and significant increase in the discussion of issues of domestic and sexual violence after a change in mayor, followed by a decay function.\(^\text{18}\) The origin of the decay pattern is also evident in the city council minutes and in interviews with the mayors. Specifically, the female mayors often noted that they pushed a large number of policy changes through the policy process shortly after she took office; after these policies were changed, there were a few maintenance policies to update each year. The female mayors expressed themes of responsibility and protection when she served as an advocate for the

\(^{18}\) Each change is significant in an ARIMA model; full details are available in Appendix E; the exponential decay function is evident as an auto-correlation function (ACF):

\[ R = \frac{\sum(Y_{t-1} - \bar{Y}) \cdot (Y_{t-k} - \bar{Y})}{\sum (Y_t - \bar{Y})^2} \] shows an exponential decay.
women in their city; “It was important for me to support having a [domestic violence] advocate at our local courthouse. Women in our community go there for protection. We should protect them.” Another mayor, when she was able to get the city to pay for rape kits and clean clothes for victims, said that she “felt like she had to make sure [rape] victims were protected. Nothing else has gone right for them – they should at least be able to get some clean clothes at the hospital.” Other women indicated that they pursued policies that relate to domestic and sexual violence “over and over again, until I got what I wanted,” or that “No one considered rape to be an important topic. I had to bring it up ten times before it was discussed once. And then I had to defend it as something we [the council] should consider.”

That the gender of the mayor has a fairly dramatic and significant effect on the discussion of issues that relate to domestic and sexual violence provides support for hypothesis 1. The narratives of female leaders, as well as the form of the data, suggest that theorists who advocate for the integration of marginalized groups into the deliberative process are correct: descriptive representatives can offer an alternate perspective on a variety of issues.

**Community Participation:**

They just come to me. I tell them to come to the meetings. I listen to them. They notice. More of them come. Rinse and repeat.

Female mayor, discussing interactions with constituents

A substantial body of scholarship has examined the effect of gender on leadership style and policymaking. However, little in the literature examines the relationship between gender and approaches to policymaking in a forum like city government, where citizens have the ability to easily approach city leaders and engage in policymaking. The urban arena is a unique place for the application of a gendered or racial theory of policymaking, as constituents need far fewer
resources to enter the policy process. As such, if women and minorities open the policymaking process up – if they make urban democracies more democratic – then constituents can easily respond to the invitation of participation.

In order to examine whether female mayors change the participants in a policymaking process, I look at three indicators: the average number of items that involved a public participant, the average number of items that involve an interaction between a public participant and a leader, and the total number of items discussed per city council meeting. I use the first measure – the average number of items per month that involve a public participant – as a measure of the overall contributions of the public to policymaking at the local level. City council meetings operate in a public manner; a concerned citizen, if they wish, can engage in the policymaking activities in a city by coming to meetings and either initiating a policy in a public comment period or replying to a policy discussed by the council (Schahn and Holzer 1990). As attending meetings is an expenditure of a large amount of resources (in terms of time), only those citizens that are deeply concerned about an issue will spend the resources to influence policy.19 As detailed earlier, if women are more interested in inclusive policymaking, or if citizens feel more comfortable approaching female leaders, the rate of public participation in city council meetings should increase. The second measure examines the number of items that involve an interaction between a public participant and a city council member. My hope here is to measure not just, as one council member put it, “the crazies that come and go,” but also those comments that are about the substance of policy or require action by a leader.

---

19 There may be additional costs associated with participation in local politics as many scholars have noted, “participation through normal institutional channels has little impact on the substance of government politics” (Crosby, Kelly, and Schaefer, 1986, 172).
The third measure, the total number of items discussed per council meeting, is used to estimate the effect of the increase in public participation on the overall policymaking process. The use of these three measures allows me to focus on the effect of gender on public participation. I look first at the average number of items that involve a public participant; several interesting patterns of interest emerge.

Insert Figure 7 about here.

As Figure 7 shows, public participation increases under female mayors in four of the six cities and under the minority mayors in the cities with a white female mayor, a Black female mayor, and both cities with a Hispanic female mayor. Table 6 again uses cross-sectional time series fixed effects models to estimate the effects of race and gender on the rate of public participation in city council meetings.

Insert Table 6 about here.

As Table 6 shows, public participation increases under all but one of the female mayors; in the California city with an Asian female mayor, the increase in public participation is just outside statistical significance. Furthermore, the change to a female or female minority mayor leads to a substantively significant increase in the level of public participation in these cities. For example, in the California city with a Hispanic mayor, the change of mayors leads to an increase of 9.6 items of participation by the public; given that, on average, the rate of public participation under the earlier mayor in the city was 9.4; changing the mayor lead to a two-fold increase in public participation.

Next, I examine the total number of items per mayor that involve an interaction between a public participant and a leader; here, I include any circumstance where a leader responded to a

---

20 The p-value of the Asian mayor’s coefficient is 0.091.
comment by a member of the public, as well as anytime a public comment was directed at a specific action by a leader or the council.

Table 7 shows large differences between almost all of the male and female leaders in the total number of interactive items; the sole exception is the effect of the white female mayor in North Carolina is not statistically significant. The data from Table 7 demonstrates that the increase in public participation is not simply from a larger number of citizens turning out for the meetings to remark on non-addressable items. Instead, the increase in interactive items suggests that the leaders under a female mayor consider the constituent response task of governing central to good governance.

As I look at public participation as a percentage of total actions, these data offer a new way to understand the world of urban policymaking. The first column on Table 8 shows that there is not a difference between male and female leaders, in terms of public participation as a percentage of the total number of items.

These results may be a surprise, given the increase in items that relate to public participation and to interactions with the public. Table 8 demonstrates a pattern of interest, and one that was evident from several interviews: each item of public participation may require action of a variety of fronts, which results in a domino effect of policymaking. Thus, a citizen that voices concern about garbage pick up on her street may produce: a reaction from the council, a request for an investigation into the public works response to citizen complaints, a meeting about ideal pick-up days and times, a response from the public works department, and a reevaluation of whether the city needed to purchase that garbage truck last year that they cut
from the budget. As one mayor noted, “It isn’t just them asking you about a crossing guard. You end up practically sending the National Guard half the time. And then, it really isn’t enough.”

I look for further evidence of the increase in policy actions through an examination of the total number of items discussed in each city. As the second column of Table 8 shows, the total number of items under female mayors increases dramatically; every female mayor leads to a statistically significant increase in the overall number of items discussed in each meeting. The substantive change is very large in each of these cities; for example, in the California city with a white female mayor, the substantive effect is a twenty-three item increase in the total number of items. The overall increase in the length of the city council minutes is echoed repeated in the qualitative data. All of the mayors – male and female – said that handling citizen complaints was “central,” “necessary,” and “required.” The male mayors ended their discussion of the issue of constituent demands at these comments. The female mayors, however, focused on the problem of constituent demands. Five of the six female mayors indicated that their greatest challenge was “keeping up with all the demands of the office,” “staying on top of everything – particularly the service to the citizen requirements” and trying to handle “the ridiculous amount of crap people complain about.”

Minority Women:

The use of individuals with dual identities, such as the minority women in my study, provides both benefits and challenges. First, for the four female minority mayors, it is often difficult to separate the effects of gender and race on each leader’s behavior, particularly as the extant scholarship points to similar expectations for women and minorities in many circumstances. Second, these individuals may act in a unique manner from either their racial or
gendered colleagues, so that their behavior cannot be attributed to either group. Third, the intersectionality of race and gender produces unique challenges for minority women (Collins 1986, 1990; Felkenes and Schroedel 1993). However, at the same time, my data provides the ability to examine both gender and race, including how the intersection of race and gender might effect a leader’s actions in office, and is a new set of information on this often-understudied group of representatives.

In an attempt to separate out the effects of race and gender, I next used the time series data, with dummy variables for the gender of the mayor, as well as a dummy variable for the interaction race and gender for the minority women. Using time-series fixed effect techniques, I then model these against the discussion of issues relating to domestic and sexual violence and the discussion of issues relating to race and ethnicity. Table 9 shows the results of these models.

As shown in the first column of Table 9, gender is, overall, a significant predictor of the rate of discussion of issues relating to domestic and sexual violence, but the interaction of race and gender is not a significant predictor, suggesting that gender alone is the element of importance in these mayors effecting the discussion of issues relating to domestic and sexual violence. Looking at the discussion of issues relating to race and ethnicity in the second column of results, however, suggests the opposite story; here, gender is an insignificant predictor of discussion of issues of race and ethnicity, while the interaction of gender and race is a significant predictor of discussion of these issues. An obvious limitation of my research is the lack of minority male leaders to serve as a comparison group in attempting to separate out the effects of race and gender on political behavior.
In the qualitative data, several patterns of interest emerge. First, the minority mayors see themselves as representatives for both women and minorities; the dual identity of both woman and minority shapes their actions. Specifically, these representatives feel a responsibility to, as one representative noted, “Step in wherever I am needed,” or serve the needs of women when no one else could or would, and be a voice for minorities when they were underrepresented. Second, the female minority leaders all identified situations where their dual identity forces them to make a decision between a policy that was good for women and one that was good for their minority group. These choices usually surrounded an issue of a public safety versus civil rights. For example, in one city, women in the community attempted to organize a push for the city to provide a database of individuals on parole in their community, as to identify “dangerous areas.” However, the majority of individuals that would have been listed in the database were minorities convicted of drug offenses. The female minority leader tiptoed a line between the women’s groups and the minority groups, eventually proposing that that women use the sex offender’s database. However, as the mayor put it, she “lost both fights.”

Finally, leaders with dual identities are forced to follow the demands of their constituents more often than leaders with single constituency groups. The female minority mayors expressed regret over not “having the time to get my things passed,” or being kept so busy with “all the issues of the minority community and schools and child safety and everything else that I can’t do anything new.” The expression of a lack of time or resources to engage in innovative policy choices suggests that white male leaders might be more successful in the accomplishment of changes that they want, simply because they are confronted with fewer – or feel less responsible to – constituent demands. Indeed, a male mayor that I spoke to indicated that he liked the use of the business community as an electoral base because “they don’t want much. And what they do
want, I don’t have a lot of control over. I can’t change state taxes. I can’t change the business climate. All I can do is make sure downtown has nice flowers.”

**Conclusion:**

I use a unique combination of coded city council minutes and qualitative interview data to investigate the connection between gender and the policymaking process. In general, female mayors have a significant and substantive effect on the deliberative policymaking process at the urban level in the United States. Cities with female mayors may not address “women’s” issues more often than cities with male mayors, but they do spend a significantly higher amount of time on issues of domestic violence and rape crisis, which are issues that cities have control over and that mayors can address. Cities with minority mayors discuss issues that relate to race and ethnicity much more than cities with white mayors. Minority mayors are often able to tie the abstract issues of race and ethnicity in American society to specific problems in their communities, and use the problems as opportunities to teach the community about, as one mayor put it, “problems that everyone knows about, but no one knows about.”

Female mayors also seem to produce changes in the structure of policymaking in their cities. The change of the gender of the mayor lead to substantial increases in public participation in city council meetings and in the total number of items discussed in city council meetings. However, it is unclear as to whether the increase is due to a change in leadership style by the mayors, as suggested by the literature, or from a larger set of constituents that identify with these mayors, which results in an increase in the number of constituents who feel that they can approach (and demand responses) from the mayors. Regardless of the reason, the data presented here suggests that the job of leadership for female mayors is more difficult than for male mayors.
The female mayors have more citizen demands, so they have to walk a fine line between being responsive to these demands and being a good leader. As one mayor put it, constituents “want you to police them all the time but leave them alone. They want trash pick-up every day, but no garbage trucks on the roads. They want the best schools but no taxes. They want lots of jobs but no development. Well, let me get out my magic wand.” The increased demands by citizens – and the responses they require – restricts the ability of female and minority mayors to reactive policymaking and prevents them from engagement in any form of proactive policymaking.

A limited case study approach has obvious weaknesses, and external validity is a central problem. I am cautious in the application of any of my finding to cities outside Southern California and North Carolina. However, my approach of a comparison of cities, both in time and through cross-sectional research, allows me to say, with a fair bit of confidence, that the gender and race of a mayor has an effect on policymaking and deliberation in US cities. Specifically, the gender and race of the mayor changes both the style and the substance of deliberation. Additional research might include an expansion of the scope of the study, a concentration on the causal mechanism behind the increase in public participation, and a focus on city-central policies, all of which would benefit the discipline.
### Tables and Figures:

#### Table 1: Demographic Profiles of Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Mayor 1</th>
<th>Mayor 2</th>
<th>Population (rounded)</th>
<th>Per. White</th>
<th>Per. Black</th>
<th>Per. Asian</th>
<th>Per. Hispanic</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Control)</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Control)</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Profiles of Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Mayor 2</th>
<th>City Councilor?</th>
<th>Ambition?</th>
<th>Primary Support Group</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Asian community</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Control)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighbors &amp; Friends</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Control)</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Business Organization</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Women friends</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Church friends</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Discussion of policies relating to Women, city fixed effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>St. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (CA)</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (CA)</td>
<td>0.093***</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (CA)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>0.821***</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (NC)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (NC)</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (NC)</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.0429***</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared (overall) 0.722
N 973

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Table 4: Discussion of items relating to Domestic and Sexual Violence, city fixed effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>St. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (CA)</td>
<td>0.286***</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>0.722***</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (CA)</td>
<td>0.198***</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (CA)</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>0.0616***</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (NC)</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (NC)</td>
<td>0.1986***</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (NC)</td>
<td>0.0209***</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.0611***</td>
<td>0.0212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared (overall) 0.8211

N 973

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Table 5: Discussion of items relating to Race and Ethnicity, city fixed effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>St. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (CA)</td>
<td>0.144***</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>0.090***</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (CA)</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (CA)</td>
<td>0.0621</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>0.1486***</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (NC)</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (NC)</td>
<td>0.066***</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (NC)</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.0144***</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared (overall)               0.7911

N                                973

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Table 6: Public Participation, city fixed effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>St. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (CA)</td>
<td>9.731***</td>
<td>1.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>4.230</td>
<td>2.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (CA)</td>
<td>4.483***</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (CA)</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>3.827***</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (NC)</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (NC)</td>
<td>12.005***</td>
<td>3.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (NC)</td>
<td>6.407**</td>
<td>2.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>10.823***</td>
<td>4.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared (overall) 0.4521
N 973

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Table 7: Interactive Items, city fixed effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>St. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (CA)</td>
<td>3.796***</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>5.555**</td>
<td>2.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (CA)</td>
<td>5.484**</td>
<td>2.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (CA)</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>4.425***</td>
<td>1.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (NC)</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>1.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (NC)</td>
<td>5.310***</td>
<td>1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (NC)</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.2347***</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared (overall) 0.3943
N 973

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Table 8: Percent Public Participation and Total Number of Items, city fixed effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Percent Public Participation</th>
<th>Total Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>St. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (CA)</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (CA)</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (CA)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male (NC)</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female (NC)</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female (NC)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.0189</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared (overall) 0.1223  0.6241

N 973  973

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Table 9: The Effects of Gender and Race on Policy Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Domestic and Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Race and Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Error</td>
<td>St. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.101*** 0.029</td>
<td>0.062 0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Race</td>
<td>0.025 0.028</td>
<td>0.360*** 0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.062*** 0.001</td>
<td>0.029*** 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>0.6847 973</td>
<td>0.7723 973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Fig. 1: Discussion of Issues Relating to Women (CA Cities)

Fig. 2: Discussion of Issues Relating to Women (NC Cities)
Fig. 3: Discussion of Issues Relating to Domestic and Sexual Violence (CA Cities)

![Graph 3: Discussion of Issues Relating to Domestic and Sexual Violence (CA Cities)](image1)

Fig. 4: Discussion of Issues Relating to Domestic and Sexual Violence (NC Cities)

![Graph 4: Discussion of Issues Relating to Domestic and Sexual Violence (NC Cities)](image2)
Fig. 5: Discussion of Issues Relating to Race and Ethnicity (CA Cities)

Fig. 6: Discussion of Issues Relating to Race and Ethnicity (NC Cities)

Fig. 7: Average Public Participation
Fig. 8: Average Number of Interactive Items

* = Statistically significant at the 0.05 level

Mayor 1    Mayor 2
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Appendix A: Coding of Subject Matter of City Council Minutes

AFFORDABLE HOUSING: Affordable housing, housing costs, housing developments that include set-asides for low-income residents, rent subsidies for low-income residents, public housing, unsafe housing

CHILDREN: Child safety, activities for children, children presenting to the council, drug free programs, fairs for kids, fingerprinting, amber alerts, missing children, pedophilia, sex offenders databases, crimes against children

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT: Community development block grants; grant administration, grant dispersion, grant management, redevelopment activities

DEVELOPMENT: economic development, attracting businesses, retaining businesses, location of businesses, large-scale developments

DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE: Domestic violence, rape, sexual assault, rape crisis response

EDUCATION: Scholarships, achievements, presentations by school aged children, recognition of achievements by children in schools, reports by schools

GENERAL: Hiring employees, firing employees, raises, promotions, general council business, authorizing purchases, office equipment, office supplies, legal issues

HEALTH: Public health, free clinics, health fairs, health epidemics, health preparedness, responses to health issues

LIBRARY: Library buildings, fines, exhibits, books, fundraising, hiring, firing, promoting library employees

PUBLIC WORKS: Roads, electricity, water, gas, utilities, trash, recycling

PARKS AND RECREATION: Parks, park rentals, sports, hiring and firing park employees, pools, baseball fields, golf courses, parks equipment

RACE AND ETHNICITY: Race, ethnicity, diversity, Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez, discrimination, harassment, day laborers, racism

PUBLIC SAFETY: Police, fire, EMT, appropriate responses to crimes, equipment, canine units, drug task forces, police training, liquor licenses and enforcement, underage drinking, crime prevention, flooding, forest fires,

TRANSPORTATION: Public transportation, transportation issues, traffic, buses, trains

ENVIRONMENT: Environmental degradation, global warming, clean air, clean water, open space

WELFARE: Redistribution of resources, public assistance programs, food stamps, scholarships,

WOMEN: Gender, women’s health, discrimination, harassment, female leaders, sexism
### Appendix B: An Example of the Coding Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Follow 1 part</th>
<th>Follow 2 part</th>
<th>Follow 3 part</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2001</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2001</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2001</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2001</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>4-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2001</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[21\] C = Ceremonial; P = public participant; E = Employee of city; L = City council member

\[22\] Leaders were assigned an ID number, which I allowed me to examine whether the female mayor alone with changing the discussion of items, or whether her presence allowed others to initiate discussion of items.

\[23\] A = Affordable Housing; C = Children; Cdbg = Cdbg; D = Development; Dv = Domestic Violence; E = Education; G = General; H = Health; L = Library; P = Public Works; R = Parks And Recreation; Re = Race And Ethnicity; S = Public Safety; T = Transportation; V = Environment; W = Welfare; Wo = Women

\[24\] Id.: C = Ceremonial; P = public participant; E = Employee of city; L = City council member

\[25\] V = vote; T = tabled; H = Held to next meeting

\[26\] The breakdown of votes; 5-0 = five votes for the item and no opposed, while 3-2 = three votes for the item and two votes against the item.
Appendix C: Qualitative Interview Questions

Questions for Mayors and City Council Members:
1. What is the best part of being a [Mayor / City Council Member]?
2. What is the most frustrating part of being a [Mayor / City Council Member]?
3. Why did you run for office?
4. What are the most important issues in [city]?
5. Are there issues in [city] that you think are important, but don’t receive enough attention?
   a. What are these issues?
   b. Why do you think that they don’t receive enough attention?
6. What policies are you most proud of? Why?
7. Are there any groups that you feel are underrepresented in [city]?
   a. Which groups?
   b. Why do you think that they are underrepresented?
8. Are there any groups that you feel a special responsibility to represent?
   a. Which groups?
   b. Why do you feel responsible to represent them?
9. Who are the most powerful groups in [city]?
10. Who are the least powerful?
11. If you could give a new [Mayor / City Council Member] some advice about being a leader, what would it be?

For women only:
12. Do you think that your gender effected your actions in office?
   a. How?
   b. Why?

For minorities only:
13. Do you think that your race effected your actions in office?
   a. How?
   b. Why?

For city council members that were in office with both mayors in each city:
14. Do you think that changing mayors matters?
   a. Why?
15. What was the biggest change you saw with the change in mayors?
16. What did you expect when the mayor changed?
17. Did [name of second mayor] surprise you in any way?

Questions for Mayors only:
1. What is are the most important changes you accomplished in office?
2. What were your goals when you ran for mayor?
   a. Do you feel like you accomplished these goals?
   b. Why or why not?
   c. What was the biggest challenge to accomplishing these goals?
3. What is the best thing about [city]?
4. What one thing would you change about [city]?
5. What distinguishes you from your predecessor?
6. In what ways are you the same as your predecessor?
7. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about being mayor of [city]?
Appendix E: ANOVA Results for Women, Domestic and Sexual Violence, and Race and Ethnicity discussions

Table E1: The Effect of Mayoral Change on Discussions of Items relating to Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City 1</th>
<th>City 2</th>
<th>City 3</th>
<th>City 4 (Control)</th>
<th>City 5</th>
<th>City 6 (Control)</th>
<th>City 7</th>
<th>City 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayoral Change</td>
<td>0.026+</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.056*</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.026*</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPG St. Err.</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.065*</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.218*</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPG St. Err.</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = P > 0.10; * = P > 0.05

Table E2: The Effect of Mayoral Change on Discussions of Items relating to Domestic and Sexual Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City 1</th>
<th>City 2</th>
<th>City 3</th>
<th>City 4 (Control)</th>
<th>City 5</th>
<th>City 6 (Control)</th>
<th>City 7</th>
<th>City 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayoral Change</td>
<td>0.164*</td>
<td>0.172*</td>
<td>0.137*</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.030*</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.129*</td>
<td>0.072*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPG St. Err.</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.138*</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.249*</td>
<td>0.135+</td>
<td>0.040*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.145*</td>
<td>0.095*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPG St. Err.</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = P > 0.10; * = P > 0.05

Table E3: The Effect of Mayoral Change on Discussions of Items relating to Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City 1</th>
<th>City 2</th>
<th>City 3</th>
<th>City 4 (Control)</th>
<th>City 5</th>
<th>City 6 (Control)</th>
<th>City 7</th>
<th>City 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayoral Change</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.054*</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.040*</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPG St. Err.</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.030*</td>
<td>0.218*</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPG St. Err.</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = P > 0.10; * = P > 0.05