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ABSTRACT

NAVIGATING THE PATH TO PRESENCE:
IDEOLOGY, POLITICS, AND THE CAMPAIGN FOR GENDER BALANCED
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS IN IOWA

by

EZRA JOSEPH TEMKO

University of New Hampshire

From 1986 through 1988, Iowa adopted and strengthened a gender balance law that required men and women be equally represented on state boards and commissions. In 2009, Iowa extended this law to also require its counties, municipalities, and school districts to gender balance their boards and commissions. Iowa’s law remains unique in the United States. Through archival research and interviews, my research investigates how advocates navigated the ideological landscape associated with this policy issue. My research unveils the mechanisms that substantially deradicalized gender balance in Iowa, enabling its passage and shifting Iowans’ perceptions of gender, governance, and affirmative action—disembedding gender segregation, normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good governance. Based on my findings and analyses, I argue for reconceptualizing ideology through navigation theory—actors simultaneously hold multiple complementary and competing ideologies and must negotiate how these ideologies are (de)activated, (de)prioritized, and interpreted and applied to the issue under consideration. In Iowa, advocates employed collective action frame management to facilitate and steer this navigation such that a majority of legislators voted for and governors signed these affirmative action legislation.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND FOR STUDY: IOWA’S GENDER BALANCE LAW

Women have been and remain substantially underrepresented in community leadership across many domains, as are other target populations (e.g. racial minorities). Advocates have tried to address this, including through direct advocacy for increased appointments and through public policy. Affirmative action programs and policies can help counter this underrepresentation, but they often face intense ideological opposition, rooted in dominant conceptions of individualism, meritocracy, and gender and race roles, particularly in the United States, where states have passed ballot initiatives to ban affirmative action and quotas are not even part of the political discourse (Moses and Farley 2011; Phillips 1995). Many affirmative action programs have been dismantled; those that remain often justify themselves using language regarding diversity as a public good for everyone rather than centering themselves as attempting to address social inequity and racial and gender disparities (Berrey 2015). Very few public policies have been implemented in the United States in the past decade to increase women’s representation.

In the United States, women were initially excluded from foundational rights and responsibilities, including civic ones like voting or holding elected office. Women’s rights organizations initially aimed to remove overt barriers to women’s inclusion and end basic discrimination. To this end, in the area of appointed office, women’s rights advocates initially focused on increasing women’s representation through appointments project: collecting rosters of names, recommending women for appointment, and advocating to appointers for them to appoint (more) women.

As the women’s rights movement ascended and women’s representation increased but
remained proportionately low, gender balance emerged as a basic feminist goal: globally, nationally, and in Iowa. This push reflected a commitment to women’s equity and a commitment to systemic change to correct women’s deficient social status. Iowa adopted a gender balance law for its state boards and commission in 1986. It was amended and strengthened in 1987 and again in 1988. Two dozen other states have attempted to follow suit. A number of states have a variety of laws, policies, resolutions, and accountability advocacy encouraging women’s appointments and gender balance on state boards and commissions. However, Iowa is the only state in the country with a state law that outright requires gender balance on all state boards and commissions.

Iowa women’s rights advocates next sought to extend the state’s gender balance law to include political subdivisions. Their initial attempts were unsuccessful. Finally, in 2009, at a time when around the country affirmative action policies and programs were encountering increased opposition and in some cases being dismantled, Iowa adopted a law extending gender balance to local jurisdictions. My research investigates how advocates navigated the ideological landscape associated with this policy issue such that Iowa exceptionally adopted gender balance requirements for appointed office.

CREATING SOCIAL CHANGE: THE PROBLEM OF IDEOLOGY

I am conceptualizing ideology as a “belief system” consisting of values about “right and wrong,” norms about “what to do,” and theories “about society” (Oliver and Johnston 2000:44). Ideologies are “maps of problematic social reality and matrices for the creation of collective conscience” (Geertz 1973:220). They “provide a diagnosis, prognosis, and rationale” on social, cultural, and political issues (Oliver and Johnston 2000:46). Nonetheless, ideology is a term that has a multitude of both overlapping and contrasting meanings and applications in the literature, with the only seeming area of consistency being that ideology has “coherence”—that it “refers to a set of idea-
elements that are bound together, that belong to one another in a non-random fashion” (Gerring 1997:980).


Interest Theory: The Reproduction of Social Stratification Through Ideology

Policy solutions are rooted in whether and how societies view certain phenomena to be social problems and in how they view certain social groups. These views are produced and reproduced through stories, characterizations, and symbols (Blumer 1971; Guetzkow 2010; Edelman 2001; Schneider and Ingram 1993). The dominant sociological theory on ideology—interest theory—posits ideology as a result of universal internalization of belief systems that reproduce unequal power relations (Adams 2001; Geertz 1973). For example, groups that are viewed as socially deserving benefit from favorable public policies; these policies are portrayed as for the broader public good. Conversely, groups that are viewed as socially undeserving meet unfavorable public policy outcomes; their goals and needs are viewed as illegitimate within the public policy realm. Both these groups internalize these messages (Schneider and Ingram 1993).

Dominant ideologies of individualism and meritocracy interact with values of equal opportunity and fairness to make affirmative action policies—designed to advance equity—appear inherently unequal and unfair. Dominant U.S. ideology supports an equality that is difference-devoid, meaning that it does not take into account pre-existing background conditions of equal

---

I use identity-devoid, gender-devoid, race-devoid, etc. as synonyms for the dominant term in the literature, which uses blind instead of devoid. I do this to avoid the ableist use of blind as meaning ignorant (Ben-Moshe 2006; Cherney 2011; May and Ferri 2006; Schalk 2013).

I use gender-devoid rather than gender-neutral because the two concepts are related but different. Gender-devoid implies a lack of awareness (or attempt to ignore) gender, whereas gender-neutral allows for acknowledgment of gender but advocates not using gender as a form of differentiation.

For example, a gender-neutral bathroom is one in which the bathroom does not preference use by any particular gender (these are often now called all-gender or gender-inclusive bathrooms), whereas a gender-devoid bathroom would presume that bathrooms are a space where gender is not a construct that manifests within that setting and its context. A gender-neutral bathroom may still have female hygiene products and/or urinals, whereas a gender-devoid bathroom would presume uniformity and provides universal accommodations that are formally equally accessible to everyone.
opportunity, making ‘formal equality’ appear synonymous with real equality (Gamson 1992a; Geertz 1973; Williams 1998). In reality, women often have to be more qualified than their men counterparts to become political appointees (Carroll 1986). Blacks often have to be more qualified than their white counterparts to obtain equivalent jobs (O’Sullivan, Mugglestone, and Allison 2014). All else being equal, women and racial minorities still face decreased prospects of successful outcomes (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004; Castilla 2008; Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Pager 2007).

Interest theory is supported by theories on cultural power (Swidler 1995). Rooted in Karl Marx’s writings on the production of (false) consciousness and Antonio Gramsci’s writings on ideological hegemony, social theories of power have developed to account for cognitive influences that distort perceived preferences and societal norms and practices (Edelman 1985, 2001; Gamson 1992b; Gaventa 1980; Gramsci 1971; Hayward 2000; Komter 1989; Lukes 2005; Marx and Engels 1970; Schneider and Ingram 1993, 2005). According to sociologist Steven Lukes, powerful agents shape the meaning, perceptions, and interests of target populations, manufacturing their consent against their real interests (Lukes 2005). According to political scientist Clarissa Hayward, power is structural constraint in which social boundaries (e.g. rules, norms, institutional arrangements, identities, etc.) delimit freedom and possibility for all actors (Hayward 2000, 2018). Cultural power involves controlling and shaping discourse and its interpretation (Gamson 1992a; Lakoff 2004; Young 1990; Zerubavel 2006).

The notion of cultural power overlaps with related cognitive theories around inequality. Political scientist Iris Young names cultural imperialism as one of the faces of oppression. Young argues that cultural imperialism reflects “how the dominant meanings of a society render the particular perspective of one’s own group invisible at the same time as they stereotype one’s group and mark it out as the Other. Cultural imperialism involves the universalization of a dominant group’s experience and culture, and its establishment as the norm” (Young 1990:58-59). Sociologist
Patricia Hill Collins, drawing on philosopher Sandra Harding’s conceptualization of one dimension of oppression being symbolic, defines symbolic oppression as “widespread, societally-sanctioned ideologies used to justify relations of domination and subordination” (Collins 1993:32). These ideas have substantive overlap and share a focus on cognitive distortion and shaping preferences in ways that can subjugate (or alternatively empower).

Consciousness and hegemony are often presented in the literature as almost predetermined based on power structures, without much possibility of successful challenges to realize political consciousness (Edelman 1985, 2001; Gamson 1992b). Phenomenology also reinforces the idea that people can internalize ideas, values, and norms that may or may not be congruent with empirical reality and that are often shaped by power. People intersubjectively make meaning and reinforce those meanings through networks that share said meanings. Worldviews, or symbolic universes of meaning, may come into conflict with one another, in which case, according to sociologists Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, the group that has more power usually gets to shape how people conceive their reality (Berger and Luckmann 1966). According to interest theory, the issue of gender balance should be subject to and overwhelmed by traditional gender ideology and dominant ideologies of meritocracy, individualism, neoliberalism, and identity-devoidedness.

A Limited Toolkit for Challenging Cultural Power

Literature on cultural power focuses on the reproduction of power and inequality, not on instances of its successful contestation (Auyero and Swistun 2008, 2009; Benford and Snow 2000; Cremson 1971; Danzinger 1988; Davis 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Edelman 1985, 2001; Gamson 1992a, 1992b; Gaventa 1980; Hayward 2000; Komter 1989; Schneider and Ingram 1993, 2005). Interest theory does not contain a pathway for challenging cultural power. However, strain theory, the notion that people form and reform ideologies to cope with their own strain, does include a pathway for change.
Nevertheless, its utility for challenging cultural power has not been well explored (Geertz 1973). Instead, a literature on cognitive liberation and empowerment exists, though it does not easily lend itself to operationalization (Freire 1970; Gaventa 1980; Ledwith 2011; Lee 2011; McAdam 1999; Smock 2004). A few social movement organizations draw directly on sociological theorizing on power in their work, but they have not conceptualized or operationalized contesting power beyond a first step of seeking to better identify and understand it (Grassroots Nd; Hunjan and Pettit 2011; Institute 2015; Jass Nd; Miller et al. 2011; Participation Nd; Strategic Nd, 2017; VeneKlasen and Miller 2007). Social psychological literature on cultural cognition has produced numerous tangible insights on social persuasion, but it often lacks attention to structural determinants of ideology and social policy outcomes (Davey 2009; FrameWorks 2017; Gamson 1992a; Jowett and O’Donnell 2012; Kahan and Braman 2005; Van der Linden, Maibach, and Leiserowitz 2015; Yale 2017).

*Scholarly literature: strain theory and cognitive liberation.*

Complementing and providing empirical support for interest theory, there are a number of empirical works on cultural power and the reproduction of inequality. For example, epidemiologist Devra Davis (2002a, 2002b, 2003) studied a Pennsylvania town ruined by a deathly smog and yet in denial regarding the culpability of its nail mill in producing the problem, among other cases. Sociologist Javier Auyero and anthropologist Débora Alejandra Swistun (2008, 2009) revealed an Argentinian community’s individualistic explanations for health outcomes that were the result of Shell’s operations. Other studies have directly addressed Lukes’ theory of power, such as political sociologist John Gaventa’s (1980) study of coal miners in the Appalachian Valley and their internalized powerlessness, manufactured by a multinational corporation. Hayward (2000) produced
her theory of power through an ethnographic comparative case study, revealing how teachers’ beliefs and practices were differentially shaped by structural factors.  

Cultural power literature tends to focus on exploring how cultural ideologies manifest and reproduce. Work on successfully contesting dominant ideologies is comparably sparse (Gamson 1992a, 1992b). Social movement literature lacks a robust set of studies focused on changing cultural schemas, on how cultural changes that contest prevailing ideologies of patriarchy, racism, and neoliberal capitalism are successfully stimulated and accomplished within communities and societies embedded in the very systems that produce these ideologies (Benford and Snow 2000).

According to political scientist Thomas Rochon (2000), cultural change occurs when movements successfully disrupt consensus values and understandings of policy issues. Rochon and sociologist Alberto Melucci argue that, respectively, small groups of critical thinkers and small informal organizations operating at society’s margins create new alternative values; these values are then reformulated and disseminated through collective action. Change is marked by people not just thinking differently about an issue, but thinking in a different way about the issue. This entails challenges to dominant discourse and changes to the discourse on the issue (Rochon 2000; Smock 2004).

Cultural schemas that recognize structural inequality can translate into cultural demands and in turn social progress, including social policies that reflect our government acting as a benevolent, power-balancing force in our society. Given the impact of dominant ideologies on public policy, to move policy forward on matters of social justice, dominant cultural myths such as those regarding gender, race, and individualism must be countered (Edelman 1985, 2001; Guetzkow 2010; Schneider 2004).

---

2 For additional empirical studies of Lukes and Haywards’ theorizing, see Cremson 1971, Danzinger 1988, and Komter 1989.
and Ingram 1993, 2005). From a sociological perspective, in order for people and communities to adopt and engage with a particular cultural perspective that supports particular policies, they need to undergo cognitive liberation—embracing a belief that a particular change is appropriate, necessary, and possible (Lee 2011; McAdam 1999). However, cognitive social movement literature focuses on the cognitive developments that lead people to join and become active with social movements rather than on social movements’ attempts to change the cognitive frames of decision-makers or other external targets (Eyerman 1991; McAdam 1999).

The concept of cognitive liberation is a direct contradiction to a determinist standpoint of power defining cognition. It is incompatible with interest theory, which does not offer a pathway forward for how communities can successfully contest and shift dominant ideologies. However, another theory on ideology encompasses ideological change, including among less powerful actors—strain theory. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973:201) typologized ideology into these two theories—interest theory, in which people “pursue power” and ideology is “a mask and a weapon,” and strain theory, in which people “flee anxiety” and ideology is “a symptom and a remedy.” Geertz traced strain theory’s development as a reformed version of interest theory, one that “arose in response to the empirical difficulties encountered by the interest theory,” with influences from “personality systems” ideas (Freud), social systems (Durkheim), and the connection of these (Parsons) (Geertz 1973:201,203).

Strain theory conceives of ideologies as deeply held cognitive belief systems that results from and can change in response to actors’ interpretations of their experience (Geertz 1973). Rooted in classical strain theory (see Merton 1938), ideologies are functional; they serve as “coping” mechanisms to aid actors in escaping anxiety and the tension and “friction” caused by not accomplishing societally sanctioned objectives (Geertz 1973:203,204; LaCapra 1988). While Geertz critiques strain theory, he is less dismissive of it than interest theory, possibly in part due to his
underlying belief that, “in the modern world at least, most men live lives of patterned desperation” (Geertz 1973:204). Geertz indeed suggests that ideology is a response to “strain,” but that the theory needs to be expanded to include not just social and psychological strain but also “cultural” strain (Geertz 1973:204,219). I am not aware of social movement scholars explicitly operationalizing strain theory and connecting it to cognitive liberation or to strategies and tactics for creating ideological change. Strain theory appears in the ideology literature as an explanation of ideologies and ideological change, not as a strategy (Geertz 1973). Indeed, Geertz “argued that culture should be studied for its meanings and not for its effects on action” (Swidler 1995:27).

Strain theory also has some potential shortcomings in explaining ideology. According to General Strain Theory, individuals have patterned differences in their distress and inequality, which is linked to social structure (Agnew 2006). Strain theory would suggest that those who have alternative coping mechanisms such as perceived social support, mastery, and self-esteem that assist them in effectively dealing with distress are less likely to turn to ideologies for coping (Agnew 2006; Mirowsky and Ross 2003). While strain theory offers an explanation for ideology that allows for agency, it opens up a number of questions about the process between strain and ideology formation. What makes people experiencing distress and social strain turn to ideology rather than other outlets for coping such as drugs, offending, or support groups (and vice versa—why do people turn to drugs, offending, or support groups instead of ideology)? Is negative tension the only way to craft or change an ideology? This implies ideology is solely formed out of negative emotions. If someone is not strained in an area, do they not subscribe to ideologies? Is that possible? Do they just support the status quo? Is that still ideology? If someone is fulfilling societal goals, or does not feel social tension, can they still hold or change ideologies? Strain theory as it relates to ideology seems underdeveloped.
There is a body of literature on the process of cognitive liberation. It is divergent but often intersecting. This literature includes empowerment/consciousness-raising processes (especially feminist and anti-racist approaches, see Ledwith 2011), popular education, critical pedagogy, and conscientization (see Freire 1970, also see Gaventa 1980), and techniques such as power analyses (see Participation Nd and Institute 2015). In Gaventa’s (1980) case study, he explains the conscientization process as he saw it unfold: people engage in limited actions and in organizing around limited manifest interests that initially do not directly interfere with the real interests of powerful agents. As this continues, people develop a sense of possibility regarding future change, and upon further organizing, the community encounters barriers to their goals that directly deal with powerful agents. They thus come to understand their own actual interests. However, in Gaventa’s study, the less powerful group, while going through the conscientization process, ultimately returned to cultural powerlessness (Gaventa 1980). I have not found later studies of social movements or disadvantaged constituencies seeking change that build on or operationalize Gaventa’s conscientization pathway. There is a need to further develop or refine these ideas for how they can be applied to concerted efforts by social movements to enact cultural change. The study of ideology formation is also often ignored within these theoretical frameworks (Geertz 1973).

*Social Movement Organizations that Strategically Seek Cognitive Liberation*

Social movements seek to create and change ideologies (Swindal 1995). Social movement actors engage in work to change how people understand the world and the meanings they give to it. Social movements are highly oriented toward cultural politics—they are “knowledge producers” (Gamson 1992b; Eyerman and Jamison 1991:55; Snow and Benford 1992). Social movements engage in cultural politics, or “politics of signification,” in attempts to change people’s conceptions of social
problems and thus change how our society addresses said problems (Eyerman and Jamison 1991; Hall 1982:64; Rochon 2000).

While social movements is a well-recognized field of sociological inquiry, much of what has been learned from its study has not been new and useful information for social movement practitioners.

Both activists and scholars want to know, for example, what works in communicating issues to people outside a social movement organization, what tactics of influence are effective and when…. Activists want to know what works and how. Within social movement coalitions and organizations, there are heated debates about tactics… Most start also with sometimes explicit assumptions about how political change takes place and what tactics are most effective at promoting policy reform, but these beliefs are supported, if at all, by anecdote, rather than systematic research (Meyer 2005:196,202).

There are thus enduring questions facing practitioners but lacking robust scientific insights (Gamson 1992a; Meyer 2005). A select group of organizations strategically work toward cognitive liberation through actively applying Lukes’ and Hayward’s social theories of power. While there are some associated partnering organizations, the primary three organizations that actively apply these theories include the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Just Associates (JASS), and the Grassroots Policy Project (GPP). IDS is based out of the University of Sussex in England and works with communities in the developing world on local democracy empowerment work. John Gaventa is IDS’s Director of Research. JASS is a U.S. based organization that works for women’s rights around the world. GPP, or Strategic Practice, is a U.S.-based consulting group that offers trainings and expert collaboration with organizations in the field that are interested in doing this work. GPP is the only one of these three groups that conducts regular work in the United States (Institute 2015; Jass Nd; Strategic 2017).

IDS, GPP, and JASS all have important strengths and limitations regarding their scope and depth. Their strengths are all informed by academic literature, research, and practice. GPP has well-developed resources and work on strategic framing. IDS is quite strong at power analysis and
includes Hayward’s power theory in addition to Lukes’ power theory. JASS is mindful about mitigating their own reproduction of systemic oppression as they go about doing work abroad to dismantle patriarchy.

However, these organizations’ practitioner guides also contain substantive limitations. Overall, these guidebooks focus on 1) why it is important to consider power, 2) conceptualizing power, 3) how to analyze power, and 4) moving to action. This fourth section sometimes includes aspirational remarks or goals and visions. However, the lists of seemingly effective strategies do not necessarily include a pathway for moving forward that can be operationalized. In the JASS publication, the section regarding how to confront “invisible [cultural] power” as understood within that framework consists of 66 words (VeneKlasen and Miller 2007). IDS’s publication reproduces JASS’s table with this content as their offer regarding tackling invisible power, and similarly also reproduces the table on their powercube.net website (Hunjan and Pettit 2011; Participation Nd). GPP contains a separate publication on “Building Political Power,” but after three pages explaining social theories on power, spends fewer than 250 words in a conclusion with broad ideas and reflections for what to do about it and why it matters (Grassroots Nd; Strategic Nd).

Just Associates also has a published advocacy book; this book encompasses many literatures that their guidebook does not address; beyond the same treatment as in the guidebook of dimensions of power, it includes a feminist political empowerment process, philosopher of education Paulo Freire’s model of political consciousness and popular education, and a feminist modification to Freire’s model. While their popular education, deliberative democracy theory, and root cause analysis seem to have potentially useful overlaps, the only explicit intersection of the presented works within the book is the feminist modification of Freire’s dialogue framework. Otherwise each approach is presented as a standalone approach rather than being synthesized (Miller et al. 2011).
Freire’s model of cultural politics is used intentionally by some social movement organizations. Freire’s popular education model may be effective with a captive audience of students, among particular classes/groups of workers, or in particular contextual settings. However, insular communities internally engaged in these conversations is not enough by itself to automatically foment change. This model may struggle to be effectively transferred to broader communities of place or into social movements that actively seek policy change.

Sociologist Kristina Smock labels Freire’s model of cultural politics as applied to community organizing models as a “transformative” model, in that its proponents attempt to challenge prevailing ideologies and replace them with new frameworks (Smock 2004). These organizations use popular education and reflection techniques. Smock studied two organizations that used this model. Both have limited success in persuading their target member audience and both struggle with putting together collective action, let alone mobilizing for short-term wins. These organizations also had difficulty amassing the resources (e.g. funding and staffing) to commit to long-term consciousness-raising activities, which is not unusual for social movement organizations that also try to engage in popular education (Smock 2004).

The Justice Advocacy Group (JAG), one of Smock’s case studies, struggled to get their lower-class members to engage in their educational workshops or to care about thinking structurally about their own situation and how it fits into larger power and contextual dynamics. Instead these members were interested in tenants’ rights outcomes and their everyday lived struggles. JAG was, however, able to gain already sympathetic middle-class members who would engage in their critical consciousness activities. Smock’s other case study that used the transformative model, the Center for Reflection, Education, and Organizing (CREO), also tried to use a public education model to build consciousness. CREO strived to incorporate this into their English as a Second Language
program. However, the people they served were interested in learning English, not in engaging in structural thinking.

JAG also worked to create ideological change among community targets. They attempted to host community workshops and meet with local public officials to present their vision and framework. However, their attempts to get people to rethink gentrification in terms of neoliberal capitalism seemed irrelevant and out-of-touch to their broader audience targets. JAG lacked political clout and was viewed as radical. Overall JAG lacked short-term successes, but they were, in collaboration with others, able to stop a few particular development projects. At one point JAG shifted the conversation on Tax-Increment Financing (TIF) district proposals from a consensus view that TIF proposals were win-win to a more critical view that their advantages and disadvantages needed to be considered and community concerns addressed. Nevertheless, JAG did not get buy-in for the type of development they wanted.

The short-term goals JAG could achieve were often disconnected from their transformative goals. For example, they collaborated with tenants to stop a building demolition. They then tried to get the tenants to turn the building into a tenant-run cooperative. The general tenant response was, “We’re not asking for the tenants to be in charge; we just want a cleaning service and management that works” (Smock 2004:219). Smock’s analysis led her to argue that transformative organizations are not adept at having strong resource capital or achieving tangible outcomes, and that their goals of building consciousness (education) and taking action are often in conflict. Overall, organizations that intentionally engage in working toward cognitive liberation have resources at their disposal for understanding cultural power, but models for working to challenge it remain underdeveloped.

Social Psychological Models of Social Persuasion

There has been growing recognition in the public policy realm that the social construction of reality
matters. For example, the extent to which people believe climate change is real, a problem, caused by humans, worth addressing, and able to be addressed has substantive implications for climate change policy and is the subject of robust study (Yale 2017). To this end, this body of literature is burgeoning.

Deliberative democracy literature relevant to social persuasion focuses on the role dialogue and interaction can play in altering people’s views and consciousness. Dialogue can encourage perspective-taking and facilitate understanding the other (Cornwall and Coelho 2007; Phillips 1995; Williams 1998). People’s encounters with out-groups can shift their cultural perceptions of these groups (Young 1990). Contact and conversation may help change people’s views or at least moderate them. Still, deliberative spaces in and of themselves can ignore or reproduce institutional bias, institutional inequality, power, and structure (Cornwall and Coelho 2007; Phillips 1995; Williams 1998).

Another pathway that can lead to changed views is cognitive dissonance between one’s lived experience and one’s worldview (Berger and Luckmann 1966). This concept is called cognitive consistency in the social psychology literature and is part of consistency theory. This theory suggests internal consistency is importance to people, but it has also been extended to include impression management: how people attempt to shape others’ perceptions of their personal consistency (Jowett and O’Donnell 2012). Similarly, sociologists David Snow and Robert Benford (1992) argue that collective action frame resonance depends on how well the frames are interpreted as corresponding to the empirical situation, how much they affect an individual’s lived experience, and how well they match existing schemas. Sociologist and social movement scholar Bill Gamson (1992a) suggests that this interpretation process is filtered both by one’s own experience and by the experience of one’s personal networks.

The social construction of reality makes this process less than straightforward for social
movement actors. Cognitive dissonance results from perceived, not objective, personal impact. The extent to which and manner in which people define social problems as impacting their lives can differ dramatically. Some individuals deny a connection to empirical situations that may objectively seem highly relevant and impactful; other individuals hold a strong personal connection to and are personally impacted by empirical situations that may objectively seem remote and abstract (Gamson 1992a). Thus, social movements have to uncover and engage with what makes someone feel personally connected to a social problem or otherwise figure out how to facilitate that meaning-making process.

The most well-developed segment of the literature on social persuasion is the social psychology literature on cultural cognition. Cultural cognition is the notion that cultural schemas are a lens through which people engage in meaning-making around policy issues, including determining empirical facts (Kahan and Braman 2005). Cognitive beliefs are formed in interaction with people’s emotions, cultural values, and personal values (Jowett and O’Donnell 2012). This body of work focuses on issues like message framing, the importance of the messenger, personality traits, types of message appeals (e.g. fear, other emotional appeals), repetition of messages, source credibility, interpersonal networks, interpersonal communication, alignment to existing schemas, and symbolic representations of the message (Jowett and O’Donnell 2012).

While this body of literature offers relatively practical and pragmatic tools for social movement organizations, it tends to focus on the psychological processes involved in cognition that occur in interpersonal communications. For example, an article by social psychologist Sander van der Linden, communication researcher Edwards Maibach, and environmental scientist Anthony Leiserowitz (2015) about how policymakers can better frame climate change draws insights from psychology, including using experiential stories, fostering social group norms, increasing issue proximity, focusing on positive outcomes from policy solutions, and being openly value-oriented
Power and structure tend to be bypassed, and the focus is usually on specific policy successes rather than achieving changes to broader schemas or accomplishing ideological change.

This can manifest in scholarly advice to social movement actors encouraging them to avoid working toward ideological change. To overcome cognitive bias, social psychology communication scholars sometimes advocate focusing on framing one’s policy position within a lens that will resonate with the cultural values people already share—to work “through rather than against cultural cognition” (Kahan and Braman 2015:169). For example, the Frameworks Institute, a communications organization that offers research-based ways to talk about social issues to advance social change, suggests that moving forward racial justice policies necessitates not engaging in structural arguments about racism (Davey 2009; FrameWorks 2017). FrameWorks suggests this because of current views on race, such as the “dominant race frame,” in which people believe that “to the extent that racism persists, it is in the hearts and minds of ‘bad’ people who unfortunately pass it on to their children” (Davey 2009).

This can be problematic because it means the dominant race frame does not get countered and that policies that require belief in systemic inequality do not get support. On the issue of affirmative action (and discussed in more detail in future chapters), Gamson found that the key determinant differentiating support for and against affirmative action was people believing that institutional racism exists and is problematic (Gamson 1992a). Strategies aimed at addressing social problems require addressing both individualistic and sociostructural determinants of the problem. Individualistic understandings of a social problem produce support for individualistic methods to address that problem. Advocacy that focuses solely on individualistic determinants “to the general exclusion of strategies aimed at its structural determinants will insufficiently address the structural and contextual causes” of the problem (Temko 2019:9). Gamson also notes that considering social
problems as both structural and agential is necessary to foster social movement actors’ connection to the issue while simultaneously effectively addressing the issue. In order to enable the emotional response of moral indignation, there needs to be more of an enemy than simply an abstract force (or else actors feel a lack of mastery). However, without naming actual structural causes, we risk not addressing the actual cause of the social problem at hand. Sustaining collective action requires a delicate balance of “concrete and abstract” (Gamson 1992a:32). Given the limited resources and short-term goals of funders and many organizations, mobilization and short-term wins are often prioritized over persuasion and long-term consciousness and movement building, even when discussions of framing are explicit (Healey 2012; McAdam 1999; Smock 2004).

Cultural studies, and in particular cultural cognition literature, can tend to take an individualistic and/or psychological approach to understanding the social world. However, structure conditions cultural orientations and cultural change (Wilson 2010). Biased discourse is not legitimated by independent individuals. Instead, ideologies are co-maintained, usually by an entire social system (Zerubavel 2006). Social persuasion campaigns are embedded in systems of power and the campaign process and its success is both formed and dependent on social and historical contexts (Jowett and O’Donnell 2012). Cultural cognition literature needs to further incorporate a sociological perspective to address cultural power and engage in exploring potential avenues for broader schematic changes. Similarly, the interest and strain theories of ideology are both “psychological and sociological concept[s]” (Geertz 1973:203). Interest theory includes sociological structure and an actor’s “felt advantage” and strain theory includes “a state of personal tension and a condition of societal dislocation” (Geertz 1973:203). Evaluating them and potentially moving them forward requires consideration of both actors and structure, of micro and macro processes and their interaction (Bates 2010; Hays 1994; Johnson 2014a; Layder 1985).
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

Gamson (1992b:68) wrote that “it is an achievement… for a challenger to force the sponsors of a legitimating frame to defend its underlying assumptions. The sheer existence of a symbolic contest is evidence of the breakdown of hegemony and a major accomplishment for the challenger” (Gamson 1992b:68). Yet in Iowa, women’s rights advocates not only engaged in campaigns around an issue steeped in symbolism—they achieved legislative victories.

Given the ideological contexts of gender balance, how did advocates in Iowa overcome these ideological barriers to get such a policy proposal adopted? What made Iowa exceptional—how and why did Iowa advocates succeed in the late 1980s when no other state has yet been able to do so? In 2009, what led a majority of legislators to go against the national tide pushing back on affirmative action and instead believe that extending gender balance was worth supporting? What are the implications of what happened in Iowa for cognitive social movement theory?

My research contributes to the social movement literature on ideology, power, cultural change, and cultural cognition. Gender balance is a form of affirmative action, a quota that, in order to remediate historical and continuing sexism, requires the government to appoint no more than half the membership of a board or commission from one gender, increasing women’s representation on men-dominated boards and commissions as well as women’s overall representation in appointed office. Gender balance, and quota systems and affirmative action more broadly, are often controversial public policies (Hughes, Paxton, and Krook 2017). They encounter backlash due to ideologies that posit ‘formal equality’ (that is identity-devoid) as the only way to have genuine equality. Individualism and meritocracy craft false notions that formal equality is equality. Stereotyped traditional perceptions on race and gender interact with ideas around these other

3 Throughout this study I use man/men and woman/women instead of male and female when referring to gender rather than sex (Herman 2015; Safire 2007).
ideologies to incorrectly explain why women are underrepresented in leadership and higher-status capacities. Given the current empirical limitations of interest and strain theories of ideology, my study provided a test case of the validity of these theories, teasing out the strengths, gaps, and areas for growth in the assumptions and parameters these theories constitute and ultimately moving ideology theorizing forward toward a more valid and nuanced conception. This analysis also has implications for social movement organizations seeking to understand how to successfully co-create a more equitable society, especially advocacy groups interested in increasing women and racial minorities’ representation among community leadership.

Gamson (1992b:67) has argued that “students of social movements need a social psychology that treats consciousness as the interplay between… individuals who operate actively in the construction of meaning and sociocultural processes that offer meanings that are frequently contested.” While this is a pathway forward for researching social movements and cultural power, it also lacks a fuller consideration of power and structure. Cultural cognition literature provides useful insights into social persuasion and cultural change, but would be strengthened through being further developed with an increased sociological perspective. Considering how communities make change and accounting for social power can enhance our understanding of cultural cognition and social persuasion. To this end, organizational communication scholar Dennis Mumby (1989) has argued that a focus on ideology and the “deep structure” of an institution can help studies of communication, culture, and meaning transcend overly behaviorist and individualistic orientations. Ideology links culture and power; studying it can help one understand the more structural roles institutions and culture play in shaping meaning (Mumby 1989). Sociologist Herbert Gans (2012) has argued that sociological cultural studies too often ignore structure and its relationship to culture. My study contributes to cultural cognition literature through using a wider focus, analyzing individual, group, community, institutional, systemic, and structural levels and their interactions, and making
social context and structural inequality central to the investigation.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS METHODS

Public policies can have tremendous impacts on people’s lives and society’s trajectory. I decided to focus on public policy because of this impact. I selected the topic of affirmative action because I was interested in researching cultural power. Gender balance is not just an affirmative action policy; it is a quota form of affirmative action. Gender balance is a radical project that contests ideas of ‘formal equality’, meritocracy, man-centeredness, and individualism through what is objectively a quota system. A gender balance requirement explicitly aims to take steps to redress inequalities in our society and in doing so (would seem to) explicitly acknowledge the lack of equal opportunity that women encounter in U.S. society. Supporting gender balance may require recognizing that formal equality is not enough and a belief that government should take active steps to redress these inequities (Bonilla-Silva 2018; Carroll 1986; Edelman 2001; Gamson 1992a; Gans 1988; Hughes, Paxton, and Krook 2017; Johnson 2014a, 2014b; Phillips 1995; Schneider and Ingram 1993, 2005; Stoll 2013; Williams 1998). This case study is thus particularly interesting because it explores a policy issue that is embedded in and thus connects with people’s ideologies, worldviews, and internalized biases.

I intentionally selected a case in which the public policy under consideration was adopted into law. This study moves beyond the deficit perspectives on reproduction of inequality by exploring the cognitive paths of decision-makers as they came to interpret gender balance as worth supporting (Harper 2010). Instead of adding to the now robust literature on why affirmative action policies are being dismantled, this study seeks instructive insights from a case study in which the Iowa legislature went against the grain and enacted policies that further affirmative action. By examining a case of positive deviance, I was able to consider what makes Iowa exceptional and draw
practical insights that can translate into popular social movement knowledge regarding strategy and techniques actors may find effective to employ when working on policy issues around representation, affirmative action, or that are embedded in potentially problematic ideologies (Herington and de Fliert 2018).

Because of this, my methods were necessarily historical. If I had selected a contemporary case study, I could have engaged in direct observation. However, I felt that addressing my research question required me to look at cases in which there was success in getting to victories (at least legislative victories) on the affirmative action policy. Conducting an ethnography of legislation currently under consideration would be untenable for a project that needed to be time-bound. It would be unworkable as a case of positive deviance if the case ultimately ended up with the legislation failing to be adopted or sufficiently progress (as happens often with legislation and policy campaigns, including but not limited to affirmative action proposals). Researchers who have gone into field sites hoping to observe collective action and challenges to cultural power have ended up instead writing about the absence of collective action (Auyero and Swistun 2008, 2009; Norgaard 2011, 2015). In Gaventa’s (1980) case study, while he was able to observe conscientization, this was a short-term success that by the end of his case study had reversed itself, with the powerful multinational corporation exerting its power and reproducing acquiescence.

I intentionally chose a relatively contemporary case study for two reasons. First, it increased the likelihood that I would have quality rich data. When first exploring potential case studies, I came across and was intrigued by the advocacy work of the New Jersey Bipartisan Coalition for Women’s Appointments. The group first convened in 1981 and has regularly reactivated since then. However, information on the project from 1981 was sparse. Besides a report by a now deceased author, a number of the founders were also deceased, and the Center for American Women and Politics at Rutgers University had not explicitly added materials from the project to the university archives
Having a case study that is relatively recent enables me to have access to more archival data and to have more people who were involved in the case study still alive to interview. Second, selecting a relatively contemporary case keeps my findings relevant to the current U.S. landscape regarding prevalent ideologies, race and gender discourse and relations, and public policies.

I decided to focus on state policy because there have not been similar recent successes adopted at the national level, and even if there were, there are both greater access issues with interviewing Congresspersons as well as conceptual issues with studying ground-level cultural change on national legislation; said legislation often has been preceded by cultural battles at a more local level and said policies may also be less connected to persuasion campaigns or Congresspersons’ worldviews. I wanted to focus on campaigns in which persuasion, and not just mobilization, played a role, as well as campaigns with a smaller unit of analysis so that I could study specific concrete institutions’ and communities’ roles in affecting perceptual and schematic changes. However, I also required a unit of analysis that would involve a set of actors broader than what some administrative rulemaking or executive orders might entail. I wanted a case study in which there was more than one primary target, so as to avoid findings and analysis that may be more idiosyncratic. The most straightforward path for Iowa legislation to get adopted is a majority vote of the 100 state representatives and of the 50 state senators, followed by a signature by the governor. Based on these factors, I chose my particular case study as one of the few contemporary cases that I identified of affirmative action policies or programs that have advanced in state legislatures to become law in the past decade.

I conducted qualitative research because I was interested in process and culture. My method is relatively unique for ideology studies. Most ideology studies are conceptual/theoretical, quantitative, or use discourse analysis (Maynard 2017). This also removes them from being
embedded in “an action context…. Political consciousness is forged in the process of collective action,” and here I attempted to capture both action and its trajectory to decision-making within a real-life positive deviance case study (Gamson 1992b:182; Herington and Fliert 2018). Using historical analysis, including archival research and interviews, I was able to capture the contexts, “dynamicism,” and complexity of actors’ cognitive decision-making processes in the closest proxy I had to their occurrence in real-life context (Gumpel, Zioni-Koren, and Bekerman 2014:226). Other methods may not have captured changes that occurred during the legislative session or campaign, especially if there were multiple changes or moving parts. Using ethnographic methods improved my ability to develop an understanding of the complexity and nuance of the legislative process (Gumpel, Zioni-Koren, and Bekerman 2014).

Geertz argued “that the social sciences have not yet developed a genuinely nonevaluative conception of ideology” (Geertz 1973:196). Interest theory is “superficial,… its sociology too muscular,” providing a structurally deterministic theory that ignores actors’ agency (Geertz 1973:202). Strain theory “reduced sociologists to viewing ideologies as elaborate cries of pain” (Geertz:1973:209). Geertz argued that ideology has not moved forward as a concept due to “theoretical clumsiness” that considers ideology as “an entity in itself” rather than considering its relationship to actors’ interpretive meaning-making processes (Geertz 1973:196). Interest and strain theory often ignore how ideological formation actually occurs (Geertz 1973). Social movement scholars often identify but fail to analyze ideas and meanings (Snow and Benford 1992). The most objective and valid understanding of meaning-making process often comes from qualitative ethnographic work (Blumer 1969). My method enabled a simultaneous focus on meaning-making and ideology, matching Geertz’s call.

As noted, I could not use participant observation as my primary method because I required legislation that I knew would have an outcome of being adopted. Nevertheless, traveling across the
state of Iowa and spending some time in the state capitol, I did get an observational sense of Iowa’s geographic and political landscape and dynamics. While some of this has changed from 2009 to 2018, other aspects have not, from the state’s overall demographic distribution (Iowa is mostly a rural state with several population centers spread throughout the state) to the capitol chambers and the process for contacting legislators on the house and senate floor. Through in-depth interviews and archival research, my ethnographic inductive approach enabled me to build on the existing ideological theories of interest theory and strain theory, and add complexity, validity, and improved practical application to existing empirical works that capture static cross-sectional linear pathways by which collective action frames and interpretations of social phenomena connect particular ideologies to particular decisional outcomes.

To answer my research questions, I began with background research on my case study as well as the general social, cultural, and political contexts of the communities, organizations, societies, and policy environments within which my case study is located (Jowett and O’Donnell 2012). I started out focused on the 2009 legislation. I then conducted in-depth interviews. In February 2018, I conducted phone interviews with primary advocates for the 2009 legislation: the House floor manager, the Senate floor manager, and two interviews with the executive director of the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women. After doing more background and contextual research, I traveled to Iowa, and from March 15, 2018 through March 24, 2018, conducted 48 in-person interviews across the state. I also conducted 16 interviews by phone between March and May 2018. In total, I conducted 68 interviews with 64 people. I transcribed my interviews, resulting in over 400 pages of single-spaced transcription. In addition to phone interviews, I learned some information through e-mail exchanges with people who had information or insights into the case. Appendix A, preceding my bibliography, contains a list of personal communications. When I provide a quote or am directly referring to what someone said, I use an in-text citation formatted (F. Last, PC, 2018).
I also explored and analyzed newspaper archives, the Iowa legislative website, websites from organizations that were involved in the legislation, and other texts that discussed or were related to the legislation and Iowa politics and culture. A number of web pages (e.g. from 2009) were available through the Internet Archive Wayback Machine (e.g. websites for the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women, Iowa state Republican and Democratic parties, and the Iowa League of Cities). Legislative records on the Iowa Legislature website are helpful but limited; there is more information for 2009 than for the 1980s, but even in 2009 Iowa had not yet begun audio or video recording committee hearings or floor sessions.

While I was initially focused on gender balance as a contemporary case study, my initial research revealed just how integral the history of women’s rights (in Iowa and as it is connected across the country and globe) was in shaping the 2009 legislation, especially the role of Iowa’s gender balance legislation in the late 1980s. This necessitated broadening my project to sufficiently explore the 1980s part of the case study. To obtain useful, thick data, I engaged in archival work, especially through exploring documents at the Iowa Women’s Archives at University of Iowa, in person from May 29, 2018, through June 5, 2018, and then afterwards through over 1500 collected photos and scans (Geertz 1973). I typed notes from these photos and scans with information that was directly relevant to my case study. References to the archival records I used from the Iowa Women’s Archives are included in in-text citations and in the bibliography.

As I learned more about the case study and as I collected additional data, new questions or possibilities arose and my analysis generated new and refined questions. As this occurred during my research process, I requested different boxes from different collections in the archives, for interviews reached out to different people to interview, and otherwise searched for, read, and analyzed additional news articles, pieces of legislation and House and Senate journal records, as well as other available sources.
Most interviewees gave me permission to use their name, use the audio recording from their interview in presentations, and otherwise make use of their interview, enabling me to record a historical account of this case study without obfuscation. One of my interviewees preferred I use a pseudonym, and one was okay with me using their name when discussing their own views, but preferred I use a pseudonym for all other insights they gave me. There were a few instances where interviewees made off-the-record remarks that have remained confidential. Otherwise, while a few interviewees did not give me permission to use audio from our interview in presentations, all data in this paper is nonfiction.

In recording actual history, I ended up with the challenge of having valid data. As expected, I encountered people recalling things incorrectly or conflating things from what was at the time nine years ago or even over 20 years prior. The archival materials also contained errors—both in people’s recollections as well as factual errors in reports. Because this was historical data, there were data that I could not triangulate. There was not always a good source to use to investigate and resolve a discrepancy. Nevertheless, the joint use of archival work and in-depth interviews often enabled me to triangulate my data and both deconstruct narratives and memories from empirical realities, as well as weave them together, allowing me to further extend my findings (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003).

I next organized my data chronologically and categorically. The two categories I used were women’s rights in context and increasing women’s representation. These were cross-listed with chronological time periods: 1) 1776 to 1959: A Foot in the Door; 2) The 1960s: Continued Emergence; 3) The 1970s: The Feminist Movement’s Heyday; 4) 1980-1984: Moving Forward, With Resistance; 5) 1985-1988: Fighting to Hold On, Fighting for More; 6) 1989-11/2006: The Gender Revolution, Slugging Along; 7) 11/2006-2009: The Democrats Govern; and 8) 2010-2019: Gender Balance on Iowa Boards and Commissions. Within each of those categories, I also organized the information in a variety of ways, such as by the frames and messages used by opponents or
proponents, or with references to particular groups or topics, such as the Iowa Women’s Legislative Caucus or urban-rural issues. For the 2009 legislation, I also conducted data analysis, including a logistic regression analysis, of House Republicans’ votes (not included here).

As I analyzed my data, I considered a number of areas that require attention in studies of cultural cognition and social persuasion. Among these were discourse, present ideologies, conceptions of gender imbalance as a social phenomenon, and perceptions of gender balance policies. Additionally I paid attention to individuals as opinion leaders, as well as individuals’ interpretive meaning-making processes, their perceptions of proximity to the issue, and decision-making outcomes. Individuals are also situated within other important areas to analyze: groups, institutions, and corresponding collective positions and norms. Individual and collective actors’ intentions, goals, messengers, tactics, and targets all impact social persuasion. The media, social and historical contexts, and power structures are also all important areas for focus (Gamson 1992a, 1992b; Jowett and O'Donnell 2012). Both over longer periods of time and within particular campaigns, I paid special attention to the trajectory of positions on gender balance and the reasons for those positions, especially how these positions remained stagnant or changed.

In the end, themes about what mattered ideologically bubbled up to the surface for me to analyze and investigate further; these provided direction and focus for my writing. This manuscript focuses on the themes that are most connected to ideology. As I analyzed the data relevant to these themes, I particularly looked for counterevidence to ensure that my theorizing was both empirically valid and to move my theorizing forward by exploring the nuance and complexity of social life. While my dissertation defense proposal included an initial literature review on a variety of areas relevant to cultural power and ideology, I began my research with an inductive approach, meant to begin from a place of hypothesis-generating as opposed to hypothesis-testing (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003). I did not know what I would find once I began my fieldwork and I intentionally
remained open to whatever pathways the data led me toward. I remained open to directions that could engage with literature and theories outside the confines of what I investigated in my initial literature review. Discussion of relevant literature is discussed in more detail in Chapters Three and Four, corresponding with the thematic findings that emerged during my research. As I sought to build relevant theory on this topic based on my data, I viewed my research study as an iterative process that grappled with the empirical reality I uncovered and how it affirms and provides counterevidence to existing theory.

ARGUMENT: NAVIGATING THE PATH TO PRESENCE

Stakeholders subscribed to multiple ideologies; while socially patterned by group or experience, different stakeholders interpreted different ideologies as corresponding with gender balance and with being more or less salient and more or less supportive or problematic. Stakeholders’ decision-making processes involved negotiating these ideologies. The majority of stakeholders did not view gender balance as a quota or as a radical project because traditional ideologies of individualism, meritocracy, neoliberalism, and traditional gender ideology were not the primary lens through which these stakeholders interpreted the legislation. Gender balance had been deradicalized into a normative public policy through gendered integration, other policies and protocols that socialized stakeholders into being used to gender balance type practices, and through powerful and intentionally activated frames and ideologies related to good governance. Gender balance advocates successfully worked to shape stakeholders’ ideological negotiations, contributing to their ability to garner enough support for Iowa to adopt gender balance requirements for state and local boards and commissions.
Deradicalizing Gender Balance

The interest theory perspective on ideology, as well as corresponding sociological literature on cultural power, oppression, and phenomenology, all provide a straightforward argument that attempts for gender balance should be met with traditional ideologies that will dominate the discourse and decision-making processes on the issue (Adams 2001; Berger and Luckmann 1966; Collins 1993; Edelman 1985, 2001; Gamson 1992a, 1992b; Gaventa 1980; Geertz 1973; Gramsci 1971; Hayward 2000, 2018; Komter 1989; LaCapra 1988; Lukes 2005; Marx and Engels 1970; Schneider and Ingram 1993, 2005; Swidler 1995; Young 1990; Zerubavel 2006). However, during Iowa’s successful legislative gender balance campaigns, ideologies were (relatively) infrequently structurally determined dominant norms that individuals had internalized. At the times Iowa adopted gender balance laws, the relevant traditional ideologies were not dominant. My research thus provides a counter to and contrast with interest theory, which is still the dominant frame within sociological approaches to understanding ideology (Adams 2001). Gender balance was substantially deradicalized in Iowa, enabling its passage and shifting Iowans’ perceptions of gender, governance, and affirmative action.

Literature on cognitive liberation and empowerment processes presume a need for conscientization to overcome false consciousness and support one’s own true interests (Gaventa 1980; Ledwith 2011; Lee 2011; Love 1984; McAdam 1999). However, in this case study, stakeholders undergoing ideological change was a factor in determining support, but nevertheless played less of a role than the changes to stakeholders’ interpretive perceptions of gender balance. Gender balance was socially reconstructed such that it was not dominantly interpreted as a phenomenon that necessarily required a process of cognitive liberation to overcome traditional ideologies that would otherwise prevent support. Stakeholders generally encountered a collective consciousness socially defining gender balance as fair, the “right thing to do,” positive, and, outside
of its strong supporters, as not overly consequential. This interpretation activated ideologies such as egalitarianism, social liberalism, and pragmatism while suppressing ideologies such as traditional gender ideology, neoliberalism, and meritocracy.

This deradicalization of gender balance occurred through disembedding gender segregation, normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good governance. These terms and processes are explained and expanded upon in Chapter Three. Disembedding gender segregation refers to both macro-level changes regarding societal integration of men and women and micro-level interactions and experiences resulting from this integration. This process especially served to produce men who were allies for women’s rights and gender balance and to produce women who saw women’s rights and gender balance as necessary objectives. Normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices refers to contextual changes that seemed marginal or indirectly related to a comprehensive gender balance law, but nevertheless helped shift the status quo such that Iowa’s successful gender balance proposals were oft-perceived as a standard and best practice. Prioritizing an ideology of good governance refers to the frames of good ol’ boys network and good government as well as an ideology of pragmatism, all of which were salient and resonated with a critical mass of Iowan stakeholders. Through implementation of gender balance, these processes have increased the stickiness of gender balance as a normative policy, meaning that the idea has become more embedded and requires increased cognitive work to change people’s perceptions of it. Implementation has also contributed to and continues to contribute to shifting Iowans’ schemas on issues of gender, diversity, and governance.

*Navigation Theory*

Based on my findings and analyses, I argue for reconceptualizing ideology using what I call navigation theory—actors simultaneously hold multiple complementary and competing ideologies
and must negotiate how these ideologies are (de)activated, (de)prioritized, interpreted, and applied to the issue under consideration. In Iowa, advocates employed collective action frame management to facilitate and steer this navigation such that a majority of legislators voted for and the governor signed gender balance legislation.

Navigation theory both draws from and challenges the two overarching intellectual traditions on ideology: interest theory, which posits ideology as universal internalization of belief systems that benefit the powerful, and strain theory, which posits that ideologies are deeply held but subject to change in response to individuals’ experiences (Geertz 1973). While interest theory has validity in that traditional ideologies can dominate, and while strain theory has validity in that ideological change can occur as a result of strain, these theories needed reworking to fit the empirical world of my case study. Rather than having internalized one cohesive dominant ideology or shifted to a different ideological belief to make sense of their experiences with the social world, legislators, lobbyists, and other stakeholders held multiple, sometimes conflicting ideologies simultaneously.

Gender balance advocates used collective action frame management to attempt to steer actors’ negotiations of their ideological beliefs toward support for the legislation. Actors encountered and navigated factors including but not limited to: whether women’s underrepresentation in politics was problematic and if so what type of problem it was and what had caused it, meritocracy, equal rights, fairness, government roles, gender ideology, positionality, ingroup beliefs, loyalties, constituencies, and good governance practices. These considerations led to different prioritization and activation of particular ideologies, which in turn resulted in particular policy positions and voting outcomes. Advocates also created or positioned targets so that the targets encountered empirical confrontations that created cognitive dissonance. Advocates then offered salient replacement frames to give actors an easy cognitive path toward making sense of the empirical confrontation. For targets who did not initially interpret the empirical confrontation as
dissonant or who made sense of their dissonance through opposing frames, advocates needed sustained engagement with the target or to foster the target having long-term and repetitive engagements with the empirical confrontation in order to foster schematic change. While advocates encountered pushback against gender balance legislation and initial failures, advocates were often able to negotiate how ideologies were prioritized and how they were interpreted and applied to the issue, a key determinant of their success in getting gender balance laws adopted in Iowa.

ORGANIZATION OF STUDY
Chapter Two provides an overview of my case study: a historical record of gender balance in Iowa. This chapter provides context for my theoretical chapters as well as data that I draw on as evidence in my theoretical chapters. I first discuss the women’s rights movements’ initial aims to increase women’s appointments. Next I outline how the concept of gender balance became a feminist goal and overview the legislative campaign in Iowa in the late 1980s that produced Iowa’s gender balance law for state boards and commissions. After that I provide background on the subsequent campaign for extending that law to local boards and commissions, culminating in Iowa’s 2009 law. Within each of these areas, I provide a relatively chronological account. This chapter also briefly discusses the law’s implementation and provides some context beyond Iowa regarding affirmative action, gender balance legislation, and gender quotas.

Chapters Three and Four evaluate my case study in reference to literature on ideology, cognitive social movement theory, and my research questions. Chapter Three begins by demonstrating the limited applicability of interest theory, noting that in Iowa gender balance was viewed less as a quota and more as a fair, common sense, and minor public policy tool that had the potential to advance women’s equity. I next unveil the mechanisms that substantially deradicalized gender balance in Iowa, enabling its passage—disembedding gender segregation, normatizing and
institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good governance. The chapter concludes by discussing how implementation of these gender balance laws has continued to stimulate these three processes, further shifting engaged Iowans’ perceptions of gender, governance, and affirmative action.

While Chapter Three challenged the interest theory on ideology, Chapter Four discusses how its primary alternative, strain theory, also has limited empirical application. While I did come across ideological change in my case study, rather than actors traveling from one ideological position to another, I found that people simultaneously hold a multiplicity of ideologies, and that within particular situations and contexts different ideologies are activated and prioritized. How an individual constructs and interprets the situation confronting them shapes how they apply ideologies to the situation. Chapter Four defines and elaborates my reconceptualized framework for understanding ideology—navigation theory. It provides substantial evidence of its operation in this case study. I explore stakeholders’ negotiations of their ideologies in relation to a number of areas that impacted their decision-making processes, such as: stakeholders’ evaluations of government intervention; stakeholders’ evaluations of whether or not gender imbalance is problematic, and if so, what the nature of the problem was; and how stakeholders’ other priorities, such as affinity groups, impacted how stakeholders negotiated ideologies and ultimately impacted their position on gender balance. This chapter also outlines how advocates created or enhanced cognitive dissonance through presenting empirical confrontations that conflicted with existing ideologies, offering replacement frames, and using sustained engagement to make this dissonance matter. Advocates sought to manage dissonant ideologies through collective action frame management in order to obtain public policy victories.

Finally, Chapter Five concludes my study. I review and synthesize my arguments, re-examining my case study and argument in relation to their implications for theorizing ideology and
cultural change, as well as identifying areas for future analysis and research. I also discuss specific contributions my study has made to the social movement literature. I conclude with a discussion of my study’s implications for gender equity and cultural change.
CHAPTER TWO: IOWA ADOPTS GENDER BALANCE FOR ITS BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

REMOVING BARRIERS AND INCREASING WOMEN’S APPOINTMENTS

In the United States, women were initially excluded from basic rights and responsibilities. Women’s rights organizations’ initial aims were thus focused on removing overt barriers to women’s inclusion, including enfranchisement and the right to hold office, and on ending basic discrimination. Advocacy for appointed office translated into an initial focus on breaking *glass floors*—getting women on appointed bodies.

*American Association of University Women (AAUW)*’s *Appointments Projects*

In the 1930s the AAUW began formally working on a national level on increasing women’s appointments through an active appointments project called Rosters of Women Qualified for Public Service. Women’s names were collected and submitted to appointers. The AAUW also recommended appointers increase women’s appointments and urged its members to get involved in the issue (Gould 2013, 2016; Noah 1981).

One AAUW member who heeded this call was Iowan Joan Lipsky, who from 1956 to 1958 served as president of the AAUW Cedar Rapids Area Branch (AAUW Cedar 2018). While Cedar Rapids had had women school board members in the past, it had become 100% men, and its men members had developed an exclusionary pseudo-appointment system. Outgoing school board members would resign the summer before September elections, a new member would be appointed,

---

4 Glass ceilings refer to the gender barrier women encounter reaching the upper echelons of an organization (e.g. a corporate CEO, the U.S. president). Glass floors refer to the gender barrier women encounter entering men-exclusive organizations at even the base level (e.g. admission to college, becoming an attorney, holding elected office, being a member of a board or commission). Women’s exclusion from membership on the Iowa Supreme Court and especially the Chief Justice role would be considered a glass ceiling; women’s exclusion from being a judge in Iowa, even at the district court level, would be considered a glass floor.
and then that member would run as an incumbent. These appointees were always men, making this system “a device whereby women were really being kept out” (Schenken 1989b:7-10). Lipsky was alarmed when the board appointed a man she felt was incompetent on matters of education. Lipsky decided to run against him, and she subsequently lost (Schenken 1989b).

Next, in 1958, when the school board announced an upcoming resignation, Lipsky brought together a coalition of women’s groups’ leaders, including the League of Women Voters, and recruited a well-qualified candidate, Georgia Nye. The group went to the school board chair and suggested he appoint Nye for the seat being vacated, noting that otherwise they and their organizations’ members would commit to electing Nye and defeating his candidate. The school board chair was shocked and initially offended, but he appointed Nye, who was thus subsequently elected, indeed later serving as Iowa Association of School Boards president (Schenken 1989b).


Commissions on the Status of Women (CSW)’s Appointments Projects

Iowa Governor Harold Hughes (D) established a CSW in 1963, Iowa Governor Bob Ray ® re-established it in 1969, and it became statutory in 1972 (Clarenbach and Thompson 1974; Durden 2003; Governor’s 1964; NACW 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018a; Spencer 1989c). The Iowa CSW was “a recognized leader in the nation” among CSWs in the 1970s (Geadelman 1976; ICSW 1977). CSWs around the country started roster appointment projects; Governor Ray’s CSW started theirs in 1970 as one of their primary activities. Within five years the Iowa CSW had 500 completed rosters on file

Women’s Political Caucus (WPC)’s Appointments Project

The National WPC (NWPC) was founded in 1971 to put women in positions of power. The NWPC founders believed having women equally represented in political decision-making would result in policies that promoted equity for women (NWPC 2018). Roxanne Conlin founded Iowa’s WPC (IWPC) in 1973. Its inaugural conference attracted 600 attendees, making it the largest in the country (Herndon 1984; ICSW 1973b; IWPC 1980b; Koerber 1974; NWPC 2018; R. Conlin, PC, 2018). By 1974 the IWPC had 5,000 members and 25 chapters, making it “the largest state caucus in the United States” (Burrell 1974; Document 1974). At their September 1974 convention, the IWPC had over 1,000 attendees (IWPC 1980b). The IWPC began holding bring-your-own lunches with legislators at the Iowa Capitol every other week in 1975. By March 1976 the lunches garnered 30 to 40 attendees. The IWPC was the only WPC in the United States to regularly meet informally with legislators (IWPC 1980b; Kettner 1976).

In 1976, two national reports placed Iowa in first and tied for first with two other states for the highest percentage of women on their boards and commissions (Follon 1976; National Commission 1977c). Table One below shows women’s representation on Iowa state boards and commissions from 1967 through 2006. Percentages may vary depending on a number of data collection and analysis factors. For example, in 1984 the IWPC and Governor Terry Branstad (R) respectively reported women constituting 25% versus 33% of state board and commission members (ICSW 1985, 1996b; IWPC 1984).

Table One. Women’s Representation on State of Iowa Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14% or 21.5%, 235 total (July)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%, 300-507 total, 29% (December)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While women’s representation on boards and commissions increased from exclusion to overall proportional representation, appointments were still gender typed. The IWPC’s July 1974 study found that almost one-third of state boards and commissions had zero women, including “several well-known powerful commissions” (Gappa 1974; Gappa and Conlin 1974:2). Some boards and commissions were also overrepresented by women; the Licensed Cosmetology Examiners and the Board of Nursing both had zero men (Gappa 1974; Gappa and Conlin 1974).
STRIVING TOWARD PARITY: GENDER BALANCE ON STATE BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Work by the women’s rights movement in Iowa, nationally, and internationally to correct women’s deficient social status resulted in a broad push for fair representation, and by the end of the 1970s, a goal of equal representation of women in the policy-making arena, including on boards and commissions. In 1986, embedded in a massive state government reorganization effort, Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) led a successful effort to establish gender balance on state boards and commissions as Iowa law. After Governor Terry Branstad (R) continued to make appointments that were in flagrant violation of the spirit of the law, and with an opportunity crafted by attention to the issue of political and gender bias and women’s underrepresentation in the judiciary, Hammond and other women’s rights advocates were able to strengthen the gender balance law in 1987 and again in 1988, making Iowa the first state in the United States to have a strict mandate of gender balance on state boards and commissions. Other states have attempted to follow suit, and while new laws have been enacted, no other state has been able to replicate Iowa’s success.

*Gender Quotas for Elected Officials: International Context*

Iowa’s legislative advocacy for a gender quota took place within an international context where women were identifying equal inclusion in governance as a right and working for gender quotas, though in countries with parliamentary systems, these policies were aimed directly at elected officials. In 1995, the UN’s Fourth World Conference on Women included an endorsement of gender balance, calling for “women’s equal participation in decision-making” and calling upon governments to take action “to achieve equal participation in their decision-making bodies” (United 1996). Figure One below shows a timeline of when countries adopted their first gender quota law (for electeds).
By spring 2008, 46 countries had legislative gender quotas in their constitutions or electoral/party laws. Over 60 countries had at least one political party with parliamentary representation that had voluntarily adopted their own internal gender quota requirements (Dahlerup 2008). There are currently over 130 countries with constitutional, electoral law, or party rules that contain gender quotas (Pande and Ford 2011; Paxton et al. 2019). Rwanda is the world leader for highest proportion of women in the lower House of their national parliament. Rwanda’s parliament went from 17.1% women in 2000 to 45.0% women in 2004 after instituting a quota law in 2003 (Inter-Parliamentary 2019). Gender quota requirements are an effective method to change the gender composition of a particular institution.

Affirmative Action: U.S. Context

While the United States was not pursuing gender quotas, affirmative action policies aimed to increase women’s representation. Gender balance is an affirmative action policy. Affirmative action as a policy to address systemic and institutionalized discrimination (especially regarding race, but also sometimes gender or class) dates back to a quota system for African American employment in Public Works Administration projects under President Franklin D. Roosevelt (D) (Hsu 2018). In
1961, President John F. Kennedy (D) issued an executive order requiring government contractors “take affirmative action” to work toward “nondiscrimination” in the areas of “race, creed, color, or national origin” (Hsu 2018). In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson (D) extended this to include gender and religion (Jurist 2013). Affirmative action took hold in university admissions policies and employment in the 1960s and 1970s (Berrey 2015).

Iowa’s 2009 campaign for gender balance took place at a time when affirmative action laws were being challenged around the country. Californian black businessman Ward Connerly led a petition effort in 1995 to put banning affirmative action in California on the ballot. He was successful and California voters subsequently banned affirmative action, the majority voting for what was titled a “Civil Rights Initiative” (Hsu 2018; Larson and Menendian 2008; Moses and Farley 2011). Connerly tried to take his campaign national, co-founding the American Civil Rights Initiative (ACRI) and launching it in 1997 as a birthday celebration of Martin Luther King, Jr. (Ayres 1997).

Table Two below presents state campaigns to ban affirmative action. Not all were ACRI initiatives.

Table Two. State Campaigns to Ban Affirmative action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Passed (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Banned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Passed 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Banned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Passed (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>legislature</td>
<td>Did not get on ballot (27-32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Did not get on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Oppose (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Did not get on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Support (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Did not get on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>legislature</td>
<td>On 2010 ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>citizen vote</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>legislature</td>
<td>Adopted (House 219-80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Hsu 2018; Larson and Menendian 2008; Moses and Farley 2011; National 2014; Rockwell 1996

ACRI campaigns sometimes confused voters with what they were actually voting for, especially as
they were framed as civil rights initiatives and did not state they were banning affirmative action. Residents were approached to sign petitions by someone who would ask if they were against discrimination, and if so whether they would sign a petition to end discrimination in their state (Moses and Farley 2011).

The table above shows a gap period between 1999 and 2006. During that time, the ACRI and others were waiting for what they hoped would be favorable court decisions. When the U.S. Supreme Court issued its opinion upholding the University of Michigan Law School’s affirmative action plan, ACRI announced that same day their plan to bring their campaign to Michigan.

For 2008, Connerly called ACRI’s plans to ban affirmative action in five states “Super Tuesday for Equal Rights” (Larson and Menendian 2008; Moses and Farley 2011). Due to court challenges, opposition, and fraudulent signatures, Super Tuesday ended up with only one more state banning affirmative action. Unsatisfied, Connerly decided to move on from the issue (Larson and Menendian 2008; Moses et al. 2010; Wong 2008; Zeveloff 2008).

President Nixon’s Task Force on Women’s Rights and Responsibilities Calls for Equal Representation, 1970


Gender Balance for the Iowa Civil Rights Commission, 1974

Iowa’s first gender balance bill for a state board or commission was part of a 1974 bill to strengthen
the Iowa Civil Rights Commission. The IWPC supported it. It required that “not more than four [of the seven] members of the civil rights commission can be of the same sex” (Tigges 1974; Tigges and Macauley 1974a:4). Two legislators proposed an alternative bill that was narrower in scope and did not have a gender balance component; that bill was assigned to a committee but did not get a floor vote (Iowa legislature 1974e). The legislation passed the Senate 33-12, the House as amended 95-0, and then the Senate as further amended 44-1. Governor Bob Ray (R) signed the bill into law (Iowa Legislature 1974h). It was normal for state boards and commissions to have specific requirements about their membership composition. However, this was the first time gender balance was one of those requirements. The Des Moines Register framed this provision as ensuring “that neither sex heavily dominates commission membership” (Szumski 1974). From a practical standpoint, this could be a reaction to the expansion four years earlier of the nondiscrimination code to include sex; a plurality of cases before the Iowa Civil Rights Commission now had to do with sex discrimination complaints (Document 1974; Jensen 1970).

*Political Party Balance on State Boards and Commissions, 1976*

The first state law in Iowa requiring comprehensive across the board balance on state boards and commissions was adopted in 1976 and required that no more than half plus one seat of a state board or commission’s membership be from one political party. The law did not require much ideological diversity since many Iowans are not registered as Democrats or Republicans. The original introduced legislation applied to Governor Bob Ray (R)’s current set of nominees and indeed had been introduced as a reaction to his nominees. Ray responded that he would not modify his nominations list but was open to legislation for future reform (AP 1975; Iowa Legislature 1976; J. Hatch, PC, 2018; McCormick 1975; Office-Governor 2019; R. Scott, PC, 2018a; Reid 1975; State 1975a, 1975b).
Iowa Women’s Legislative Caucus (IWLC)

As more women entered the legislature, they formed a WLC, with women legislators providing support to one another and claiming their power. From at least 1975 on, women legislators got together informally and worked with one another (Schenken 1989c). In 1979, the women legislators convened as a support group for the women pages. In 1981, Representative Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) formally put together the WLC (Schenken 1989a). The WLC held a weekly bring-your-own lunch during which its bipartisan membership (of women only, though men could attend) could “bring each other up to date on issues of interest to women and families” (Lloyd-Jones 1984).

The WLC held their own biennial retreat. It began because House Speaker Don Avenson (D-Fayette) organized an annual fishing trip, but only invited men legislators to go with him. He refused to include women, even when asked. The WLC decided to begin hosting their own “fishing trip,” though it was fishing in name only. The retreat, held in non-election (odd) years through the 1980s, was a time for WLC members to get together, relax and socialize, and do some strategic planning (Hammond 1988; Hannon 1985a, 1988, 1993a; Hannon and Schenken 1989a, 1991b).

The WLC provided solidarity, a supportive network, information, and a mechanism for shared advocacy on women’s issues (Daubenmier 1985; Hannon 1985a, 1993a, 1995b, 1995c; Schenken 1989a; Schenken 1991c). The WLC would invite legislative leaders to a meeting early in the legislative session to discuss their priorities (Lloyd-Jones 1984). Senator Bev Hannon (D-Jones) noted that the speaker and majority leader listened “because they couldn’t afford to alienate… a sizeable voting bloc” (Hannon 1993a; Schenken 1991a). By 1984, the WLC had come into its power, succeeding in getting legislation passed on issues from comparable worth to child care, legislation which Lloyd-Jones said even in the feminist heyday of the early 1970s “wouldn’t have even been introduced, let alone seriously debated and passed” (Lloyd-Jones 1984). In 1989, Lloyd-Jones reflected her belief that there was successful legislation that had happened as a direct result of the

*International Women’s Year (IWY)’s Call for Equal Representation, 1977*

IWY was an extensive undertaking. The United Nations CSW hosted a world conference in 1975 that adopted equality in policy-making representation as an explicit goal (Iowa Coordinating 1977a; Mattingly and Nare 2014; Stout 2012; United 1976; UN Women 2018). In the United States, a National Commission for IWY put together a report of about 400 pages with 115 policies, including “equal representation” as a principle and calls for equal participation in numerous areas, including appointive office (Abzug 1977; Frie and Bonk 1977; ICSW 1985; Iowa Coordinating 1977a, 1977b; IWPC 1988+; Mattingly and Nare 2014; National 1975; National Commission 1976). The Women in Power Committee’s recommendations chapter included a call for governors to strive to increase women’s appointments by 1980, with extra attention to boards and commissions with very few women, and by 1985 to achieve “equal membership of men and women serving on all State boards and commissions” (National Commission 1976:314).

Next the National Commission on the Observance of IWY was charged with hosting a National Women’s Conference and organizing state and territorial meetings for states to elect delegates to the national conference and for states to themselves identify policies to address barriers
to women (Frie and Bonk 1977; Iowa Coordinating 1977a; IWPC 1976c; Mattingly and Nare 2014). Jean Lloyd-Jones (former League of Women Voters of Iowa president and future legislator) convened the Iowa Coordinating Committee to put on the Iowa Women’s Meeting (Follon 1977; Frie and Bonk 1977; Iowa Coordinating 1977a; Schenken 1989a). From June 10 to 12, 1977, 1500 Iowans participated in the meeting, which had speakers, 56 workshops (90 with repeats), exhibits, entertainment, and free day care. Iowans endorsed the National Commission’s 15 core recommendations and approved 130 more, including on gender balance (Iowa Coordinating 1977a, 1977b, 2007b).

That November, Senator Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) led the Iowa delegation to the National Women’s Conference in Houston, Texas, which included Jean Lloyd-Jones and delegates from various Iowa women’s organizations. There delegates adopted a National Plan of Action, which included increasing women’s appointments, gender balance for state boards and commissions by 1985, and gender balance for political parties (Frie and Bonk 1977; Iowa Coordinating 1977a; IWPC 1976e, 1980b; List 1977; Mattingly and Nare 2014; Schenken 1989c).

Out of IWY emerged a clear call for states to have gender balanced boards and commissions. IWY institutionalized the idea of gender parity meaning gender balance and of gender balance applying to state boards and commissions (Henry 1994). A reading of the reports and recommendations discussed and adopted as part of IWY clearly demonstrate that an underlying goal was to have women represented in proportion to their numbers. Thus, for areas like government public policy-making and boards and commissions that pooled from broader society, the goal was for women to be represented in equal numbers to men.
Gender Balance in Story County, 1975-1978

Johnie Hammond became involved with the League of Women Voters in the 1960s. As part of her local League, Hammond was part of a study committee that focused on Story County government (Schenken 1991a). When Hammond ran for Story County Board of Supervisors in 1970 and again in 1974, her platform included support for increasing women’s representation on local boards and commissions, rooted in the League’s analysis. She was elected in 1974, the first woman supervisor for the county, and proceeded to increase and then gender balance the county’s boards and commissions (Hammond Nd, 1994, 1995; J. Hammond, PC, 2018; Schenken 1991a). Hammond was elected to the Iowa legislature in 1982 and was the lead proponent of Iowa’s 1980s gender balance legislation.

Political Parties’ 50-50 Rules

Gender balance became a normal practice among politicos through political parties’ 50-50 rules, which set a precedent for an extension of gender balance to other arenas. Following women gaining the right to vote, political parties wanted to ensure women supported them and began 50-50 rules to require equal gender representation. The national parties adopted equal representation delegate rules in the 1970s, though the Democratic rule became a gender balance requirement and the Republican rule abandoned having a strict gender delegate requirement (Chapin 2010; Dewhirst 2007; Schnall 2005).

Iowa’s first gender balance bill was House File 492, a 50-50 rule. Filed in 1965 by Representative James Resnick (D-Scott), the legislation regulated political parties in “special charter cities” of a certain population size. Among the various regulations, the law required that “A male member and a female member for each political party shall be elected from each precinct to the city central committee at the primary election” and that “the city central committee… members from the
same precinct shall not be of the same sex.” The bill passed the House and Senate unanimously and was signed into law (Iowa Legislature 1965).

In 1972, National Women’s Political Caucus (NWPC) leaders met with Democratic and Republican national committee leaders and secured their commitment to work toward equal representation of men and women at the upcoming 1972 national conventions (NWPC 2018). The 1972 Democratic National Convention (DNC) has about 40% women delegates, up from 13% in 1968 (NWPC 2018; Schnall 2005). The 1972 Republican National Convention had almost 30% women delegates, up from 17% in 1968 (IWPC 2018; Schnall 2005).

After pushback from disgruntled Democratic men who felt left out of the 1972 convention due to “quotas,” the DNC changed their rules for 1976 from requiring delegate outcomes of proportional representation to requiring delegate selection processes that followed approved affirmative action plans (Freeman 1976; WPC 1973c). The Republican party adopted rules for 1976 that required states to “take positive action” and “endeavor” to achieve gender balance for their national convention delegates, but specified that the “rules are not intended to be the basis of any kind of quota system” (Freeman 2008; NWPC 2018; Schnall 2005:389). Without required outcomes, women’s representation looked like it was going to substantially decrease for 1976 compared to 1972 (NWPC 1976). In response, the NWPC and the National Organization for Women (NOW) pushed for a 50-50 requirement. On the Democratic side, they subsequently made a deal with presidential candidate Jimmy Carter to get his support on a number of items and wait until 1978 for the gender balance rule requirement, which was then instituted (Freedman 1976; NWPC 2018; Schnall 2005).

At the 1976 Republican National Convention (RNC), women’s participation increased to 36% from under 30%. Feminists seeking to improve women’s representation with 50-50 rules encountered anti-quota pushback and were accused of trying to “McGovernize” the Republican party (Schnall 2005:390). Indeed, even the NWPC Republican Women’s Task Force leaders did not
support a 50-50 rule for delegates, saying it would be an “illegal quota” (Freeman 2008). While the Republican party still has a 50-50 practice for its national committee, there are no national gender requirements for state delegations. Some state Republican parties have retained their own 50-50 laws; Iowa has not (Freeman 2008).

As of 2008, the RNC’s internal practices still encouraged affirmative action and gender balance for state RNC delegations, for its Standing Budget Committee, and for other committees, though again noting these were not intended to be quotas (Republican National 2010). The Iowa Republican party was more conservative than the national party on these matters, demanding “an end to gender-specific offices in the Republican party” (e.g. national committeeman and committeewoman) (Iowa Republican 2008). The state party’s constitution also had an article on “Nondiscrimination in elected or appointed party positions” which stated both opposition to discrimination and affirmative action:

The Republican Party of Iowa shall not use race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin as a criterion for either discriminating against, or granting preferential treatment to, any individual or group in any of its elected or appointed party positions at any level. This section shall be implemented to the maximum extent consistent with law and the National Republican Party Constitution and bylaws (Republican Party 2010a).

**Considering Gender Balance for Individual State Boards and Commissions, 1984**

A study bill to create a Commission on Children, Youth, and Families went to the House State Government Committee (Iowa Legislature 1984b). The State Government Committee had nine women members [including Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) as Vice-Chair] and 14 men members (Iowa Legislature 2018a). The committee added a provision to the bill that “Not more than nine of the [16] voting members of the commission shall be of the same gender.” The bill passed the House 88-8, the Senate 40-5, and was signed into law April 16, 1984 (Iowa Legislature 1984b). Also in 1984, on April 18, Representative Lloyd-Jones proposed an amendment to an
amendment on House File 2527 to require gender balance on an Iowa world trade center board. Lloyd-Jones’ amendment to the amendment passed, though the amendment itself failed (Iowa Legislature 1984c; State 1984).

Gender Balance Fails, 1983

In 1981, President Ronald Reagan (R), who opposed the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), called for a 50 States Project in its place, with the idea that states could each ensure their laws were not discriminatory without proceeding with a constitutional amendment (Hammond Nd, 1995; Reagan 1982; Rendel 1982). Patricia (Pat) Geadelman, who had served as Governor Bob Ray (R)’s CSW Chair, was the Iowa representative for this project. While the federal government invested little to no resources into the project, Geadelman took it seriously (ICSW 1982b; News 1982; Reagan 1982).

The ICSW began its 50 States project in July 1982 (ICSW 1982b). In 1983, Governor Terry Branstad (R) acted on the ICSW’s push to implement the 50 States Project in Iowa, appointing a task force of women attorneys to go through Iowa’s state code and identify discriminatory laws for correction (Iowa WLC 1984a). In 1985, Branstad initiated legislation based on the 50 States Project task force report. One bill was assigned to the House State Government Committee, where Representative Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson) was chair and Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) Vice Chair. Hammond was assigned to manage House File (HF) 332, “An Act relating to discrimination on the basis of gender and marital status” (Hammond Nd, 1995; Iowa Legislature 1985b). One of the provisions dealt with county boards of social welfare, proposing to change the requirement that these boards’ memberships have “at least one… woman” to language specifying that “both sexes shall be represented” (Iowa Legislature 1985b; State 1985a).

Representative Hammond was tickled when she saw the requirement that the county social welfare board have a man on it (“both sexes shall be represented”). When Hammond was on the
county board of supervisors she had (informally) done just that for her county. Hammond had made a “big issue of that [county] social welfare board” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). It proved very difficult getting the first man to be willing to serve on it, but she did, and looking back the man was proud of his service (Hammond Nd, 1995). Hammond recalls that at least two of the members of her county board had

went up to his farm one morning, and took cookies with us and asked for coffee. And we sat with him, and we said the social welfare board needs the perspective of a man and we have not had that, and we believe you could do that.  
Well, I don’t know about that, I just don’t know about that. He was a good ol’ Iowa farmer. But he took that on and he really came to appreciate and value it (J. Hammond, PC, 2018).

Given her experience, Hammond felt managing HF 332 was “easy for me,… but it also just hit me—hey, my gender balance bill would be germane to this bill” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). Hammond decided to propose an amendment to the legislation, adding in a requirement for state gender balance. Representatives Richard Varn (D-Johnson) and Dottie Carpenter (R-Polk) co-sponsored the amendment (Iowa Legislature 1985b).

The State Government Committee at the time had 21 members, including seven women, which included both amendment co-sponsor Carpenter and Representative Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) (Iowa legislature 2018a). The legislature was men dominated. In 1985, with 22 women and 128 men legislators, the Iowa General Assembly was 14.67% women (ICSW 1996b).

Women legislators on the House State Government Committee all supported the amendment. The amendment faced substantial debate and opposition, even from men Hammond had considered progressive (Hammond Nd, 1995). Hammond was surprised at their response, which was, “without even thinking of it, Well, we want the best qualified, and what if that’s a man and you’re wanting us to appoint a woman?” Hammond noted that “obviously” you want the best qualified person, but “obviously we don’t have a ranking of 1 through 5,000 in terms of who’s best qualified, and there are many people that would be qualified to serve on a particular state board and so it was kind
of a phony argument” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018).

A few men joined the seven women on the committee in voting for the amendment, presumably Bob Arnould (D-Scott), Rod N. Halvorson (D-Webster), and Donald Shoning (D-Woodbury), but it failed to pass by one vote (Hammond Nd, 1995; State 1985b). When the bill came to the House floor, Hammond again brought forward her amendment, where it failed again, this time by more than a two-to-one margin, 29-64-7 (Iowa Legislature 1985g; State 1985b). The bill, without the amendment, then passed the House 96-0-4 (Iowa Legislature 1985g). There were 19 women representatives at the time. Eighteen were present for the vote, and 14 of them voted for the amendment. Notably, among the men voting for the amendment was Don Avenson (D-Fayette), who was Speaker of the House at the time and through the 1980s, and Jack Hatch (D-Polk), who remained in the legislature through the 2009 legislation (State 1985b).

The women legislators who had supported the gender balance amendment were surprised and angry at the opposition to it and the defeat of the amendment (Hammond Nd, 1995). The State Government Committee addresses issues regarding licensed occupations and professions, so bills regarding corresponding boards and commissions often go before the State Government Committee. Following the failure of the legislation, Hammond, along with the other State Government Committee women members, began successfully passing amendments to legislation dealing with specific boards and commissions that came before them to require that particular boards or commissions be gender balanced. This became known as the “usual amendment.” Lloyd-Jones remembers “heated opposition from some of the male members of the committee” the first time they did this, “but it passed.” The next time “there were a few groans of resignation,” but it also passed. Then it became normal: the “usual” amendment or “generic amendment on gender

5 While I do not have a record of the committee vote, when the same amendment was voted on on the House Floor, these three committee members voted for it, while the other male committee members voted against it.
balance” (Hammond Nd, 1995; J. Lloyd-Jones, PC, 2018; Lloyd-Jones 1986b; Schenken 1991c). This process continued repeatedly (Iowa Legislature 1985c, 1985d, 1985h, 1985i, 1986a, 1986c, 1986f; Lloyd-Jones 1986b; Schenken 1991c; State 1985b, 1986). Regardless of whether or not a particular bill passed, the House was now in the regular practice of requiring gender balance any time it discussed legislation dealing with boards and commissions, and the Senate was now in the practice of continuing to vote for legislation the House amended in this manner.

**Gender Balance Passes, 1986**

The first broad-based state gender balance law passed as part of Iowa’s 1986 reorganization bill. Governor Terry Branstad (R) proposed reorganization to streamline services and cut spending (Clark 1986a; Gruhn 1986b, 1986d; Hannon 1985/1986; 1986c, 1986d; Zimmerman 1986a). The issue of state boards and commissions (how many, their policy-making authority and its relation to gubernatorial accountability and democratic governance, their makeup and constitution, the degree of public participation, etc.) was an important part of the discussion of reorganization, with the Iowa Women’s Legislative Caucus concerned about reduced board and commission autonomy and power, especially for the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) (Clark 1986c; Gruhn 1986f; Hammond 1986b; Hannon 1986c, 1986d; Norman 1986c; Witosky 1986; Zimmerman 1986a).

Governor Branstad proposed state reorganization in December 1985, though he subsequently proposed two revisions and then a multitude of amendments (Gruhn 1986d). The process started in the Senate Committee on State Government. The committee “worked round the clock” for a month and produced its own bill (different from the governor’s original proposal), Senate File (SF) 2175. The bill was 405 pages and cost $7.75 per copy to print ($17.88 in 2018 dollars) (Gruhn 1986g; Hammond 1986b; Hannon 1986c; Iowa Legislature 1986f).

SF 2175, as introduced, included a few provisions related to gender balance for specific
commissions and councils (Iowa Legislature 1986g). The Senate took up the measure and considered and adopted various amendments. On February 25, 1986, after 11 weeks of work on it in the Senate, the Senate passed the bill with a vote of 41-8 (Hannon 1986c, 1986d).

The legislation then headed to the House (Hannon 1986c, 1986d; Iowa Legislature 1986g). Representative Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson) had recently been appointed to chair the State Government Committee, where the reorganization bill went (Lloyd-Jones 1986b). The House State Government Committee was the same for the 1985-1986 session, which included Johnie Hammond (D-Story) as Vice-Chair and a number of women, including Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) (Iowa Legislature 2018a; Lloyd-Jones 1986b). The House State Government Committee worked on the bill, reviewing the Senate’s amended bill, and put forward a detailed multipage amendment with its recommendations for changes to the bill. This included changing the consumer advisory panel to an appointment by the attorney general, rather than governor, and specifying that for the panel, “Not more than a simple majority of the members shall be of the same gender.” This sentence was placed directly after a sentence already there about political party balance, and it passed (Iowa Legislature 1986g:1026). A “grueling” process involving over 15 hours of debate and consideration of 86 amendments (one of them being the State Government’s 146 page amendment) ended with some adopted, others rejected, and finally the bill passing the House on March 18, 1986 by a vote of 78-19, sending it back to the Senate with a 163 page amendment (Clark 1986a; Gruhn 1986f; Iowa Legislature 1986g).

The Senate and House could not reconcile their competing versions of reorganization, so a conference committee was appointed to resolve the numerous differences. Leadership appointed House and Senate members where a new compromise version would be written, likely with “many more changes.” The conference committee’s version would go back to the legislature for a yes or no
vote, but no further amendments would be allowed at that point (Gruhn 1986f; Iowa Legislature 1986g; J. Hammond, PC, 2018; Hannon 1986d; Weber 1986; Witosky 1986).

Conference committees have 10 members in total, five from each chamber (Weber 1986). This conference committee was co-chaired by Lloyd-Jones and Senator Bob Carr (D-Dubuque), the chairs of the two chambers’ State Government Committees (Iowa Legislature 2018a; Weber 1986; Witosky 1986). Hammond described the committee as a friendly one (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). On the conference committee, besides Hammond and Lloyd-Jones, Carr, Senator Charles Bruner (D-Story) and Representative Rod N. Halvorson (D-Webster) were known supporters of gender balance (Hammond Nd, 1995). Bruner was a member of the Story County chapter of the Iowa Women’s Political Caucus (Iowa Legislature 2018c). Hannon named him as one of three supportive and friendly men in the state senate at the time (Hannon and Schenken 1991; Hannon 1995c). Carr was a member of the League of Women Voters (Iowa Legislature 2018c). Halvorson had been one of the three men State Government Committee members in 1985 to support Hammond’s gender balance amendment proposal (State 1985b).

The Conference Committee set to work (Iowa Legislature 1986g). Hammond (Nd, 1995:2) recalls that, with the bill in conference committee, “we found our opportunity to put gender balance in the Code.” The bill already discussed boards and commissions, even requiring gender balance for a few of them. Hammond said the bill “had a place where it would fit in there” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). The conference committee added a new section, “Gender Balance,” immediately following discussion of political party balance on boards and commissions, stating,

It is a policy of the state of Iowa that all boards, commissions, committees and councils shall reflect, as much as possible, a gender balance. If there are multiple appointing authorities for a board, commission, or council, they shall consult each other to avoid a violation of this section (Hammond Nd, 1995:2; Iowa Legislature 1986g:1536).

Lloyd-Jones saw the addition of the gender balance language as simply good policy and in
line with what the House State Government Committee had been doing in the past. Previously the State Government Committee had been attaching the “generic” or “usual” amendment to bills dealing with boards and commissions. In this case, according to Lloyd-Jones, “we attached it” to the reorganization bill (Lloyd-Jones 1986b). Furthermore, by attaching the generic amendment to the reorganization bill, “we put it on for everything” and therefore could “save a lot of time” (J. Lloyd-Jones, PC, 2018). Hammond also felt it was a strategic and opportune way to get gender balance passed. Hammond noted that “the bill was so large that no one would read through all of that material and the governor would not veto the bill because he wanted most of the measures in it” (Hammond Nd, 1995:2).

The “as much as possible” language in the gender balance provision had a few purposes. Boards and commissions with an odd number of members could not contain perfect gender balance between men and women. The language was also intended to be used for committees that reflected pools of potential members that were heavily dominated by one gender or another. The policy was written with some flexibility with deference to professional licensing boards that were man or woman dominated, so that, for example, man nurses and woman engineers did not have to disproportionately serve on their respective boards (Hammond Nd, 1995). Hammond said, “We were trying to be reasonable, so that you didn’t have all the male nurses in the state having to be on the boards all the time” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). Doderer noted that, “We later discovered we’d written it weakly, at the governor’s request. He was reluctant to cover every board ‘just in case.’ We had put ‘if possible’” (Schenken 1991c:21).

After negotiating for over three weeks, on April 17 the conference committee issued their 190 page report / compromise amendment (Gruhn 1986a; Iowa Legislature 1986g). The legislative session was supposed to end on April 22, but the legislature had yet to pass a budget or tackle a number of important and timely policy issues (Gruhn 1986a, 1986g). With no amendments allowed,
both chambers voted on the report and approved the final state reorganization bill. It was
subsequently signed by the governor (Iowa Legislature 1986g).

The final state reorganization proposal was over 500 pages, the longest bill in Iowa history.
It was also the largest government reorganization Iowa had ever attempted, reducing Iowa’s 68 state
departments to 20 and substantially consolidating gubernatorial power (Hannon 1986c; Weber 1986;
Witosky 1986). Hammond is not sure how many legislators knew gender balance was in the final
reorganization bill when the final vote occurred, comparing the bill to “those tax bills that Congress
passes that they don’t know what’s in there” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). The ICSW and the
Legislative Service Bureau included gender balance in their summary of reorganization (ICSW
1986b; Iowa Legislature 1986g).

Senate Passes Gender Balance for Judicial Nominating Commission, Encompassing Appointed and Elected Positions
While state reorganization was an encompassing project for the legislature in 1986, there was also
substantive attention to judges, in particular their lack of gender diversity and their political leanings.
Representative Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) led a big push from 1986 to 1987 on women’s
underrepresentation in the judiciary. Iowa’s process for selecting judges involves state and district
nominating commissions that nominate potential judges for the governor to appoint. These
commissions have members appointed by the governor and members elected by attorneys (Davis
2018; Iowa Legislature 1983; Riggs 1963; State 2010a). While Iowa had a law requiring political party
balance on most state boards and commissions, judicial nominating commissions were exempt;
Democratic legislators interpreted this allegedly merit-based system meant to keep politics out of the
court system as enabling partisan and ideological appointments. In January 1986, Senator Bob Carr
(D-Dubuque) proposed a constitutional amendment to remove the ban on considering political
party for judicial nominating commissions so that they could also be party balanced (Brewer et al.
Meanwhile, there was also attention to gender in the judiciary. Iowa had never had a woman Supreme Court justice. The most high status applicant for an opening was a woman, and she was passed over (Associated 1985, 1986b; Santiago 1986b). The Des Moines Register ran stories on the issue, including sharing her and other women judges’ perspectives on how the justice system was “like a good-old-boy network” (Flansburg and Overboiser 1986b; Hannon 1986h; Iowa Organization 2012; Laird 1986; Licht 2011; Mitchell 2015; Norman 1986b; Santiago 1986b:6A).

Representative Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson), along with Representatives Johnie Hammond (D-Story), Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson), and in total 45 sponsors, filed an amendment that would add “and gender” to where the constitution read “Due consideration shall be given to area representation” (Iowa 1986; Iowa Legislature 1986h; IWPC 1986). The constitutional amendment passed overwhelmingly (State 1986). As a constitutional amendment, the measure needed to be passed again in 1987 or 1988 and then put to the voters. The Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) labeled this initiative a priority issue (ICSW 1986b).

The Iowa Supreme Court opposed the measure, and under Chief Justice W. Ward Reynolds (who was Republican) engaged in an active political advocacy campaign on the basis that they wanted to ensure they were continued to be removed from politics (Daubenmier 1986; Reynolds 1986b; Tribune’s 1971). On the partisan front, the court offered to work on training commissioners to make merit-based nominations and asked the legislature for funding for an educational program (Reynolds 1986b).

Additionally, in trying to kill the amendment, and possibly to push back against the negative publicity Iowa was getting in the news about women in the judiciary as well as low national rankings on the issue, the Supreme Court, led by its chief justice, tried to position themselves as supportive of women’s rights and decouple the issues of gender balance and political party balance. Reynolds
also made sure to defensively go out of his way to make clear that the Supreme Court’s opposition to the constitutional amendment was not because they were anti-women’s rights (Supreme 1986). To win over women legislators and the Iowa Organization of Women Attorneys (IOWA), the Supreme Court made their own changes to increase women’s representation and offered their own idea that, in lieu of pursuing a constitutional amendment, the legislature could pass a statute gender balancing judicial nominating commissions, since the constitution did not prohibit this (Reynoldson 1986b; Supreme 1986). Reynoldson gave his support for “fair representation of men and women on all nominating commissions… to provide women fair input into the judicial selection process without weakening the exemplary system of judge selection embedded in our Iowa Constitution” (Reynoldson 1986b:1). As part of this campaign, the Supreme Court fostered (and took credit for) getting the Iowa State Bar Association and Iowa Judges Association on board with their position regarding considering gender but not political party for the commissions (Reynoldson 1986a).

Almost a week after IOWA sent a letter to the Supreme Court that their board would reconsider their support of the constitutional amendment, Reynoldson wrote back announcing upcoming internal rule changes and stating,

We have at all times supported the concept of gender balancing on the judicial nominating commissions where it has not been linked, directly or indirectly, to the politicization of the nominating process…. We hope that your organization does reverse its position on S.J.R. 2002 following the August meeting, and that we have the opportunity to work together to secure legislation that will ensure gender balancing on the judicial nominating commissions (Reynoldson 1986a).

The Supreme Court then issued its own rules, reflecting the 1986 gender balance law that had been signed a month prior, stating,

‘It is a policy of the judicial branch that all boards, commissions, and committees to which appointments are made or confirmed by any part of the judicial branch shall reflect, as much as possible, a gender balance.’ The rule further declares that where there are multiple appointing authorities, consultation should occur to comply with the state gender balance policy (Iowa Legislature 1986g; Shiamanek 1986).
The Supreme Court’s endorsement of gender balance created a difficult path for stopping gender balance on judiciary nominating commissions, lent credence to the issue, and helped frame the issue as being about fairness and good governance rather than about feminism and quotas. Along with the Iowa Judges Association’s endorsement of gender balance, it also implied that gender balance is a constitutionally sound measure.

Women legislators ultimately decided to focus their 1987 judicial efforts on gender balance instead of the constitutional amendment. The ICSW endorsed this effort as part of their legislative program (Daubenmeier 1986; Doderer 1986b; Hannon 1986i; ICSW 1987c; State 1987c; Wilson and Huppert 1987). Senator Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson), who switched from the House to the Senate following the 1986 elections, introduced legislation to gender balance state and district judicial nominating commissions, including the elected appointees, with no room for exceptions (Iowa Legislature 1987c; Schenken 1992b; State 1987c). Senate File (SF) 148 was assigned to the State Government Committee, with a subcommittee of Senators Charles Bruner (D-Story) as chair (who had supported gender balance on the state reorganization conference committee and was overall a gender balance supporter), Julia Gentleman (R-Polk) (Women’s Legislative Caucus member), and Mike Gronstal (D-Pottawattamie) (who would be Senate Majority Leader during the 2009 legislation) (Norman 1987h; State 1987c; Wilson 1987a). On March 2, the State Government Committee voted SF 148 out of committee 13-1-1, and then passed it on the floor 42-5-3 (Iowa Legislature 1987c; IWPC 1987c; Spencer 1989c; State 1987c). A House study bill version passed out of committee 20-0 (Huppert 1987a; Iowa Legislature 1987a; State 1987a).

**Governor Branstad’s Gender Imbalanced Board of Regents Appointments**

Governor Terry Branstad (R) chose to interpret the “as much as possible” language to mean gender balance was a goal (one of many) and not a requirement. The Iowa Board of Regents had six men
and three women on it. With two women and one man’s terms expiring, gender balance would have required all three appointments go to women (Hammond Nd, 1995; Norman 1987d; State 1987c). Branstad chose to appoint two men and one woman to the board, including Marvin Pomerantz, “a top GOP fund-raiser” and the governor’s 1986 re-election campaign chief political fundraiser who had long wanted to be on the Board of Regents (Lantor 1987; Norman 1987d:A2; Norman and Petroski 1987). Democrats interpreted this as Branstad willfully ignoring the gender balance law (Norman 1987d; Norman and Petroski 1987).

Branstad’s press secretary, Dick Vohs, iterated that Branstad had made the nominations he did because he wanted to appoint people of “extremely high stature and credibility, and it’s difficult to find anybody of the stature of Marvin Pomerantz or John Fitzgibbon, and we are lucky they’re willing to serve.” Vohs was asked “if that meant no women met those qualifications.” He responded, “Can you name one?” Asked again, he elaborated, “Can you name one that can exceed the qualifications of, say, a Marv Pomerantz?” (Norman 1987d:1). Continuing, Vohs stated, “I don’t think that there is anyone out there, man or woman, who would be as qualified as those two.” Vohs said that while Branstad took the gender balance law into account, it “should be followed when ‘you can find the best appointee and keep a gender balance’” (Norman 1987d:A2).

Branstad, also asked whether no women met the qualifications, responded,

It means there weren’t any men more qualified than Mary Williams and there weren’t any women more qualified than John Fitzgibbon and Marvin Pomerantz. In my judgment, they were the best people for the job…. I always try to appoint the best person to the job whether they are men or women… In this particular case, the three people I picked happen to be one woman and two men (Norman 1987d:1).

The Des Moines Register responded with the headline, “Governor’s aide sees few women qualified to serve as regents,” on the front cover, above the fold, with two articles on appointments under it (Norman 1987d; Norman and Fogarty 1987). The next day, March 25, the article “Branstad under fire on regents appointments” was on the top of the second page where the paper had their
State Capitol Report (Norman and Petroski 1987). That same day, the paper published an editorial “No qualified women?...,” which accused Branstad of ignoring the gender balance law (Flansburg and Doak 1987c). The editorial opined, “Caught flatfooted by having the mistake called to public attention, Branstad’s press aide Richard Vohs blundered into questioning whether there are any women as qualified as the two men appointees.” The bottom half of the editorial was then titled, “…How about these?,” responding to Vohs’ question to the press at the press conference, “Can you name one?” with a list of over 100 well-qualified women (Flansburg and Doak 1987c).

The next day, the Des Moines Register’s editorial page continued the list with another 90 names (Flansburg and Doak 1987b). The next day the paper again had an article on the issue, “Branstad’s appointment of men questioned again,” appearing on the top of the second page where the paper had their State Capitol Report (Norman 1987b). That day, the paper printed another list on their editorial page, with over 80 more names (Flansburg and Doak 1987a). Half a week later, after the paper had obtained the list of Board of Regents applicants, another article was published in the paper, “52 men, 28 women were on list of candidates for regent positions,” again appearing on the top of the second page where the paper had their State Capitol Report. The news article contained the list of those 28 women, sharing biographical details for the four most well-known (Petroski 1987).

Another article on the matter also appeared that same day on the bottom of the front page of the paper, in which Republican Representative Raymond Lageschulte (R-Bremer)’s wife, Virginia Lageschulte, shared she had been told by the governor’s aide who coordinates appointments that she could not serve on the Iowa Commission on Elder Affairs at this time because of the gender balance law. She was told the commission already had four women members and the two who were expiring were both men, so the appointments had to be men (Norman 1987g, 1987i).

After the Senate received Branstad’s 150 additional appointments for consideration, gender balance as an issue only intensified (Davidson 1987; Hannon 1987b). Senate Majority Leader Bill
“Hutch” Hutchins (D-Audubon) felt the governor was in the wrong but that the appointments and gender balance issue were “taking up too much of our time.” He wanted to be able to move past it (Norman 1987f). Branstad claimed his lawyers told him that the gender balance provision “is not mandatory” (Hannon 1987b; Norman 1987i). The 30 Senate Democrats discussed the issue in caucus, which included two Democratic women senators (double from the year prior). Despite some objections, they decided to compromise with the governor—allow his current appointments, but move toward full gender balance going forward (Norman 1987f).

Representatives Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson), Dottie Carpenter (R-Polk), and Johnie Hammond (D-Story) went to the attorney general on the matter, but they were told the law was too vague to rule that the governor had broken the law (Hammond Nd, 1995). All the gender imbalanced appointments were confirmed by the Senate, with three to eight senators voting no. The no votes consistently included Bev Hannon (D-Jones) as well as Charles Bruner (D-Story), who had been on the reorganization conference committee, and Mike Gronstal (D-Pottawattamie), who was Senate Majority leader in 2009 (State 1987c; State 2017).

Requiring Gender Balance, 1987 and 1988

After passing the senate, the gender balance bill for judicial nominating commissions (Senate File 148) was assigned to the House State Government Committee, with a subcommittee of Representatives Eugene Blanshan (D-Greene), Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson), and Donald Shoning (R-Woodbury) (Huppert 1987c; State 1987a). Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story), Doderer, and others proposed amending SF148 to also address the gender balance law that the governor was disregarding by removing its “as much as possible” language, making gender balance an “inflexible” requirement (Hammond Nd, 1995:3; Iowa Legislature 1987c; IWPC 1987c; J. Hammond, PC, 2018; Schenken 1991c; Spencer 1989c).
The State Government Committee adopted the amendment. Blanshan, committee chair, offered the amendment forward to the House, and it was adopted. The bill as amended then passed the House 94-3-3 (Iowa Legislature 1987c; State 1987a). The Senate then further amended the bill to specify that anyone currently serving on a board or commission could complete their term and passed the bill again, 44-0-6 (Iowa Legislature 1987c, Spencer 1989c; State 1987c). On May 1, Senate Majority Leader Bill “Hutch” Hutchins (D-Audubon), a yes vote, filed a motioned to reconsider SF 148, but on May 4 he withdrew his motion (State 1987c, 1987d). The House threatened to block Senate legislation if the Senate did not approve the legislation (Hannon 1987-1994).

The legislation encountered some opposition. The Cedar Rapids Gazette published an editorial against the bill, nurses opposed it, concerned with finding qualified men, and some Republicans “put [up] a fairly spirited fight against it” (Gazette 1987; J. Lloyd-Jones, PC, 2018; M. Gronstal, PC, 2018). However, some Republicans advocated strongly for the legislation, including Women’s Legislative Caucus members and especially some of the younger men (J. Lloyd-Jones, PC, 2018). Opponents did not want to “be too strident in their position, so they would express some reservations that, *Gee, I don’t know how many qualified people—qualified engineers are there*” (M. Gronstal, PC, 2018).

The House voted in support of the amended legislation 83-14-3. The 14 no votes were all Republican representatives, but there were 42 Republicans in the House in total (State 1987b). Governor Branstad expressed his dislike for the bill but signed it into law anyway (Associated 1987; IWPC 1987c; Iowa Legislature 1987c; J. Hammond, PC, 2018; Spencer 1989c).

Also in 1987, the Legislative Council received nominees for the Education Uplink Study Committee that consisted of six men and zero women. The committee already consisted of 14 men and only one woman. Representative Dottie Carpenter (R-Polk) proposed that the council not confirm the nominees and instead ask for women to be appointed. That June, a revised slate of
nominees included four women and two men, which would still leave over three men for every woman on the committee. The Legislative Council decided to confirm the nominees, but they also unanimously adopted a policy that going forward Study Committees’ public membership would be required to be gender balanced (Hannon 1987b; Peeters and Johnson 1987a, 1987b; Perrin 1987).

The 1987 gender balance law required that no gender make up greater than one-half the membership plus one. While this meant boards and commissions with an odd number of members approximated gender balance, it allowed those with an even number to remain gender imbalanced (e.g. a six member board could have four men and two women). In 1988, the House State Government Committee amended a bill focused on updating the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women to specify that even numbered boards could not be more than half one gender (Durden 2003; Hammond Nd, 1995; Hannon 1987c, 1987e, 1998a; Iowa legislature 1988a; Spencer 1987; State 1988a; Quinn 1988). The House adopted the amendment and then voted for the bill 95-0-5. The Senate voted 36-8 for the amendment and then 44-1-5 for the bill as amended (State 1988b).

Iowa’s state gender balance law is being implemented judiciously. Whoever is governor has a designated staff person who coordinates board and commission appointments and ensures all legal requirements, including gender balance, are met for these appointments (Bullard 1988; D. Bystrom, PC, 2018; D. Heaton, PC, 2018; Fogarty 1988; Hammond Nd, 1995; L. Miller, PC, 2018; M. Mascher, PC, 2018a; Nelson 1993c; R. Scott, PC, 2018a). A cursory look at Iowa’s boards and commissions listings in March 2019 suggests the state is in compliance with the law. Iowa has a state website directory with records of board and commission members; members’ genders are included with each record (Office-Governor 2019).
A Proceeding Push Across the States: Kappie Spencer’s National Gender Balance Project

In February 1988, American Association of University Women (AAUW) National Legislative Chair Kappie Spencer, who had moved from Iowa to Florida in 1984, read about what Iowa had done and found it exciting and important (Spencer 2004). Spencer led a national campaign called the National Gender Balance Project to get other states and localities around the country to adopt gender balance. National women’s organizations like the Fund for a Feminist Majority, National Association of Commissions for Women (NACW), National Women’s Political Caucus (NWPC), National Organization for Women (NOW), and the Women’s Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) adopted gender balance as a best practice law and encouraged its adoption elsewhere (Damon 1990; Downie 1988; Fund 1988, 1989/1990; Iowa Division 1989; J. Hammond, PC, 2018; Petroski 1990; Schenken 1991c; Spencer 1989c, 1991c, 1997, 1999b, 2004; Quinn 1988).

The National Gender Balance Project produced a flurry of activity across the country. By 1989, 13 states had introduced gender balance legislation. That year Montana and North Dakota passed legislation, with Montana’s resolution “urging” gender balance “to the greatest extent possible,” and North Dakota’s legislation, which initially had the same language as Iowa, passing after being amended to read that there “should” be gender balance and that “professional boards should strive to meet the gender balance of the profession” (Spencer 1989c). By the time Iowa’s 2009 bill was considered, half of the U.S. states had introduced some kind of gender balance resolution or legislation, with most activity occurring in the 1990s.


Successful gender balance laws were, nevertheless, qualitatively different from Iowa’s gender balance law. Other states’ gender balance laws and resolutions lacked an outright requirement or contained language around exceptions for feasibility, merits, balancing gender balance with other criteria, etc. Some resolutions or legislation were drafted as a goal statement or written to urge, encourage, strive for, or require consideration of gender balance. The one other law that had an outright requirement was Tennessee’s 1994 law, but it was limited in scope and was timebound. The Tennessee law required the current and following governor to make alternating man/woman appointments to their higher education governing boards until they reached gender balance (Associated 1990b, 1991a, 1991b, 1993, 1994a, 1994b; Carrie 2013b; Commission 2015; Daugherty 1994a, 1994b; Denny 1989; Florida 1994; Franklin 2007; Fund 1989/1990; General 1999a, 1999b; Hanson 1994; Hardy-Fanta and Kelly 2007; Henry 1977; Herald-Tribune 1994; Jaquet 2015; Lam 1993; Lavelle 1990; Levin and Thaler 2017; Montague 1997; Moxon 1992, 1994; Oregon 1997; Raine
EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY, AGAINST THE GRAIN: GENDER BALANCE ON LOCAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Following the state gender balance law, women’s rights advocates in Iowa attempted unsuccessfully to extend Iowa’s gender balance requirement for state boards and commissions to local jurisdictions, on which women remained underrepresented and gender typed (A. Abdul-Samad, PC, 2018; Fry 1983; Roos 1991). There was less support for state-imposed local gender balance compared to state gender balance because “it wasn’t popular to tell local government what they should do” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). There were multiple period attempts between 1991 and 2006, some of which included racial representation requirements. None of these attempts were successful.

With the 2006 election, Democrats came into power. Iowa Democrats of the late 2000s were more universally committed to gender egalitarianism than they had been when they had last controlled the legislature during the 1991-1992 session. From 2007 through 2010, Iowa legislators enacted a myriad of legislation aimed at improving social equality. In 2009, during a period in which affirmative action policies and programs were being pushed back against and dismantled across the country, Iowa Commission on the Status of Women E.D. Rachel Scott and Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) led a concerted, strategic, and successful legislative campaign to extend Iowa’s gender balance law to include political subdivisions’ boards and commissions. Iowa thereafter witnessed a political turn to the right and consequentially a weakened Commission on the Status of Women. Nevertheless, overall Iowa’s gender balance law has broad buy-in as being good public
policy, even among some of its 2009 detractors. Local jurisdictions’ implementation of the gender balance law has been uneven but altogether positive. Since the law’s passage, women’s rights advocates have engaged in continuing efforts to support the law’s implementation.

Local Gender Balance: The Usual Amendment, Local Action

Unsuccessful Legislation
Periodic attempts to pass legislation extending the state board and commission gender balance law to include local jurisdictions began in 1991. The 1991 legislation was closest to passage; no other bills passed either chamber. Table Three below summarizes local gender balance legislation introduced prior to 2009.
### Table Three. Local Gender Balance Legislation, 1991-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Covered Demographics</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | | | | **House Speaker Bob Arnoul (D-Scott) was gender balance supporter.**
|      | | | | **Senate Majority Leader Bill "Hutch" Hutchins (D-Audubon) had mixed record on women's rights issues.**
|      | | | | **Senate Minority Leader Jack Rife (R-Cedar) is anti-women's rights/gender balance.**
| 1991 | Rep. Tom Baker (D-Folk) | Gender and race | • House voted 41-47 against amending to "to the extent possible".
|      | | | • House voted 51-47-2 to unseat amendment by rural jurisdictions
|      | | | (5 Dem no votes, 7 GOP yes votes).
|      | | | • House voted 58-39-3 to adopt bill as amended
|      | | | (2 Dem no votes; 6 GOP yes votes).
|      | | | • Senate Local Gov. Cmte voted 7-3.
|      | | | • No Senate floor vote.
| 1993 | Reps. Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson), Johnie Hammond (D-Story), Mary Neuhauser (D-Johnson), Dotte Carpenter (R-Polk), Bill Bernau (D-Story), Janet Metcalfe (R-Polk), Bob Dorsky (D-Johnson), Bill Brand (D-Benton), Philip Brammer (D-Union) | Gender | Assigned to Local Gov. Cmte | Last year gender balance bill had a Republican co-sponsor.
| 1997 | Reps. Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson), Pam Joehn (D-Dubuque) | Gender | Assigned to State Gov. Cmte | Introduced late in session.
| 1998 | Rep. Wayne Ford (D-Polk) | Gender and race | Assigned to Local Gov. Cmte, no subcommittee assigned | |
| 1999 | Rep. Wayne Ford (D-Polk) | Gender and race | Assigned to Local Gov. Cmte | |
| 2006 | Reps. Pam Joehn (D-Dubuque), Mary Mascher (D-Johnson), Cindy Winkler (D-Scott), Beth Wessel-Koensch (D-Story), Vicki Lenning (D-Johnson) | Gender | Assigned to State Gov. Cmte, no subcommittee assigned | Bloc of five progressive women introduced nine other bills together in 2006; all involved in 2009 legislation as well.

A Democratic Sweep: Elections and Partisan Control

The Iowa House had a Democratic majority in 1991 and 1992, which was when local gender balance legislation had been able to pass through the chamber (House File 469 in 1991). However, the 1991 bill had been blocked in the Senate by old guard Democrats. With growing partisanship over women’s rights issues, gender balance was challenged to proceed between 1993 and 2006. The House was Republican controlled from 1993 through 2006, thwarting passage of attempts to extend gender balance to local jurisdictions. The Senate had a Democratic majority in 1991 through 1996 and shared representation and leadership between Democrats and Republicans in 2005 and 2006.

In the 2006 midterm elections, as part of a national Democratic tide, Democrats gained control of both the Iowa House and Senate. Chet Culver, a Democrat, was elected governor (C. Larimer, PC, 2018; Divided 2017; List 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018a; State 2017). This was the first time Democrats had control of the House, Senate, and governor’s office in Iowa in 42 years (the 1965-1966 session) (C. Larimer, PC, 2018; Iowa Legislature 2018c; List 2018). The Iowa legislature in 2009 began with 32 Democrats and 18 Republicans in the Senate, and 56 Democrats and 44 Republicans in the House (State 2017). Democratic legislators spoke of this time as characterized by “a very progressive mood” and resulting in “an amazing change in Iowa” with a flurry of progressive activity enacted that “really did move Iowa forward” (C. Winckler, PC, 2018; D. Kelley, PC, 2018; D. Olson, PC, 2018; Gearino 2007a; P. Murphy, PC, 2018; R. Thomas, PC, 2018; S. Sodders, PC, 2018a). Many legislators and stakeholders felt that Democratic control also enabled gender balance to have enough votes and support to pass (A. Abdul-Samad, PC, 2018; D. Bystrom, PC, 2018; D. Olson, PC, 2018; E. Gayman, PC, 2018; J. Danielson, PC, 2018; P. Jochum, PC, 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018a; S. Sodders, PC, 2018a; R. Thomas, PC, 2018).
Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) Proposes Local Gender Balance Study Bill

The ICSW had supported local gender balance on their legislative agenda since the initial 1991 bill, but it was one item out of over 100 (Beam 1991; Burt 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000; Christensen 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996; Friends 2006a, 2007a; ICSW 1992, 1993b, 1995a, 2001a; 2002a, 2006; Painter 2004, 2005; SchraderBachar 2005, 2006). After Governor Chet Culver (D) appointed Rachel Scott to be ICSW E.D. in August 2007, Scott led the ICSW through a strategic planning and reorientation process to focus more on “advocacy” and less on “programs and services,” and to pare down their legislative proposals to help them strategically focus their resources. The ICSW went from their 2007 list of six priorities and over 150 proposals for administrative rules, state laws, and local items to a 2008 list of 13 priorities and nothing additional (C. Winckler, PC, 2018; Friends 2007a, 2007c, 2007d, 2008b, 2008c; ICSW 2008, 2009a; J. Olsen, PC, 2018; Reed 2009; R. Scott, PC, 2018a, 2018c, 2018d).

Local gender balance was one of the ICSW’s 13 priorities in 2008 (Friends 2008b). The ICSW tracked their priorities; a newsletter tracking the gender balance bill shared the end outcome for the priority—“NO BILLS INTRODUCED” [capitalization in original] (Friends 2008c). For 2009, the ICSW selected four policy priorities, with local gender balance among them (Friends 2008a; ICSW 2009a, 2009b, 2009d; R. Scott, PC, 2018a). Scott was initially reluctant to include local gender balance as a top priority (R. Scott, PC, 2018a, 2018c). However, ICSW commissioners were passionate about the issue and convinced her it was important—to improve women’s representation, seek gender parity, and accomplish something tangible and impactful (Friends 2008d; J. Olsen, PC, 2018; L. SchraderBachar, PC, 2018; P. Peters, PC, 2018b; R. Scott, PC, 2018a, 2018c). Scott ended up persuaded that local gender balance was worth pursuing, namely due to the pipeline idea. She recalls, “The Commission convinced me... we’re building the bench for women to run for office if we do this” (R. Scott, PC, 2018a). Scott still had concerns about it because she was not sure
how to go about persuading legislators on the issue (R. Scott, PC, 2018a). She thought it was too hard and would never happen (R. Scott, PC, 2018c).

On December 1, 2008, the Status of Women Division of the Iowa Department of Human Rights issued a bill request for House Study Bill (HSB) 12 and Senate Study Bill (SSB) 1050 to extend the state gender balance law to local jurisdictions (Iowa Legislature 2008a). HSB 12 and SSB 1050 added a clause to state code extending the gender balance requirement for all appointive boards, commissions, committees, and councils of the state to also apply to political subdivisions of the state (Iowa Legislature 2010a). A study bill is an idea that gets drafted as preliminary legislation for committee consideration. The governor, state agencies, and legislators can request study bills. If a committee approves a study bill, it becomes a legislative bill (renamed as a house or senate file) and can proceed to floor debate (Iowa Legislative 2014). Scott submitted a request for house and senate study bills for equal pay legislation at the same time (Iowa Legislature 2008a).

Regardless of party control or whether there are enough votes for various legislation, the legislature addresses a multitude of policy issues each year. In order for gender balance to pass in 2009, it had to be proposed and prioritized. The most recent introduced bill on gender balance was in 2006, when Republicans were in control. Democrats were in control in 2007 and 2008, but as the ICSW noted in 2008, no bill was introduced. Representative Pam Jochum (D-Dubuque), who sponsored the 2006 local gender balance legislation, attributed there being a bill in 2009 to the ICSW. “It came from them,” she said. “The Commission on the Status of Women had pushed several years to try to get us to address boards and commissions at the local level” (P. Jochum, PC, 2018). Representative Beth Wessel-Kroeschell (D-Story) also commented that gender balance was able to pass in part because the ICSW board “came up with what they wanted, they had [specific] policy recommendations” (B. Wessel-Kroeschell, PC, 2018). The ICSW’s decision to prioritize and advocate for gender balance legislation as a top priority in 2009 was a crucial factor in the bill being
considered in 2009. Given that Republicans took control again in the 2010 elections and remain in control presently, if there had not been a bill in 2009 or 2010, it is unlikely local gender balance legislation would have become law. The ICSW’s role in deciding to have a narrower agenda that included gender balance as a key item they advocated for was thus essential for its passage in 2009.

Local Gender Balance Passes, 2009

Democratic leadership in 2009 [House Speaker Pat Murphy (D-Dubuque) and Senate Majority Leader Mike Gronstal (D-Pottawattamie)] were supportive of gender balance. They therefore assigned the study bills to their respective State Government Committees (rather than the Local Government Committees), which were friendlier bodies for the legislation. Both had chairs who were passionate about supporting the legislation (M. Gronstal, PC, 2018; M. Mascher, PC, 2018b; P. Murphy, PC, 2018; S. Dandekar, PC, 2018; W. Horn, PC, 2018). Senate State Government Committee chair Staci Appel (D-Warren) assigned Steve Sodders (D-Marshall) as subcommittee chair and Pam Jochum (D-Dubuque) and Randy Feenstra (R-Hull) as subcommittee members (Iowa Legislature 2018a, State 2009b). House State Government Committee chair Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) assigned herself as chairperson of the subcommittee and appointed Vicki Lensing (D-Johnson) and Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton) as subcommittee members (Iowa Legislature 2009c, 2010a, 2018a).

The Iowa State Association of Counties (ISAC), Iowa League of Cities, and the Iowa State Association of County Supervisors were against the legislation (Iowa Legislature 2019c). They tried to stop the bill, including by volunteering to work as an organization to increase women’s representation on local boards and commissions as an alternative to the legislation. When that did not work, they tried to push for amendments like making the bill a recommendation rather than a requirement, changing the requirement from each individual board or commission being gender
balanced to jurisdictions needing overall gender balance (an equal number of men and women in the jurisdiction serving on boards and commissions, regardless of which boards or commissions they served on), exempting specialized boards, and exempting rural jurisdictions (A. Kemp, PC, 2018, B. Peterson, PC, 2018; H. De Groot, PC, 2018; J. Hyland, PC, 2018; M. Wentzien, PC, 2018a).

Concerns about rural jurisdictions and specialized fields were a sticking point, including among Democrats (C. Isenhart, PC, 2018). Initially proponents were willing to compromise by having the gender balance requirement exclude licensing and technical boards and commissions. These were not viewed as the primary pathway to future political office and were not viewed as the more important primary power boards that advocates wanted women to have access to (Iowa Legislature 2010a; R. Scott, PC, 2018a).

Regardless of supporters’ feelings about rural jurisdictions and their capabilities to gender balance their boards and commissions, Mascher was also initially open to including a population-based exemption for the law, which some prior bills had also included (R. Scott, PC, 2018c).

While Mascher initially proposed an amendment to create a population-based exemption and a technical/professional board exemption, Republicans on the House State Government committee objected to the exemption of more rural communities (Iowa Legislature 2010a; J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018a, 2018c). Representative Chris Rants (R-Woodbury), who as of 2009 had two daughters and no sons, said “where women live shouldn’t determine how they are treated. ‘Why on earth in this bill do we create exemptions for some communities? I think that’s wrong’” (Eby 2009a; Iowa Legislature 2018c). Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) E.D. Rachel Scott remembered a committee member saying, “I can’t explain to my daughter why, because we live in a small community, she wouldn’t have the same opportunities as she would somewhere else” (R. Scott, PC, 2018c). Representatives Rants and Scott Raecker (R-Polk) filed an amendment to unexempt rural jurisdictions (Iowa Legislature 2010a).
This resurfaced legislator concerns about rural jurisdictions (J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018a, 2018c). Representative Doris Kelley (D-Black Hawk) said she was strongly for gender equity and gender balance, but that she held off on supporting the legislation until her sole concern was addressed, which was that “in the rural area, women are not near as strong. They’re not looking for boards. They’re busy farming or they’re busy at home. They’re not as aggressive or progressive as the women in urban areas. And so I was really kind of concerned about some of those smaller communities” (D. Kelley, PC, 2018). Kelley was one of seven representatives collectively called the Six Pack (Bawn et al. 2017; D. Kelley, PC, 2018; E. Gayman, PC, 2018; Hinton, Bonnett, and De Groot 2009). These more conservative Democrats had enough votes together to dip Democrats’ voting power to below 50%, so Democrats had to heed them (D. Kelley, PC, 2018; E. Gayman, PC, 2018; Iowa Legislature 2018c). Simultaneously, local government organizations were still connecting local government officials to legislators to share their concerns about the legislation, making some Democrats nervous about the bill (Belin 2009a; D. Struyk, PC, 2018; M. Gronstal, PC, 2018; M. Wentzien, PC, 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018a).

Through discussions among legislators and local government organizations, a compromise was crafted and amendments filed to have the local gender balance law apply to all local boards and commissions required by the state in all counties, municipalities, and school districts, but to add some flexibility in case gender balance proved difficult in more rural areas or for the more technical boards (or for those who did not believe it was difficult, to appease and gain support from those who did). This flexibility took the form of requiring political subdivisions to make a good faith effort for three months to make an appointment that would meet gender balance, but that if, after three months, the appointing body could not find someone qualified of the appropriate gender, they could appoint someone regardless of whether or not it maintained gender imbalance (A. Kemp, PC, 2018; D. Struyk, PC, 2018; Iowa Legislature 2010a; J. Hyland, PC, 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018b, 2018c; V.
Lensing, PC, 2018).

On February 5, the House State Government Committee voted to amend the local gender balance bill to include the good faith effort. The committee then voted the amended bill out of committee with a vote of 20-1; Pettengill was the sole no vote (Iowa Legislature 2009d; M. Dolan, PC, 2018). Pettengill was the only rural Republican legislator on the committee who had previously served in local elected office—Pettengill had previously served as a city council member and mayor for Mount Auburn, a small town of less than 200 people (Eathington 2011; Iowa Legislature 2018c; P. Murphy, PC, 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018c). Pettengill also had an antagonistic relationship with almost all the House Democrats. She had first been elected to the legislature in 2004 as a Democrat. The Democratic party and labor unions had invested heavily in her initial campaign and 2006 re-election campaign. However, at the end of the 2007 session, in the midst of some contentious issues regarding labor, Pettengill switched parties, calling out Democrats as being too liberal. In general in 2009, most Democrats did not work with Pettengill on crafting legislation and would not consider amendments to legislation proposed by her (B. Wessel-Kroeschell, PC, 2018; J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018; J. Laue, PC, 2018; Newspapers 2018; P. Murphy, PC, 2018).

Both ISAC and the League had supported the ”good faith effort” amendment, with the League’s Government Affairs Counsel Jessica Harder taking the lead on it and working “very hard” for it (H. De Groot, PC, 2018; J. Hyland, PC, 2018). Two days after the committee adopted it, the League of Cities lobbyists re-registered on Senate Study Bill 1050, changing their registration from opposed to undecided (Iowa Legislature 2019c). ISAC remained officially opposed to the bill, since the bill still went against local control, and because the county supervisors association still opposed it (B. Peterson, PC, 2018; H. De Groot, PC, 2018; Iowa Legislature 2019c; M. Wentzien, PC, 2018a). However, their opposition softened and they deprioritized advocacy against it (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018a).
The House local gender balance bill, now House File (HF) 243, had been on the House agenda, but was removed from it, presumably because it did not have enough support among House Democrats. It was put back on the agenda after a friendly amendment was filed by Representative Geri Huser (D-Polk), co-sponsored by Mascher, to remove the reporting requirement from the bill (Iowa Legislature 2010a; State 2009a). Representative Elesha Gayman (D-Scott) said Huser “kind of always opposed…. more regulation” and “more anything” that seemed like it would “create more layers of bureaucracy” (E. Gayman, PC, 2018). Huser was also part of the Six Pack (E. Gayman, PC, 2018; Hinton, Bonnett, and De Groot 2009).

HF 243 came to the House floor on March 18, 2009. First an amendment that had been filed by Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama) was considered (State 2009a). Horbach believed the legislation was discriminatory (L. Horbach, PC, 2018). His amendment removed the gender balance requirement and replaced the entire bill with language about broadly seeking participation from the community and a requirement for a “fair and unbiased” appointment process in which appointments were made “on the basis of… qualifications and without bias or discrimination” (Iowa Legislature 2010a, 2009k; State 2009a). Mascher viewed the amendment as “an effort to sabotage what we were trying to do” (M. Mascher, PC, 2018a).

The amendment failed 44-54-2. All present Republican representatives voted in favor of the amendment. All present Democratic representatives voted against the amendment, with the exception of Dolores Mertz (D-Kossuth) (Iowa Legislature 20009k; State 2009a). Mertz was a former county supervisor from a rural area, a Six Pack member, and a more conservative Democrat who often crossed party lines (B. Sawyer, PC, 2018; B. Wessel-Kroeschell, PC, 2018; Clayworth 2009a; D. Olson, PC, 2018; E. Gayman, PC, 2018; Hannon 1995b; Hinton, Bonnett, and De Groot 2009; Iowa Legislature 2018c; J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018; Kossuth 2018; K. Paulsen, PC, 2018; L. Horbach, PC, 2018; M. Mascher, PC, 2018b; M. Wentzien, PC, 2018; P. Murphy, PC, 2018; R. Scott,
Next, Rants and Raecker’s amendment to unexempt rural jurisdictions was withdrawn, Huser’s amendment to remove the filing requirement was adopted, and then Mascher’s amendment to remove the small town and licensure/technical board exemptions was adopted.

After that, the legislature considered two amendments that Pettengill had filed (State 2009a). Pettengill felt that, even with the good faith effort, local gender balance was impractical and burdensome in rural communities because there were simply not enough interested qualified women to draw from in less populated areas. She felt that it was bad practice and bad governing to require local jurisdictions to wait three months without filling a board or commission position when they already knew they were not going to get anyone for gender balance (D. Pettengill, PC, 2018). The House first considered Pettengill’s amendment to replace the gender balance requirement with a requirement that political subdivisions make a good faith effort to achieve gender balance for their boards, commissions, committees, and councils. This amendment lost. The House next considered Pettengill’s amendment to reduce the time requirement for the good faith effort from three months to one month. This amendment lost 37 to 54 (State 2009a).

Finally, there was a vote on the bill as amended. The bill passed 71-27-2. Fifty-five yes votes came from Democrats. All present Democratic representatives voted in support of the bill. The Republicans split their vote, with 16 Republicans voting yes, 27 voting no, and one representative still absent. Pettengill and Horbach voted against the bill. Other than Pettengill, all members of the House State Government Committee voted for the bill. This accounted for eight of the 16 Republican votes for the bill (State 2009a).

The bill then moved to the Senate, where the Senate State Government Committee voted 11-3 to release the bill from committee. All Democrats voted for the bill. They were joined by one Republican, Senator Jim Seymour (R-Harrison). Subcommittee chair Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux)
recalls there being a “very, very fought and passionate discussion” (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018). Feenstra is part of the religious right and is a social conservative who believes in tradition and in extremely limited government (Applan and Democracy 2016; Dorman 2004; Feenstra 2018; Hoekstra 2015; Iowa KIWA 2015; Iowa Legislature 2009d, 2018c; R. Feenstra, PC, 2018; Republican 2018; Revolvy 2018; Weigel 2016; W. Horn, PC, 2018). He felt society had overcome rampant discrimination and the “vestiges of inequality” that remained could be handled “without creating laws.” Feenstra said he strongly favors having gender diversity on boards and commissions, but the idea of this being a requirement was “shocking” to him (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018).

One Democratic senator, Herman Quirmbach (D-Story), strongly opposed the bill. Quirmbach viewed the bill as a discriminatory quota that unnaturally reserved seats based on gender instead of only using merit for appointments (H. Quirmbach, PC, 2018; Quirmbach 2009). Quirmbach introduced a competing bill and channeled it through the Senate Local Government Committee he chaired, though it did not go further. His legislation required political subdivisions to have fair and open processes, recruit broadly, report on the gender makeup of their commissions, and not consider gender in making appointments (Iowa Legislature 2009o).

Despite getting delayed due to Quirmbach’s opposition, the gender balance bill eventually received a floor hearing. The bill passed 31-19. All Democratic senators voted for the legislation, with the exception of Quirmbach, who voted no. All Republican senators voted against the legislation (State 2009h). On May 26, 2009, Governor Chet Culver signed House File 243 into law (Iowa Legislature 2010a).

WOMEN'S REPRESENTATION ON LOCAL BOARDS

The gender balance law became effective in 2012. Because of the lack of an enforcement clause, local jurisdictions vary in their progress (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018; Hannagan and Larimer 2017;
The Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics at Iowa State University collects and reports data on local boards and commissions’ gender balance and gender distributions. Between 2009 and 2014, there was not much change on county Compensation Boards, with an increase from 24.0% women in 2009 to 27.7% women in 2014. However, women’s representation on county Adjustment Boards grew from 15.0% to 26.3%, over a 10% increase. Additionally, women’s representation on Planning Boards increased from 18.0% to 27.2% (Carrie 2019b; ICSW 2009f). While women remain underrepresented, there are at least 170 more women serving on county boards in 2018 than there were in 2014.

Most counties have not gender balanced all their boards. Still, the gender balance law has had an impact. The percentage of county boards that are gender balanced has also climbed from about half (49.5%) in 2014 to almost three-fifths (58.9%) in 2018, with about 50 county boards becoming gender balanced in 2018 that were not in 2014. In 2014, there were two counties with zero balanced boards, 11 counties with only one balanced board, and 50.1% of counties that had at least half their boards gender balanced. As of 2018, every county had at least one gender balanced board, only five counties had only one balanced board, and 74.0% of counties had at least half of their boards gender balanced (Carrie 2019b).

Most cities have not gender balanced all their boards. However, among the cities the Catt Center collects data on (county seats and the most populated city in each county, which often overlap), the number of cities that have gender balanced all their boards doubled between 2014 (17 cities) and 2018 (38 cities). In 2014, over one quarter (27.6%) of cities were either fully gender balanced or one board away from gender balance, and in 2018 over half (52.0%) of cities were either fully gender balanced or one board away. While almost two-thirds (65.1%) of cities have at least half of their boards gender balanced as of 2018, there are still 19 cities that seem to be ignoring the law, as they have zero gender balanced boards (Carrie 2019b). Women remain substantially
underrepresented on city airport boards (19.7%) and county veterans affairs boards (26.6%), but otherwise are at minimum 30% of the membership of each other type of board (Carrie 2019b).
CHAPTER THREE: THE DERADICALIZATION OF GENDER BALANCE

Rather than interest theory explaining how ideologies functioned in Iowa, the dominant conception of gender balance was that it was good public policy that promoted fairness and created opportunity. Gender balance was deradicalized through disembedding gender segregation, normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good governance.

INTEREST THEORY

One traditional and persisting theory about ideology, known as interest theory, is that the powerful define ideology (Geertz 1973). Interest theory’s historic roots trace back to Karl Marx’s writings on the production of consciousness, in which he argued that “the ruling class… regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age,” as well as Antonio Gramsci’s writings on ideological hegemony (Gamson 1992b; Komter 1989; Lukes 2005; Marx and Engels 1970:173). Most literature on “the cultural side of political consciousness” focuses on ideology and discourse from a critical perspective related to “the shaping of political consciousness as part of a process of class or elite domination” (Gamson 1992b:65). From this perspective, ideologies are negatively coercive; they cannot be benevolent, empowering, or justice-seeking (Adams 2001).

NeoMarxist and feminist literature on ideology and hegemony implicates ideologies as structurally constraining internalized belief systems that originate from power structures and serve to reproduce the powerful’s dominance (e.g. Collins 1993; Edelman 2001; Gaventa 1980; Gramsci 1971; Lukes 2005; Mumby 1989; Schneider and Ingram 1993, 2005; Young 1990). The powerful control and shape discourse and its interpretation (Young 1990; Zerubavel 2006). People internalize this power-shaped subjective reality that may or may not match their empirical reality (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Lukes 2005). If people experience conflicts about competing subjective realities,
the group that has more power usually gets to shape how people conceive their reality, shaping preferences and distorting the cognition of the less powerful (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Collins 1993; Young 1990).

*Traditional Ideological Opposition to Gender Balance*

People make sense of politics through their ideologies (Maynard 2013). Advocating for gender balance has the potential to be extremely contentious because the traditional ideologies of meritocracy, individualism, market fundamentalism, and gender-devoidedness all conflict with such a policy. Traditional opposition to gender balance is part of a broader opposition to quotas and affirmative action; it is viewed as the government overstepping its prerogative in order to elevate one person over another on the basis of gender rather than merit. Traditional gender ideologies produce stereotypes and internalized beliefs about dominant (privileged) and target (minority) social groups, reinforcing opposition by differentiating and distorting men’s and women’s roles and qualifications, making gender imbalance appear natural, meritorious, and indeed socially beneficial.

Subscribers to meritocracy believe that “societal resources” should be and predominately are “distributed exclusively or primarily on the basis of individual merit.” This ideology posits that hard work leads to success; it legitimates the American Dream (McNamee and Miller 2004). Meritocracy suggests that structural inequalities like sexism are problems of the past and no longer important (Bonilla-Silva 2018; Stoll 2013). In a contemporary post-gender U.S. society, gender inequality is either absent or attributed not to discrimination, but to women’s differential interests, qualifications, and individual choices. To the extent that sexism exists, it is carried out by deviant individuals and is not systemic (Stoll 2013). Therefore, government’s proper role is to prevent any discrimination that is interfering with merit-based decisions. Because the most qualified individuals are already selected for jobs, promotions, appointments, and other opportunities, government’s role is to prohibit bad
actors who seek to thwart merit-based decision-making by biasing their decisions in relation to gender, race, or other social identities. This encompasses adopting and imposing gender-devoidedness in which gender is supposed to be ignored through prohibiting both overt discrimination against minorities (e.g. refusing to lend, hire, sell, or rent to minorities) as well as affirmative action policies that give “preferential treatment” to minorities (Gamson 1992a; Stoll 2013).

Those who believe in this ideology oppose gender balance because they view any affirmative action or quota system as discriminatory and inherently unfair. In the late 1980s gender balance campaign, this was seen by those who opposed gender balance because they wanted the “most qualified person” on boards and commissions, which they believed gender balance would thwart, an argument that continued through 2009. “The Most Qualified…” is an argument aimed to “defend… privilege” by referencing meritocracy without taking stock of the unequal social distribution of opportunities (Bonilla-Silva 2018:60; Stoll 2013). During affirmative action’s initial implementation in the 1970s, a common criticism was that affirmative action would lead to “a loss of academic excellence” at institutions of higher education (Wicker 1975).

In 2009, the main proponents of the frame that gender balance is discriminatory because it forces decision-makers to make their decisions on the basis of gender rather than merit were Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story) and Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama). Quirmbach’s opposition focused on gender balance as a quota system. Quotas are broadly perceived as negative. They are also emasculating, removing an aspect of “competition.” Horbach labeled gender balance as discriminatory. He felt identities like gender should not be taken into account in decision-making.

Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux, 2009-2019) also viewed gender balance as discriminatory, He said,
We always say that we shouldn’t have discriminatory backgrounds in our society. We shouldn’t care if people are red, yellow, black, or white, female, male, or whatever it might be, we just shouldn’t. And yet when you start going down gender balance, you’re doing that. I mean you’re discriminating one versus the other, you’re saying, well, you’re required to have this (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018).

Other opponents like, Representative Teresa Garman (R-Story, 1987-2002), and Representative Dawn Pettengill (D-Benton, 2005-2007; R-Benton 2007-2018), who did not call out gender balance as discriminatory, still opposed using gender as a criterion. Garman was a member of the religious right and the only woman to vote against the 1987 gender balance bill; she also voted against local gender balance thereafter (Hannon 1985a; State 1987a, 1987b, 1991a). In 1988, when considering a bill to have a student seat on the Board of Regents, Garman said, “I don’t believe in placing restrictions on appointments…. The best person for the job is the best person for the job” (Perrin 1988). Pettengill, in explaining her 2009 vote to me, said “I would prefer the most qualified person be on boards and commissions and in elected office. I don’t really care if they’re men or women” (D. Pettengill, PC, 2018). Pettengill’s commitment to a gender-devoid meritocratic ideology also came through in her devaluation of women’s rights work that drew attention to gender inequality. Pettengill said that “these women’s groups [like the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women]… glory in victimhood. I can’t stand that” (D. Pettengill, PC, 2018). Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn) explained that, “For Pettengill, it’s always about the fact that women should be able to hold their own and be a good candidate. They shouldn’t have to make quotas for them. If they’re the best, they’ll rise up” (R. Schulte, PC, 2018). During the 2009 gender balance campaign, Pettengill, Horbach, and Quirmbach were the three legislators who introduced legislation or amendments to null the primary gender balance requirement feature of the bill.

These legislators’ opposition is congruent with literature on opposition to affirmative action. Sociologist Bill Gamson conducted a study of collective action frames in the later 1980s, at a time U.S. President Ronald Reagan (R, 1981-1988) was working to roll back affirmative action (Gamson
Gamson’s focus group participants who did not believe racial discrimination still existed also did not believe the government needed to take further corrective action for past discrimination. For these participants, because racial discrimination against blacks was solely historical, affirmative action was seen as discounting whites, placing them at an unfair disadvantage. Because affirmative action bypassed an evaluation of individuals on their own merits and instead gave a particular group unwarranted preferential treatment, affirmative action was viewed as discriminatory in its own right.

Reagan, along with the conservative (and black) Civil Rights Commission chairman he had appointed, labeled opposition efforts and outcomes against affirmative action as civil rights initiatives and civil rights victories (Gamson 1992a). As previously discussed, the state initiatives that have passed to ban affirmative action have been titled “Civil Rights Initiative[s]” (Larson and Menendian 2008). For those opposed to preferential treatment, a clear and tangible enemy existed—affirmative action programs and policies (Gamson 1992a).

“Liberalism” is associated with “individualism, universalism, egalitarianism, and meliorism (the idea that people and institutions can be improved)” (Bonilla-Silva 2018). Identity-devoid “liberalism” regarding race was operationalized by supporters of racial justice in the Brown v. Board of Education decision and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. At this point, opposing structural racism and supporting race-devoid liberalism were “part and parcel of the same struggle.” Policies under this legal framework made “formal equality… the standard” (Berrey 2015:28).

In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 5-4 in Regents of California v. Bakke that the University of California-Davis’ affirmative action program was unconstitutional. Four of the justices believed that admissions policies should have “a colorblind standard.” Four dissenting justices signed onto an opinion written by Justice William Brennan that said the government “may adopt race-conscious programs designed to overcome substantial, chronic minority under-representation
where there is reason to believe that the evil addressed is a product of past racial discrimination” (Berrey 2015:31). Justice Harry Blackmun wrote that “In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way” (Berrey 2015:31).

Justice Lewis Powell had a different perspective. He did not support the “remedial defense” argument that UC Davis had a “compelling interest” to correct for racial inequality, nor did he support the argument that UC Davis had to follow “a colorblind standard.” Instead, Powell carved out a limited circumstance in which affirmative action would be constitutionally acceptable. Referring to a brief submitted by Harvard, Columbia, and others, Powell pointed to a non-quota affirmative action policy by Harvard University as one that was likely constitutional, noting that considering race as a “‘plus’ factor in admissions to get to diversity which is socially good” was a compelling government interest (Berrey 2015:31). This “cultural pluralism” perspective meant that universities wanting to proceed with their affirmative action programs and likely have majority support on the U.S. Supreme Court took care to make their arguments for affirmative action in terms of diversity rather than racial justice (Berrey 2015:32).

Another salient ideology among gender balance opponents deals with opposition to government intervention. This ideology has various names. One is market fundamentalism, “a quasi-religious belief in the absence of any and all market regulations as the source of personal liberty” (Block and Somers 2014:200). Another is neoliberalism, a belief in “the power of ‘self-regulating’ free markets to create a better world” (Steger and Roy 2010). Others are laissez-faire economics or “free market ideology” (Block and Somers 2014:3). The norm associated with market fundamentalism is to minimize government action beyond what is absolutely required.

Feenstra thus opposed gender balance because he saw it as government overreach beyond the terrain of what government should be involved with. This ideology also ties in with meritocracy—governments do not need to intervene in appointments because it is in the best
interest of appointers and the body they represent to appoint the most qualified person. According to this view, the appointment of less qualified individuals will result in unsound and inferior outcomes that create problems needing to be addressed in the future. Feenstra believed that capitalism enables meritocracy to be achieved without government sector involvement. He wrote,

Democracy offers capitalism, which provides each person the ability to achieve and create an opportunity where they can succeed or fail in a fair market setting without monopolies. This system restrains government regulation and allows the social contract to be achieved by the private sector (Feenstra 2018).

While dissimilar from market fundamentalism, ideas about the role of government also played a role in opposition among stakeholders who saw gender balance as threatening their power. In the 1980s, this included Governor Terry Branstad (R)’s desire to maintain more control over the appointments he made. In 2009, this included local government associations’ opposition to the state imposing any mandates on local governments.

Role of government mattered in 2009, with key differences in 2009 compared to the late 1980s including an established and institutionalized opposition to government policies and programs like and including affirmative action, and the frame being elevated both by the nature of the bill (targeting local government) and the opposition to the bill (local government associations opposed to state mandates).

Ideologies around meritocracy and government roles interacted with one another. Opponents of robust affirmative action programs suggest their opposition comes from their support for equality, that they want to support equal opportunity and fairness. Sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2018:54) names “abstract liberalism” as the “most important…. dominant… frame” for upholding domination and inequality (in his analysis, related to racism). Abstract liberalism ties together the idea of “equal opportunity” from meritocracy (“political liberalism”) and ideas of “individualism” and “choice” from neoliberalism (“economic liberalism”) to oppose “almost all
practical approaches to deal with de facto racial inequality” (Bonilla-Silva 2018:56). Sociologist Laurie Cooper Stoll argues that gender functions similarly to race in this manner; abstract liberalism “asserts that no demographic group should be singled out for special treatment” and interprets anti-sexist policies and programs as privileging women over men (Stoll 2013:16). Bonilla-Silva argues this frame is used to oppose affirmative action as “preferential treatment” because it appeals to the idea of “equal opportunity” in the abstract—“this claim necessitates ignoring” rampant underrepresentation (Bonilla-Silva 2018:56). Feenstra’s writing show this: “Equal rights, equal justice, and equal opportunity belong to all, regardless of race, creed, age, sex, or national origin. All laws are created for all citizens of this State, special references to any specific race, creed, age, sex or national origin is not required. All fall under the same umbrella” (Feenstra 2018).

Gamson’s (1992a) focus group study in the later 1980s confirmed that the anti-affirmative action frame was rooted in opposition to preferential treatment. Dominant ideologies of individualism and meritocracy interact with the values of equal opportunity and fairness to make affirmative action policies designed to advance equity appear inherently unequal and unfair. Dominant U.S. ideology supports an equality that is difference-devoid, meaning that it does not take into account pre-existing background conditions of equal opportunity, making ‘formal equality’ appear synonymous with real equality (Gamson 1992a; Williams 1998).

Opponents’ meritocracy and/or neoliberal ideologies were reinforced through traditional gender ideology. Adherents of traditional gender ideology privilege men and support separate roles for men and women—men in paid employment and women in family and care work (Davis and Greenstein 2009; Grunow, Begall, and Buchler 2018). This ideology would support men being on government boards and commissions, with women participating on boards and commissions dealing with care issues like social welfare boards. In the 1980s, this ideology manifested among legislators like Senators Berl Priebe (D-Kossuth, 1969-1996) and Jack Rife (R-Muscatine, 1983-2000). Priebe
prefaced any comment to Senator Bev Hannon (D-Jones, 1985-1992) with “you women” or “you women libbers” (Hannon 1993a, 1995c). Rife, who served as Senate Minority Leader, was a “classic good old boy.” For example, in 1991 Rife and Senator Jim Kersten (R-Webster, 1991-1994), both married, were in a local Des Moines nightclub doing body shots with a young legislative intern, licking salt off her neck before drinking a tequila shot, then taking lime out of her mouth with their mouths (Hannon 1991a). Rife was the only senator to vote against the 1988 bill pertaining to the CSW and gender balance (State 1988a).

The ideal type of this ideology is currently only argued for on the fringes of U.S. society. In the early 1970s, many right-wing racists switched from explicit calls for racism to opposing affirmative action and adopted a race-devoid message (Berrey 2015). In the 1980s and 2009, sexism was less likely to be found in overt statements and more likely to be found through coded language around gendered abilities, qualifications, and interest. While most legislators and advocates in the 1980s and 2000s did not overtly subscribe to or argue for traditional gender ideology, its legacy is still embedded in gendered relations and views. For example, many people believe employed labor is the domain of both men and women, but may also believe that women would be happier as domestic housewives raising children than in employment, that children suffer if their mother works outside the home, and/or that men are relatively incapable of domestic responsibilities and care work (Grunow, Begall, and Buchler 2018).

Women are stigmatized—they are viewed as a separate category, associated with negative stereotypes about their qualifications in areas outside spheres considered feminine, and this results in “status loss and discrimination that lead to unequal outcomes” (Link and Phelan 2001). Those who hold these stereotypes about women are more likely to see a gender imbalanced system as meritocratic because it reflects men’s superior qualifications, and they are more likely to oppose government intervention because they see a system with a substantial gender imbalance as evidence
of essentialist gender differences that cannot be addressed productively through government action. Bonilla-Silva explains this in terms of race; Stoll translates this to gender. Bonilla-Silva connects these views to “naturalization,” which posits that the observed differences in representation (in this case gender roles) are natural, and to “cultural racism” (here “cultural sexism”), which uses cultural arguments to explain women’s underrepresentation (e.g. women are not interested in economics) (Bonilla-Silva 2018; Stoll 2013). This construction of target identities differentiates the construction of social policies targeting said groups (Edelman 2001; Schneider and Ingram 1993, 2005).

**Interest Theory’s Limited Applicability**

While interest theory may explain some individuals’ opposition to gender balance, it does not explain how the Iowa legislature could adopt gender balance laws, or why traditional viewpoints were such a small part of the discourse around the legislation. In Iowa, traditional ideologies around meritocracy and government roles resonated with opponents and had staying power. Opponents discussed their ideas on limited government and the idea that non-discrimination means uniform treatment of everybody. Traditional gender ideology was present but not as salient as these other categories.

While Senator Johnie Hammond (D-Story) noted the recurring refrain of qualifications from the 1980s through 2009, this ideology seemed to bend to pressure from advocates. Gender ideology certainly matters; gender balance legislation would not have passed in the earlier 1900s, when fewer married women were working professionals outside the home and when giving women the right to vote was viewed as potentially corrupting society (Alice 2018; Caplow, Hicks, and Wattenberg 2001; National 2018; Stout 2012; Women’s Bureau 2012). However, in the late 1980s and again in 2009, opponents of gender balance had to contend with significant societal shifts in gender norms and discourse. They had to come across as pro-women while cogently making a gender roles argument against gender balance. Although gender ideology still impacted perceptions of whether Iowa had a
meritocracy and whether there was a problem that warranted government intervention, opposition on the basis of gender ideology manifested as pragmatic-oriented concerns about implementation of the law.

To the extent these pragmatic concerns were genuine, they were able to be addressed. Both the 1986 and 2009 gender balance laws provided for real-world obstacles: the “as much as possible” language in 1986 addressed professional and technical boards and the “good faith effort” language in 2009 addressed potential challenges in more rural areas and again with more professional and technical boards. With these accommodations, opponents like Representative Dawn Pettengill’s (R- Benton) opposition to the bill—that it was inconvenient and burdensome—did not have the same symbolic weight of direct ideological opposition.

Still, opponents’ advocacy efforts around government did not focus on this issue. There were not enough opponents who subscribed to these views to prevent gender balance from passing. Ideological opponents were less numerous in Iowa than one might expect, though in general these adversaries did not change their minds during or after the legislation. To a certain extent, this suggests that efforts will not be successful in a political environment where policy makers that are ideological social conservatives are in the majority, and that simply trying to navigate policies without confronting these ideologies may persuade active progressives and moderates, but is unlikely to make inroads with ideological conservatives.

While traditional ideologies were present, interest theory suggests that these traditional ideologies should dominate. Obviously one does not need to go far to see dominant ideologies in action. From Congressional debates about welfare or immigration to gendered products in drug and toy stores, these traditional ideologies are certainly present in our society. In Iowa, dominant ideologies should result in the defeat of gender balance. From a Marxist perspective, and the interest theory intellectual tradition in the study of ideology, dominant ideologies would dupe everyone into
opposing gender balance. If these had been the dominant ideologies among Iowa politicos, gender balance’s chance of success would be highly diminished if not impossible. This happened in other states, where the legislation did not pass or was vetoed. No other states have comparable laws with an outright requirement. Other states have adopted laws that are similar in effect to Iowa’s 1986 law that required gender balance “as much as possible” and was legally deemed optional.

However, this was not the case. Certainly gender ideology comes from a history that serves to justify unequal power relations and segregated roles, and certainly people are socialized into these ideas. Indeed, men tend to feel much more qualified than women to serve as elected officials (Bennett 2017; Boschma 2018). Nevertheless, these ideologies simply were not dominant and determinant for this legislation. Even when arguments were framed drawing on these ideologies, they simply did not seem to stick. Ideologies are by definition sticky, because they are “complex and deeply held;” individuals rarely simply “adopt whole new ideologies” (Oliver and Johnson 2000:10-11). Based on interest theory, ideologies should be near impossible to get unstuck.

Based on the symbolic dimensions embedded in the issue of affirmative action, I expected Iowa’s adoption of a gender balance law to reveal a process in which hegemonic ideologies around meritocracy and neoliberalism were present and had to be confronted and undergo some type of cultural shift. I expected to see something occurring that resonated with the literature on cognitive liberation or conscientization or empowerment, where amidst the haze and fog of dominant oppressive ideologies, individuals and groups were able to resist them and change their worldviews (Freire 1970, Gaventa 1980; Miller et al. 2011). However, my data and analyses tell a different story. The idea of gender balance as discriminatory lacked saliency. Dominant ideologies around affirmative action were in the minority on this issue. Ideology was not simply a socially determined belief system crafted by those with power in society.

Interest theory almost seems like its own ideology. It is a framework for understanding
power in the world, but it is more of a “belief system” than an idea open to empirical tests that might result in its revision and modification. Interest theory tries to explain too much and in doing so fails to explain diversity of beliefs and actions (Gamson 1992b; Gitlin 1979). There are always “inevitable tensions” in ideologies, because all social phenomena are socially constructed; “socialization is never completely successful,” and those who have alternate views provide a direct “threat” to the original ideology (Berger and Luckmann 1966). Rather than individuals and groups passively internalizing ideas from the powerful, we are “active processors of meaning” (Gamson 1992b:65). We must consider the interplay between socially produced structures and the various ways individual and collective agents navigate those structures (Bates 2010; Boonstra 2016; Calarco 2014; Digeser 1992; Eyerman and Jamison 1991; Hays 1994; Johnson 2014a; Layder 1985; McGee 2016). In understanding how actors in Iowa made sense of gender balance, it is necessary to consider them as agents who use an interpretive process (Calarco 2014; Gamson 1992b).

Gender Balance as Radical Quota

The objective definition of quota is a fixed amount (count or proportion) of something allotted to a particular person or group. To this end, from an objectivist perspective, gender balance is a quota system. However, quotas function as an ideograph in U.S. society. Ideographs are relatively abstract terms that generate broadly similar feelings within a particular cultural context, though in actuality the definition and application of the term varies tremendously. They are used for social persuasion, employed as political frames in an attempt to conflate a particular phenomenon with this term and its value associations. Examples range from fairness and equality to confidentiality and rule of law (McGee 1980). Ideographs are culturally and context specific. For example, in Japan feminists rejected the term gender balance for a gender quota proposal because of their history with the government rejecting their advocacy for equality and only accepting “balanced treatment,” which
included “discrimination based on rational grounds” (Miura 2018:91).

The social definition of quota is the use of overly rigid criteria used to bypass merit. Most U.S.-Americans oppose “quotas.” Quota is a value-laden frame. It signals opposition to the American Dream, replacing the idea that you can work hard, compete for limitless opportunities, and achieve success with a preference for a non-competitive environment that rewards individuals based on their identities rather than their achievements. When opponents of gender balance use quota as an ideograph, they hope to engage ideologies of meritocracy, individualism, neoliberalism, and gender-devoidedness, as well as claim the values of fairness and equality.

Because quota has “cultural weight,” it is a political weapon. It is an ideograph that “any campaign that seeks to increase women’s levels of representation must negotiate” (Sheeler 2015). In the United States, gender balance is framed as anti-American and anathema to American values because it is a form of the detestable quota. Someone may believe gender imbalance is a problem, be okay with government intervention, and want a fair process, but still oppose quotas.

Quotas have bipartisan opposition. In 1990, President George H. W. Bush (R) vetoed civil rights legislation that created a more accessible threshold for demonstrating race and gender discrimination, arguing it would lead companies to enact quotas in order to avoid potential liability. Congress failed to override the veto by one vote. Iowa’s two U.S. senators voted differently on the bill and veto override. U.S. Senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA) voted against the bill and voted to sustain the veto. Grassley labeled the bill a quota. Seven years later he responded to a question about his position on affirmative action by saying that “Affirmative action today is equated with quotas” (Norman 1990; Stern 1997a). U.S. Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) supported the bill and voted to override the veto. He perceived the legislation as about remediating injustice and not as a quota (Norman 1990). However, five years later he wrote back to the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) about affirmative action by stressing his opposition to quotas, calling them “wrong
and illegal” (Harkin 1995).

In Iowa, Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story, 2003-2019) attempted to frame gender balance as a quota system. Quirmbach used the term quota six times in his 2009 editorial against the gender balance bill, linking it with discrimination and appointing people who are less qualified over people who are more qualified as a result of their gender (Quirmbach 2009). Quirmbach wrote to me that his opposition was that the bill “tries to force equality of result… instead of working harder on equality of opportunity” (H. Quirmbach, PC, 2018). He wrote,

After we have recruited broadly, however, we must then choose on the basis of merit alone. The bill in question requires otherwise in some circumstances. By imposing a gender based quota system, the bill requires in those circumstances a more qualified person of one gender to be passed over in favor of a less qualified person of the other on the basis on that gender difference. That by definition is sex discrimination (H. Quirmbach, PC, 2018).

Indeed, across the country opponents have labeled gender balance proposals as quotas, and proponents have avoided the label. In Pennsylvania in 1990, Representative Ruth Rudy (D-Centre and Mifflin), sponsoring a gender balance bill, had to defend it against accusations that it was “patronizing” because it is a “quota” that ignores “qualification” (Pennsylvania 2018:1217). Rudy responded, “It is not a quota bill. We are only asking for equal representation…. If it were a quota bill, we would be asking for 52 percent representation” to reflect the percentage of Pennsylvanians that were women (Kerstetter 1991). Rudy withdrew the bill after the chamber voted 111-87-1 that a proposed amendment to prohibit the public sector from using “racial or sexual quotas” for hiring or promotions was constitutional (Pennsylvania 2018).

In 1991, Tucson, Arizona passed a resolution that the city’s goal was to seek gender and racial balance in appointments, and requiring the city clerk’s office to provide monthly reports on the racial and gender makeup of the 978 members on their 125 boards and commissions. Mayor Thomas J. Volgy, who had served 14 years on council, including four as mayor, had requested this as
his last outgoing act. He wanted to have the reports broken down by council member to show each person’s gender and racial appointments, but by a five to one vote, the city council refused to do that. Councilman Mike Haggerty called that “forcing a quota system,” and said, “It seems to me that we’d have someone breathing over our shoulder.” The mayor denied he was trying to create a quota system. Councilman Roger Sedlmayr requested modifying the resolution to change the wording from “it shall be” the city’s goal to “it is the city’s goal,” noting “that wording should take away any thought that the city is establishing a quota system” (Swenson 1991).

In 1992, North Carolina Equity criticized the lack of women’s representation on state environmental policy boards, and pointed to policies states like Iowa had enacted. Governor Jim Hunt’s spokeswoman Rachel Perry said the governor cared about diversity but would not be likely to support laws like Iowa’s because “the governor does not adhere to quotas of any kind” (Associated 1993). In 1992 and again in 1993, Minnesota Governor Arne Carlson (R) vetoed gender balance legislation, claiming “that gender balance legislation smacks of quotas” (Whereatt 1992, 1993). In 1993, Florida Governor Lawton Chiles (D-FL) vetoed a gender balance bill, calling it “a Noah’s ark approach to selecting those for governmental service” (Sarasota 1993).

In 1994 in Tennessee, Representative Jere Hargrove (D-Cookeville) was able to get a gender balance bill adopted for university boards. Hargrove made sure to state that the legislation was “a fairness bill, not a quota bill” (Associated 1994a). The bill was labeled a quota system, which made many very uncomfortable with it, though the substantial underrepresentation of women also made legislators vacillate on what to do (Associated 1994; Daugherty 1994a, 1994b). While The Tennessean newspaper’s editorial labeled the bill a quota, they said it was “a necessary move” and that if the legislature had felt party balance was appropriate, gender balance also “makes sense” (Roberts 1994). In contrast, The Jackson Sun newspaper’s editorial also called out the problem, but said the law is “a quota system,… which is unfortunate.” The newspaper recommended not using
“the heavy-handedness of quotas,” and “instead of mandating male-female appointments,” using “an affirmative action approach” (Bauer and Bohs 1994). In 2008, in Nebraska, Senator DiAnna Schimek (D-Lancaster) proposed gender balance legislation (Young 2008a, 2008b). A news article on the bill stated that “People might say the bill would establish quotas, but that’s not Schimek’s intent, she said. It’s just the right thing for the state to do” (Young 2008a).

As these cases note, gender balance laws around the country were labeled as quotas, defended as not being quotas, or in the odd case out, admitted to as being quotas but called out as necessary. However, as can be seen from the numerous denials—while gender balance laws are objective quotas, not all objective quotas are labeled as or interpreted as quotas. Essentially, political actors generally label affirmative action projects, whether or not they meet the objective definition of quotas, as being quotas if they dislike them and as not being quotas if they support them (Toner 1990b). This is similar to other ideographs like socialism. People lambast socialism, with conservatives using this frame to advocate against expansions of health insurance coverage, but people also tend to support their local government providing trash and recycling collection or putting on fireworks displays, and do not think of these programs as socialism.

Indeed, gender balance supporters also tend to oppose quotas. Because quotas are generally perceived negatively in the United States, supporters of policies that objectively could be defined as quotas rarely perceive these measures as such, as documented in a number of the above cases involving gender balance advocates. On the opposite side, gender balance opponents also sometimes support objective quotas, but in these situations, they may use different terminology. In the 1994 Tennessee gender balance discussion, the Daily News-Journal newspaper’s editorial gave the Tennessee Senate credit for requiring equal representation, but discredited the Republicans for their votes. The paper noted that GOP senators’ comments led one to believe the issue at hand was about establishing quotas, which “have been political football for decades now” and had become
even less liked in recent years, though they are a fast way to fix serious problems. However, the paper noted that “the Republicans’ expressed distaste for quotas even to remedy such an in-your-face inequity as exists on the state boards might be a bit more acceptable if the GOP has not just days before raised all kinds of cain about a quota system of them [sic] own on an issue directly to point.” The Republicans had just recently pushed against the governor for not appointing enough Republicans to the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees, claiming he did not follow this law, meaning “the Republicans were not getting their ‘quota’ of members.” The paper points out their comfort with a “quota” to help Republicans but discomfort with a quota for women. It leads with, “When is a quota not a quota? Apparently, when the quota is to be filled by Republicans” (Pirtle 1994:A6).

Quotas, as well as affirmative action, exist in a myriad of forms. Affirmative action includes such areas as legacy status and geographical diversity in university admissions. Quotas include not only party balance on boards and commissions in Iowa but also all the board and commission laws that specify who certain seats should be held for (e.g. the Iowa Workforce Development board having labor seats and business seats, and the state one having a seat for the governor). Only certain forms of quotas and affirmative action are contested. Senator Johnie Hammond (D-Story) brought up this idea, questioning Quirmbach’s reasoning for opposing gender balance. She noted that it was “interesting, because we do have other requirements, as you must know. Politics, geography, and gender. So it’s not all just who’s best qualified” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). Thus, Quirmbach’s advocacy for eliminating quota laws seems to be limited to gender balance.

Iowa legislators also considered another quota bill in 2009 and 2010. Just two weeks before the House voted on the 2009 gender balance bill, Representative Andrew Wenthe (D-Fayette), with 22 other legislators, introduced legislation that required boards and commissions’ membership to include at least one young person. The bill was sponsored by 10 Democrats, six of the Republicans
who voted yes on gender balance, and seven Republicans who voted against gender balance (Iowa Legislature 2009)). When the legislation passed in 2010, the House adopted it 93-2-5. The bill then passed the Senate 36 to 14. The Senate vote was mostly a partisan vote, with four Republicans joining all Democrats voting in support, including Quirmbach, who apparently felt this quota was worth supporting (Iowa Legislature 2010).

Quotas have sometimes been a tricky issue for the women’s rights movement to navigate (Henry 1994; Lavelle 1990). In 1977, the National Commission on International Women’s Year (IWY) ran into the issue of quotas. While the National Commission was explicitly considering diversity when selecting State Coordinating Committees, and advocating for moving toward and achieving 50% women’s representation in state board and commission appointments and elsewhere, at the same time the National Commission had to navigate its own requirements in its legal mandate to both maximize “diversity of representation” and use a “wholly open” process, meaning quotas were prohibited (Mattingly and Nare 2014:95). The National Commission thus officially instructed states that they were banned from using quota systems (Dorian, Wallace, and Office 1977). The National Commission labeled quotas “unfair” because in reserving a seat for someone from a particular category, it made the seat unavailable to others, and because quotas take a “one-dimensional” perspective on people, whereas, for example, a woman is also many other things (Dorian, Wallace, and Office 1977:4). The National Commission outlined alternative steps to meet diversity goals without using a quota system (Dorian, Wallace, and Office 1977).

In Iowa, the women’s rights movement did not have to navigate a position on quotas as they worked on gender balance because gender balance was not perceived as being a quota. It may seem surprising that something that is technically a quota was not (widely) interpreted as such in Iowa. However, this makes sense given what we know about phenomenology and other ideographs. For example, there is a strong commitment to one-person one-vote in the United States, but people are
not out protesting the U.S. Senate’s existence and labeling it an un-American quota system for states (Phillips 1995; Williams 1998).

There were very limited attempts to paint gender balance as a quota in Iowa. The only advocacy rooted in this language that I found was Quirmbach’s advocacy in 2009. Republicans [like Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama)] may have shared Quirmbach’s perspective on this, but they opposed affirmative action more broadly, of which quotas are one form. Perhaps, because gender balance opponents were not a strong organized force, they focused on the issues as they saw them (discrimination, not enough qualified women, etc.) rather than using words like quota to defeat the bill.

The closest regularly occurring charge that framed the bill as a quota was the opposition claim that gender balance restricts us (the appointing body) to half the population, making the job of appointing people, especially qualified people, even more difficult. The argument in response was that, due to women’s exclusion, this legislation actually doubled the number of people the appointing body could consider. Studies of electoral gender quotas have shown this latter interpretation falls closer to the objective outcome, with quotas increasing competition, since men are not solely competing with men anymore, and increasing the field of people considering office, increasing the overall qualifications of the candidates involved (Dahlerup 2007; Engender 2016). “Electoral gender quotas come closer to providing real equality of opportunity than equality of result” (Dahlerup 2007). When political scientist Kim Lanegran was interviewing local officials, she heard back from those implementing the law that it made sense because, while “it’s hard enough to find people to be on the Parks Board, I need to be able to tap everybody to do it.” That included everyone “who might be able” to serve. Comments like these from local officials interpret gender balance as more about expanding rather than restricting the pool of potentially available people for appointments (K. Lanegran, PC, 2018).
While only Quirmbach seemed to directly target the bill using the term quota, others like Horbach and Senator David Hartsuch (R-Scott) argued it was discriminatory. However, largely these framings of the bill were ignored. They were value-laden terms that did not speak to advocates and many legislators’ experiences. When these frames were raised, advocates tended to bypass rather than dignify them. Otherwise they were simply absent from the discourse. The ICSW 2009 fact sheet, for example, addressed what they thought were the most common points of opposition against local gender balance. These included 1) logistics: difficulty finding appointees, let alone interested women; 2) local control; and 3) a gender-devoid ideology, appointing the “most qualified ‘person’—no matter who they are.” It did not mention opposition related to gender balance as a quota or discriminatory (ICSW 2009f). While implicitly acknowledging that gender balance laws are gender-conscious rather than gender-devoid, notably absent is an accusation that gender balance is discriminatory or a quota system.

Quotas and discrimination were not frames gender balance advocates had to counter. Indeed, they were not even on advocates’ minds. When I interviewed Iowan stakeholders about this issue, even strong supporters of gender balance did not bring up affirmative action or say they supported quotas. I mentioned affirmative action numerous times, but my interviewees never did. Only two mentioned affirmative action: Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux), in bringing up how he thought affirmative action was a policy that was no longer necessary, and another advocate, who shared that Feenstra is against affirmative action. However, at least in 1991 the Iowa Civil Liberties Union recognized gender and racial balance, which they supported, as affirmative action. On their legislator scorecard, they included “HF469 – AFFIRMATIVE ACTION – Requires gender and racial balance on boards and commissions appointed by Iowa counties and cities” (Iowa Civil 1991).

Only four of my personal communications included the term quota. The primary one was Quirmbach, who used the term in his op-ed and his e-mail to me explaining his position (H.
Quirmbach, PC, 2018; Quirmbach 2009). When Representative Beth Wessel-Kroeschell (D-Story) responded with her own editorial, she did not mention quotas or even respond to Quirmbach or his particular critiques. Instead, she just put forward her own positive vision, which she felt would resonate with readers and the community (Wessel-Kroeschell 2009). Senator Jeff Danielson (D-Black Hawk), a gender balance supporter, also raised quotas as one of a number of potential reasons Republicans opposed the bill (J. Danielson, PC, 2018). Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn) also used the term, twice. The first time she was using it to describe Representative Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton)’s meritocratic ideology. Schulte also brought the term up in a way that differentiated gender balance from a subjective quota, implying quotas are only when decisions are made to appoint particular people or people from particular groups in lieu of qualifications (R. Schulte, PC, 2018).

Finally, political scientist Kim Lanegran used the term, but this was about 20 minutes into our conversation, during which she was responding to a question I asked in which I had raised the term in my question to her. Lanegran commented that “the term gender balance is less provocative, I think, than quota” (K. Lanegran, PC, 2018).

I also found the term quota in Iowa newspapers, but the focus was rarely on gender balance for boards and commissions or gender balance in Iowa. A good deal of attention to quotas and opposition to quotas centered around Title IX (Kocher 2011; Thaler 2000; Witosky, Logue, and Miller 2002). In terms of gender balance, in May 1987 the Sioux City Journal posted an editorial about the end of the legislative session, which said of gender balance, “The idea is good, but we get this nervous feeling every time someone mandates quotas and balance of gender, ethnicity, religion, age or what have you” (Sioux 1987). The next closest description was in 2001, when the Quad-City Times interviewed the bipartisan Women in Public Policy group’s leader, Leann Brunnette, who said they were trying to get more women to run for the legislature, but “her group wants to avoid being perceived as setting quotas, in part because the idea raises alarm among conservative Republicans.”
The Cedar Rapids Gazette 1987 editorial against removing “as much as possible” from Iowa’s gender balance law did not use the term quota, but it did refer to the bill as “strict balance,” a “rigid setup,” and a “straitjacket,” and that “Iowans… want prospective appointees to know they will be appreciated for what they do, not what they are” (Gazette 1987).

Advocates effectively sidelined and bypassed arguments around “quotas.” Iowans did not interpret gender balance as a quota to the extent they viewed it as worthwhile or primarily viewed it as something else. In 1987, for example, gender balance was about holding the governor accountable, not about quotas. In 2009, it was about gender equity, but was viewed as being about fairness and opportunity, tackling the good ol’ boys network, extending an existing Iowa law, and building a pipeline of women to run for office, again not about quotas. Gender balance was not read as a quota in Iowa because quotas are socially defined as offensive, radical projects in which the government usurps considerations of quality and fairness, whereas gender balance in Iowa was socially defined as a common sense, relatively benign policy that was not a big deal but could help increase women’s opportunities and seemed like the fair and right thing to do.

Given Iowa’s history with political party balance laws, and, since its adoption in the 1980s, a state-level gender balance law, Quirnmbach’s attempt to attack the bill as imposing a quota system did not resonate with legislators who were used to and supported these and other initiatives. If gender balance is about fairness or giving people fair opportunities, that is not a subjective quota because that does not match its subjective definition. In Iowa, legislation on the issue was predominately not considered discriminatory. Instead, it was a natural extension of historical efforts to increase women’s representation (Gamson 1992a). Gender balance was interpreted this way because the issue had been deradicalized. While quota as an ideograph is a powerful oppositional frame, it was organized out of the discourse and thus rendered impotent. The rest of this chapter discusses how gender balance came to be viewed in Iowa as common sense rather than as a negative quota.
Gender Balance as a Fair, Benign Policy

When I first went into this study, I was focused on the 2009 legislation and expected to find traditional rhetoric around quotas. Gender quotas exist all over the world, but seem anathema in the United States. And in 2009, affirmative action was encountering oft-successful opposition around the country. I was interested in seeing how people shifted their schemas in Iowa from such a dominant ideological perspective such that they were willing to vote for a gender quota bill. However, as it turned out, I had made some erroneous assumptions. Indeed, in my over 60 interviews, resulting in over 400 single-spaced pages of transcription, it would be easy to miss any mention of the term. When I went back to Iowa a second time and spent a week at the Iowa Women’s Archives at University of Iowa, learning more about the context of the gender balance bills from the late 1980s, I uncovered lots of discussion on and examples of discrimination—but the over 1500 pages of scans of relevant material did not point to people labeling gender balance legislation or laws as discriminatory.

Framing affirmative action as discriminatory was part of the discourse in Iowa, but it did not register or stick with most legislators and stakeholders for a variety of reasons. Discourse around gender balance in the late 1980s and in 2009 was not centered around these traditional dominant frames. During the gender balance campaigns of the late 1980s and 2009, traditional ideologies conceptually opposing affirmative action as discriminatory or advocating for a gender-devoid policy were relatively peripheral. Instead of gender balance being broadly perceived as a radical proposition, it was considered relatively benign. Representative Doris Kelley (D-Black Hawk), one of the more conservative Democrats in the legislature, shared that gender balance simply was not a big deal. Kelley said she was not sure how people thought about the gender balance state requirement prior to the 2009 bill, because it was not really talked about. For the 2009 legislation, she shared that “if you really stop and think about… it, it’s not that controversial.” Kelley said that the only possible
negative impact was that a community “couldn’t find somebody,… which we took care of with the bill…. Other than that, what negative impact would you have from this?” (D. Kelley, PC, 2018).

By and large, Iowans did not view gender balance as a feminist project, as radical or extreme, or as a quota system. Representative Ako Abdul-Samad (D-Polk) said, “Looking at the bill, the first thing in my mind is, why would anybody oppose it?” (A. Abdul-Samad, PC, 2018). When political scientist Kim Lanegran interviewed two dozen local officials from across the state after the local gender balance bill went into effect, she said she “found that really, really just interesting how common-sensical and obvious it seemed to them.” Lanegran noted these were officials who would not identify as “feminists. These people would just say, I’ve got skilled people here and I have to use skilled people…. I need to tap all the people who might be able to sit on my council…. We need a variety of voices” (K. Lanegran, PC, 2018; Lanegran 2017). Kappie Spencer noted, “When you peel it right down to the nub, it’s very non-radical, almost a mom-and-pop kind of an issue…. We’ve got to get women to take the first steps – to creep and walk – before they run” (Lavelle 1990:1B).

Iowa has a reputation known as ‘Iowa nice.’ For example, Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) E.D. Rachel Scott shared that when she moved from inner-city Indianapolis to Iowa as a young adult, she experienced culture shock, such as having people “wave at you when you’re driving” (R. Scott, PC, 2018c). I translate ‘Iowa nice’ into a policy disposition of ‘Iowa fair.’ Iowa fair refers to the common response among interviewees that they supported gender balance because it was fair and it was a common sense policy, as well as that Iowa exceptionality favors fairness and the type of decent and supportive, progressive spirit that would support laws like gender balance.

Iowa ‘fair’ can also be observed in earlier women’s rights work. Back in 1974 the Iowa Women’s Political Caucus (IWPC) noted that part of their success that year was due to “the inherent sense of fairness that most Iowa legislators seem to have” (Tinges and Macauley 1974b). Iowa ‘fair’
leads to policies that may be exceptional from other parts of the country. For example, Iowa has a unique nonpartisan redistricting scheme (R. Schulte, PC, 2018). Since 1980, both state and congressional districts are drawn up by the Legislative Services Agency (LSA), a nonpartisan staff agency of the legislature. The LSA is only authorized to take into account population and county lines (Hoffman and Larimer 2015). Location of incumbents is not considered, leading some to move after redistricting, even though at the state legislative level this is for a salary of $25,000/year as of 2009 (excluding per diem money and higher salaries for legislative leaders) (Fiscal 2009; Hoffman and Larimer 2015).

A recurring theme among interviewees was the view that Iowa is a state that has historically been at the forefront of change in areas of diversity, equality, and civil rights, unafraid to do its own thing when it makes sense to do so (A. Abdul-Samad, PC, 2018; D. Struyk, PC, 2018; E. Gayman, PC, 2018; J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018; K. Paulsen, PC, 2018; P. Jochum, PC, 2018; R. Schulte, PC, 2018). Senator Pam Jochum (D-Dubuque) said of Iowa, “We actually have always been ahead of the curve on civil rights and human rights” (P. Jochum, PC, 2018).

I also heard that Iowa is unique in its fairness and common sense approach to treating one another with decency and being inclusive (D. Struyk, PC, 2018; K. Paulsen, PC, 2018; T. Hurley, PC, 2018). “It’s just the way we’ve always kind of been,” House Minority Leader Kraig Paulsen (R-Linn) shared with me. “There’s something about Iowans where they’re intrinsically fair,” League of Cities Board President and Waterloo mayor Tim Hurley shared (T. Hurley, PC, 2018). Fairness includes nondiscrimination and accountability, issues that came up in the 1980s and in 2009. Fairness and inclusion included gender balance (J. Kearns, PC, 2018; K. Paulsen, PC, 2018). In my interviews I heard people who supported gender balance say they did so because it was the right thing to do, even among those that were not women’s rights leaders (D. Struyk, PC, 2018).
The idea of Iowan exceptionalism, of Iowa having a progressive history and leading the way on progressive change, gave the state an Iowa ‘first’ mentality that meant Iowa was not afraid to enact policies that no one else had (A. Abdul-Samad, PC, 2018). Iowa is the first state in a variety of areas (e.g. first woman attorney, first school anti-segregation state supreme court ruling, first woman in U.S. railway history chosen for a high executive position, first public university to admit men and women on an equal basis, etc.) (ICSW 1976-1977; Jepsen 1981; P. Jochum, PC, 2018; Stout 2012; Yanney 1991). Representative Elesha Gayman (D-Scott) said Iowa “leads the way in equality and diversity in a lot of ways,” and so Iowa’s unique law on gender balance is “not out of place for our culture here” (E. Gayman, PC, 2018).

Even though interviewees used Iowa fair and Iowa exceptionalism as the rationale for Iowa’s unique status regarding gender balance, it is not an explanation for why gender balance happened in Iowa. While this frame connects with an Iowa ‘fair’ mentality in which Iowa is not a surprising place to find progressive change, the frame of Iowa being a progressive leader that enacted gender balance as part of a legacy of being a pioneer in creating opportunities does not really work. First, Iowa’s 2009 bill was supported in part because of Iowa’s comparative deficit of women elected statewide compared to other states. Additionally, many legislators were unaware that Iowa was the only state with said requirement (D. Olson, PC, 2018; D. Struyk, PC, 2018; J. Danielson, PC, 2018; K. Paulsen, PC, 2018). Iowa’s exceptional status, or even discussion of whether other states had tried gender balance, did not seem to come up in the debate on gender balance in the late 1980s or in 2009. Many of Iowa’s historic changes were imposed by the judiciary and/or involved struggles and strident opposition. Much of the pride expressed in Iowa’s legacy is a retroactive pride.

However, Iowan exceptionalism does help explain normalization to an extent. The frames of Iowa fair and Iowan exceptionalism helped legitimate Iowa’s unique participation and make something more radical and unique into something more mundane. As a discursive identity and a
source of pride, it does speak to the resonance of this framing around gender balance as fair and the right thing to do. Iowa exceptionalism also speaks to legislators’ willingness to consider legislation that other states have not yet attempted. I am not aware of legislative opposition to gender balance in the late 1980s on the basis that other states did not have such a law, nor am I aware of legislators, for or against the 2009 bill, giving consideration to what other states had or had not yet done in this area.

Iowa fair and Iowa exceptionalism could help explain some of the normalization of gender balance following its implementation in the late 1980s. Leaders seem to absorb Iowa’s progressive history into an ethos of pride in the state’s inclusivity. Even Hanna De Groot, with the Iowa State Association of Counties, when I asked her about why this bill came forward in and became law in Iowa, responded by iterating her pride in Iowa and what Iowa has been able to accomplish (H. De Groot, PC, 2018). In this way, by 2009 gender balance was an issue that, while still pretty unique as an outright requirement, was by and large accepted and thought of fondly as part of Iowa’s history and culture of support for all despite identity and background.

Gender balance in Iowa was viewed as fair and the right thing to do, and not as a big deal, or as a ‘hot issue.’ The 2009 Senate minority leader does not remember the bill. When I interviewed Representative Kraig Paulsen (R-Linn), the 2009 House Minority leader, about the bill, he said of the state requirement that “generally people think it’s a good idea…. Generally I think it’s supported.” He also did not remember the 2009 bill, but had looked it up prior to our interview to try to refresh his mind. While he voted against it, looking at the ICSW’s fact sheet, he said that their study had “compelling numbers…. Women are clearly underrepresented.” He continued that “conceptually and in general, I think it’s [gender balance is] a good idea” (K. Paulsen, PC, 2018). Beyond Republican leadership, from a Republican supporter still unsure if there was a problem that needed to be addressed to opponents who said this issue was not big news in Iowa, this bill was not at the
center of Iowa’s battles over cultural and identity politics.

There are a number of contextual reasons that could have contributed to this. As noted, there were other issues facing Iowa that attracted much more attention and legislative energy in the late 1980s and in 2009. This bill also did not have a direct fiscal impact, lowering attention to it (though this is not a given, considering the attention issues around abortion or marriage equality or transgender rights generate). It could also have received less pushback from conservatives because, even while the bill’s advocates supported broad diversity, both the 1980s and 2009 laws only required bringing women who otherwise could have high status social locations into positions that overall are not coveted. While there was certainly a feminist push for inclusion, women also have different insular social networks to which they are connected. One critique of the initial 1973 IWPC convention was that “The 650 women present were composed of predominately white, middle class women whose major concern seemed to be obtaining status by supporting one of their kind in reaching a goal in the political area or being the one to reach the goal of women politician” (Tucker 1973). Gender balance legislation focused solely on gender can be critiqued for offering a limited vision of inclusion and power sharing. Historically those who first break glass floors (and glass ceilings) into power are those who have high status within their target category (e.g. widows of U.S. senators) (International 1977; Stout 2012).

Opposition to Iowa’s gender balance bills may have looked different if there was a racial minority requirement (though this was part of the 1991 bill that passed the House). The legislation does not address class diversity. While the state has a political party balance law (which still allows zero appointees of the party opposite the governor’s party), local governments do not, and so, while these laws changed the requirement around gender, appointers could still appoint middle or upper class, white, and politically and ideologically aligned women to these boards and commissions.
Political scientist Kim Lanegran noted that these laws may also be less controversial because “these are appointed positions, and these are not glamorous positions…. They’re looking for good sensible reasonable people to do this work” (K. Lanegran, PC, 2018). Affirmative action and quotas around jobs (or sports, or college admissions) may be more controversial because it triggers opponents’ fear that the government is taking away (the dominant identity group’s ability to get) jobs (or other outcomes considered valuable). From this vantage point, affirmative action is discriminatory, and opposition centers on white men not being able to get jobs given preferences for women and racial minorities. Whites may seek to exclude blacks from labor markets in which blacks are underrepresented because they see blacks, a lower status group, as cheaper labor, and therefore fear that blacks will take their jobs and/or that integration will decrease their value and compensation. Opposition to affirmative action is thus an attempt to maintain a more segregated labor market (Bonacich 1972, 1976). This frame is intentionally fomented by some right-wing politicos. For example, a 1990 television commercial for U.S. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC)’s re-election campaign, at a time when he was also the RNC’s chief spokesman, “showed white hands crumpling a rejection letter, while an announcer intoned: ‘You needed that job, and you were the best qualified. But it had to go to a minority because of a racial quota’” (Toner 1990).

However, even if someone viewed the gender balance law in this light, restricting men to half the spots on boards and commissions seems relatively uncontroversial. I say this having direct experience as someone who has previously served on a local Town and Gown Committee, Planning Board, and Conservation Commission, as well on city council and thus partially responsible for local appointments. Not too many people are going to be extremely upset that their chances are slightly diminished for getting on a board that was previously dominated by their gender, whether it is the Library Board or Board of Adjustment. As Representative Cindy Winckler (D-Scott) said, “I think we were just looking at it from an equity balance issue. People were not necessarily locally
complaining that they can’t get on boards and commissions” (C. Winckler, PC, 2018). Winckler was speaking about that there was not a lobby of women pushing for this bill that felt like they could not realize their desire to serve on (usually voluntary) boards and commissions. In general, board appointees are sought after, not self-initiated volunteers (Lanegran 2017). Serving on boards and commissions and whether or not one’s ability to do so is increased or diminished is just not an issue most people think about. This was true during the Iowa’s gender balance legislative campaigns and remains the case even with the adopted law in place.

The people who are really most affected by these policies are the appointers themselves, who want to appoint particular people: the governor, mayors, or county board supervisors, for example. In Iowa, controversy centered on one’s ability to appoint without restriction, not about whether some larger constituency believed the government was taking away their rights. Additionally, gender balance is limited to the public sector and concerns internal government operations. Legislation affecting the private sector is often more controversial, both by activating frames connected to and making more salient market fundamentalism and neoliberalism ideologies, and through activating potential opposition from interest groups like chambers of commerce.

While all these factors may have played a role in making this issue relatively benign, they were just contributing factors that explain how this issue might be more or less salient than others. Many of these factors translate to other states that have not been able to enact similar gender balance requirements. Particular processes that occurred in Iowa facilitated a view that gender balance was acceptable, fair, and good policy rather than radical and discriminatory. Disembedding gender segregation, normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good governance deradicalized an otherwise intensely contentious issue and contributed to its passage. Implementation of these gender balance laws has continued to stimulate these three processes, further shifting engaged Iowans’ perceptions of gender, governance,
and affirmative action.

THE DERADICALIZATION OF GENDER BALANCE IN IOWA

Disembedding Gender Segregation

The issue of women’s representation in Iowa provided numerous instances of people reckoning with, confronting, and changing dominant and internalized ideological standpoints, particularly when embedded gender segregation was permeable or broken. The process of disembedding gender segregation increased support for women’s integral inclusion in policy decision-making and taking action to help achieve that goal. Through gendered social interactions that exposed actors to different ideas and shaped their perceptions of these ideas and of appropriate gender roles, integrally including women in decision-making capacities became noncontroversial and excluding women made less sense.

Segregation is often thought of as a physical and spatial separation. However, while men and women are physically separated in a number of aspects of U.S. society, whether through formal exclusion (e.g. many bathrooms, locker rooms, sports teams, institutional living quarters, Greek life, etc.) or informal exclusion (e.g. men’s and women’s clubs and organizations, gender dominated careers, gender based marketing practices in commercial settings, etc.), men and women are not geographically separated. Indeed, many boys, girls, men, and women live in the same household. Segregation need not be physical. Technological developments have resulted in studies of ideological segregation and how people can seek out their own insular networks and echo chambers. And as sociologist Joan Acker has argued, beyond institutions characterized by their absence of either men or women, “gendered institutions” exist in that gender is part of the processes, ideologies, and practices within our social world (Acker 1992).
With exceptions, men and women legislators and stakeholders had numerous distinct social networks, ideological resources, and experiences in relation to patriarchy and the issue of gender balance. Women and men can also have segregated physically separate social networks and then be integrated in other spaces, while bringing in the cultural and ideological resources from their divergent social networks. For example, House Speaker Don Avenson (D-Fayette)’s fishing trip was for men only, while the Women’s Legislative Caucus’s “fishing trip” retreat was for women only. These men and women came back from their respective spaces and then shared spaces in the legislature, including the same subcommittees, committees, and caucuses.

Women, then, are not segregated from men in the same way that race has and continues to segregate people and communities. Instead, gender segregation is embedded in our social networks and practices. Social networks and their accompanying symbolic subuniverses of meaning was a key theme throughout this case study. Women were not appointed due to appointers’ exclusionary social networks. To an extent, women’s rights organizations’ roster and appointments projects maintained the separateness of these social networks, though without them fewer women would have been appointed. These roster project demonstrate the segregation of social networks. There was no roster project for men because appointers already knew men to appoint. It was women who were outside the network of men who were in power positions. Nevertheless, roster projects also speak to the interaction of social networks with prioritization and beliefs. Appointers who did not immediately think of a woman to be able to appoint could have regularly reached out and partnered with the organizations spearheading roster projects.

Additionally, belief systems accompanying social networks influence appointments. While appointers seemingly did not know any women they could think of for Planning Boards, they had no difficulty finding women for the Library Board. Similarly, after winning the right to vote, women who volunteered for political parties “found themselves licking the stamps instead of writing the
platforms or running for office” (Lloyd-Jones 1974-1985a). Appointers could find women, but it was just a matter of whether or not they thought women were appropriate appointees for various boards. As was the case in the legislature, sometimes a man committee chair had women serving on his committee and still did not appoint those women to subcommittees. He knew women; they were in his network. However, he did not consider them when he considered who would be best for appointments.

In contrast, women in appointer positions were connected to networks of women they thought of as appropriate and qualified. Representative Donovan Olson (D-Boone) said that at the local government level, men and women tend to have “connections in different ways,” making it easier for women leaders to get other women onto boards and commissions and conversely meaning boards and councils that are mostly or all men have more difficulty in this regard (D. Olson, PC, 2018). As an example of these differences, as of 1978, 12% of President Jimmy Carter (D)’s executive level appointees had been women. However, in agencies headed by women, nearly 50% of the appointed positions had been filled by women (National 1978).

One form of exclusive social network is what I call embedded segregation. Men and women can be living in the same house, working in the same office, etc., and yet gender is embedded in our social networks and processes. By embedded I mean implanted within, attached to the system. Organizations and communities are “embedded in values, norms, and meanings” and “economic, political, and social actions are embedded in social structure and culture” (Baker and Faulkner 2009:1532). Prior to the 1980s, women joining the legislature were exposed to new networks of women constituents who shared women’s problems and made women legislators into feminists. Women were allowed into the legislature, but still excluded formally from subcommittee chairs or fishing trips, informally through men-centeredness (e.g. invitations to the Senate wives club, assuming men pronouns for all legislators, lobbyists predominately inviting men to dinners, etc.).
and through a ‘new sexism’ of implicit bias and stereotyped practices that enforce these exclusionary practices. This is the good ol’ boy closed social networks that advocates for gender balance highlighted and accused of reproducing gender inequality and men domination in appointed positions. As evidenced in 2009, men and women legislators often had very different knowledge of the state gender balance law and of the Iowa public caring about the issue and supporting the legislation. Legislators and women with connections to women’s groups or that had been involved with the 1980s legislation had an entirely different familiarity with, approach to, and evaluation of the legislation.

Disembedding gender segregation is the process of the breaking apart of embedded gender segregation. Women’s changing roles altered gender ideologies and created an increased demand for women’s inclusion in policy-making and community governance. Married women’s workforce participation increased substantially from 1920 through the turn of the century. While women were 21% of the national labor force in 1920, this percentage doubled by the late 1980s (women were 44.5% to 45.0% of the labor force in 1986 through 1988) (Caplow, Hicks, and Wattenberg 2001; National 2018; Stout 2012; Women’s Bureau 2012). Women’s workforce participation continued to increase for the second half of the 20th century. Iowa was part of these national trends, though during the 1990s and 2000s, the remaining gender workforce participation gap narrowed in Iowa more than in the United States as a whole (Durden 2003; Glynn and Duke 2015; Governor’s 1964; Iowa Office 1984; IWPC 1976b; Pearson and Gordon 2008; Workforce 2008). In 1985, when state gender balance legislation was first introduced, almost two-thirds of Iowa women of working age were in the labor force (ICSW 1986c). This percentage was over two-thirds at the time of the 2009 legislation (Pearson and Gordon 2008; Workforce 2008).

Inclusion of men and women in interactions that disembed that segregation have important results. The increase of women into the workforce, into traditionally men-dominated fields, and into
areas including government and governance have changed people’s conceptions of women—for example, an evaluation of their qualifications, which in Iowa tended to be the most common argument raised against gender balance. While this change has been uneven and conflict-laden, and has created new or at least different problems (e.g. rampant sexual harassment in many workplaces, the second shift), the overarching cultural change has been a move toward empirical and cognitive egalitarianism. Indeed, the existence of problems that did not exist in the past or were not part of the cultural “cognitive landscape” reflects the progress that has been made (Best 2001; Sampson and Wilson 1995:50,51; Simons et al. 2014:659). Gender imbalance on boards and commissions is an issue because equity is an expectation in governance and because women are substantially involved in governing. As Daniel Patrick Moynihan, President Richard Nixon (R)’s counselor to the president for urban affairs, put it in a 1969 memo, “The essential fact is that we have educated women for equality in America, but have not really given it to them. Not at all” (Stout 2012:22). Institutional changes that integrate men and women but do not catch women’s status up to meet that integration can activate and make egalitarian gender ideology salient.

For men, part of women’s inclusion in governing meant exposure to ideas and social problems that men generally were not conscious of or had not considered. For example, Senator Bev Hannon (D-Jones) proposed a potty parity bill in 1990, requiring new construction and major renovations of government or public access buildings (e.g. sports arenas, restaurants, churches) with bathrooms that had more than one toilet to have two toilets in women’s restrooms for every one non-urinal toilet in men’s restrooms (Hannon 1990b; Hannon and Schenken 1991; Iowa Legislature 1990b). Hannon’s experience having six small children meant that, especially when they went on vacation, she “identified personally” with the issue she was working to address (Hannon and Schenken 1991:45). Representative Pat Murphy (D-Dubuque) recalls how his positionality as a man meant that this was not an issue he really noticed until women began raising it. Murphy also recalls
everyone at first really making fun of the bill and Republicans really attacking the bill,

but then you started hearing women say, hey, this is a bigger deal than you think it is. They said, How would you like to go to an event where there’s 20,000 people and you gotta go to the bathroom and the line’s three times as long coming out of the women’s room, whereas the men’s room there’s no line because every guy that can pee just goes in and pees and leaves. Or, they have a line but their line’s like only a third of the line. I started thinking about it and then it was one of those things that I started paying attention to…. At most athletic events guys were going and urinating and leave, the stalls weren’t being used as much. Well women don’t have a choice but to use stalls…. And it didn’t matter if you were talking about a big arena like at the University of Iowa or you were talking at a high school basketball team… we don’t have enough bathrooms (P. Murphy, PC, 2018).

*Women made into feminists.*

Women’s growing participation in governance spurred some women’s activism forward (Obradovich 2001a). Gender balance advocates in Iowa were very committed to the pipeline idea that gender balance could foster increased women’s leadership, especially in elected office. Just like men’s awareness of gender inequality expanded through women’s inclusion, women also had their own awareness expanded regarding the forms and prevalence of sexism in society through their participation in gender-integrated spaces. In addition to encountering men and women allies, women legislators encountered sexism and a good’ ol boys network operating in the Capitol, sometimes something some had not dealt with or experienced in a similar way before. As women increasingly entered the workforce and, in my focus area, positions within community governance, they had their own empirical confrontations with the existing good ol’ boys networks that made up those institutions. They were also positioned in a place of relative power, such that they formed new connections with women Iowans and women’s groups, learning more about women’s rights issues. Both of these experiences served as a conscientization process that increased women’s egalitarian gender ideologies, remaking women policy makers into women policy makers who advocated for women’s rights.

Women entering the traditionally men domains of government and community governance
encountered stigma and isolation (National Commission 1976). Sometimes encountering these sexist and exclusive social networks felt like a new or particularly marked experience. Representative Doris Kelley (D-Black Hawk, 2007-2010) said that “the very first time…. I ever felt discriminated against was when I went to the Iowa House,… because it is a man—it is a little guy’s world. There really is the good ol’ guys.” Kelley had been a lifelong Republican until around 2006. She said, “I switched parties because the locals told me that I was too strong of a female for them” (D. Kelley, PC, 2018).

Gender ideology affected the women’s rights movement’s success, women’s power in the legislature, and reception to the idea of gender balance. Treatment of women has certainly changed from when women first entered elected office in Iowa through the present, but it also has been and continues to be marked by characteristics of a patriarchal gender regime: women’s invisibility and exclusion, men-centeredness, dismissiveness of women’s rights, not treating women as professional equals, treating women as a threat, and an active good ol’ boys network (Associated 1970b; Des 1983; Doderer 1942+; Hannon 1982, 1983-1994, 1986a, 1989/1990, 1993a, 1993b, 1995b, 1995c, 1995d; Hannon and Schenken 1991, Hansen 1970; Honorable 2016; Iowa City 1932; Iowa Democratic 1982; IWPC 1988+; Johnson 2014b; Lloyd-Jones 1971, 1974-1985a; 1974-1985b; 1982, 1984; Langer 2016; Martin 1990; Mullins 1983; National Commission 1976; Roos 1993; Schenken 1989a, 1989b, 1989c, 1991b; Senate 1987; Stout 2012; Time 1970; Women’s 1970). Attitudes toward and treatment of women and women in political leadership changed throughout the 1970s and moving forward, in many ways becoming more equitable but in other ways staying the same (Cooke 1979). For example, as of 2009 the Senate Republican caucus was steeped in a culture of sexual harassment (Anderson 2018; Biondi, Newhoff, and Kinney 2017; Carroll 2014, 2017; K. Anderson, PC, 2018; Noble, Pfannenstiel, and Petroski 2018; Obradovich 2018; Price 2013; Rodgers 2017). One lead perpetrator was the Senate Republicans’ senior research analyst, Jim Friedrich, who was assigned to the State Government Committee where gender balance went in 2009 (K. Anderson,
PC, 2018; Republican Party 2010b; State 1999b, 2009b). Friedrich’s behavior was lewd, prejudiced toward multiple minority groups, public, and continued without accountability, despite repeated complaints (Biondi, Newhoff, and Kinney 2017; Carroll 2014, 2017; Clayworth 2017). Then Representative and now Senate Democratic/minority leader Janet Petersen (D-Polk) noted that the Senate Republican caucus is still, in 2018, “not friendly to women” (J. Petersen, PC, 2018).

The exclusion and discrimination women encountered shifted their views and also fostered the formation of supportive women’s networks like the Iowa Women’s Legislative Caucus (IWLC), a place in which women were not stigmatized for their gender and were able to develop a shared interpretation of their gendered experiences in the legislature as well as indignation about this experience and direction regarding what to do about it. One example of this was Representative Sue Mullins (R-Kossuth, 1979-1988). Mullins did not consider herself a feminist when she first ran for state representative. However, she said that the experience of being in the Iowa legislature “would radicalize anyone!” After just one term in office she began an active agenda of working on women’s issues because, in her words, “only women will do it!” (ISU 1994).

Joan Lipsky is another of the many examples of this process. When she had first returned to Iowa, she had felt she “was now back to raise children and do club work.” She had not considered returning to a career, let alone politics (Schenken 1989b:7-10). Lipsky said her experience of women’s exclusion and women’s empowerment in the 1950s (as discussed in Chapter Two, getting a woman on the Cedar Rapids school board and advocating for women’s appointments to local board and commission appointments) “was sort of the beginning... of my feminist activities” and that it made her realize the importance of politics. She recalled feeling “shocked” in the late 1950s that the all men Linn County Board of Supervisors “would feel restrained in the language they used at meetings if a woman was present” (Schenken 1989b:7-10). Lipsky was also appointed to a few boards and commissions herself (Schenken 1989b). She became an Iowa state representative in

Numerous women entering the men-dominated Iowa legislature have detailed how this disembedding of gender segregation revealed to them the nature of sexism and drove them to advocate for women’s rights. Disembedding gender segregation in a society and institutions with gendered power imbalances fostered the creation of women-powered and women-supportive spaces for women advocates like the IWLC’s “fishing trip” retreats or like IWY. Kappie Spencer recalls returning to Iowa from the 1977 IWY National Conference as “not just a feminist, but a dedicated feminist—determined to affect as many of the [National Plan for Action] issues as possible” (Spencer 1996a).

When women are substantially underrepresented in these spaces, they face tokenization and stigmatization based on their identity. However, when they have a critical mass, they begin to be treated like individuals (National Commission 1976; Steele 2010; Thomas 1991). Gender balance is thus an opportunity to help ensure women serving on boards and commissions might be treated as equal decision-making partners.

Women entering the legislature were sensitized to women’s issues. Women’s positioning in a patriarchal structure generated support for women’s equality (Blekensaune and Quadagno 2003). Women legislators encountered sexism in the legislature and heard from women about the problems they faced, consequently developing or strengthening their feminist outlooks. Women in these
leadership roles had symbolically informative experiences with women contacting them and through women’s groups and networks. Due to the disembedding of gender segregation that placed women in legislator roles, women residents with “women’s issues” had a representative they felt more comfortable reaching out to. Hearing about women’s issues from women also made women legislators into feminists. For example, when Representative Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson, House 1963-1968, Senate 1969-1978, House 1981-2000) was first elected, she did not yet consider herself a feminist. She recalls, “I was a housewife who worked part time…. I didn’t know women had problems” (Schenken 1991c:5,9,10). Doderer said that even by the early 1970s she would not consider herself someone who really thought like a feminist, meaning “to be aware, not just of yourself, but of women in general. And to fight for women in general as well as specifically.” In 1989, Doderer recounted that in the early 1970s she said at a conference that she was not discriminated against. She felt like “all the other women… had been,” but she did not recognize yet how she had been “channeled from the day I was born” because of her gender (Schenken 1989c, 1991c). However, Doderer said that next,

Many [women] started to write me letters. I think the reason they wrote me letters is they felt more comfortable talking to a woman who they thought had some power as opposed to writing to a man who they thought didn’t care about their problem. And whether that is true or not, I heard the women’s troubles. Right after I became pro-tem, I got a lot of letters from women on divorce problems, child problems, ADC problems…. The more I talked to women who had real problems, the more I became a feminist. I realized that women were just as smart as men, but no one had told them they could do anything. Mostly they were told they couldn’t do things…. I realized the law was against them, and that’s when I started to change it. I don’t think any of the changes were outrageous. They were long overdue…. As you solve one problem, you get a story in the paper, and you hear about another problem. And I’m still hearing about problems (Schenken 1991c:5,9,10).

Senator Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson, 1979-1994) also became more attuned to women’s rights issues through her experiences as a women’s rights leader. In 1977 she was serving as chair of Iowa’s IWY state committee. Lloyd-Jones was active with the League of Women Voters of Iowa,
but was not yet in the legislature. She remembered that, even at age 47, IWY was a learning experience for her, departing from her education up to that point. She recalled showing the preliminary program to a friend of mine here at the University, and she looked it over and said, ‘Aren’t you going to have anything on domestic violence?’ And I said, ‘I’m sorry, I don’t know what you mean.’ And she told me that she had been abused by her husband for years, and it was just a total shock to me. I just didn’t know this happened (Schenken 1989a).

These processes gave or increased women civic leaders’ feminist consciousness, and these women thus prioritized women’s issues in their advocacy efforts. Disembedding gender segregation radicalized women, and in turn impacted their support and prioritization of gender balance, deradicalizing policy ideas like seeking parity immediately through a quota and instead socially redefining these policy goals as necessary and beneficial.

*Men made into potential allies.*

As women’s participation in the workforce increased, including into traditionally men-dominated fields and areas such as government and governance, women’s roles in society shifted, as did beliefs and norms around gender. This impacted how people conceived of women, their proper roles, and their qualifications. This occurred at an institutional and structural level as well as at an interpersonal level through relationships.

Institutional changes impacted men’s conceptions of gender balance. One explanation for the urban-rural gap in the 2009 gender balance vote was that in many urban areas women were already substantially represented in governance relative to comparable rural areas. Men and women legislators from these urban areas generally rejected arguments that gender balance could not be accomplished or that women were not qualified or interested. Legislators’ biases about women and women’s value, qualifications, and roles not only delimits women legislators’ agency, it has crossover into legislators’ views on issues of women’s representation on boards and commissions (Edelman
As women’s roles in society changed, so did evaluations of policies like gender balance.

Additionally, while men may have previously been insulated from hearing about or considering women’s issues, these issues became increasingly difficult to ignore, particularly as the women’s rights movement became a more sophisticated political force. Even in the absence of changed ideologies, women’s increased representation in the political sphere also meant women had increased political agency. Legislative leadership could not afford to ignore or dismiss the Iowa Women’s Legislative Caucus (IWLC), for example. In 1987, the Iowa Supreme Court both endorsed gender balance and took steps to make the judiciary more gender equitable as a strategic response to the judicial nominating commission issue. Women’s organizational and lobbying capacity through organizations such as the Iowa Women’s Political Caucus (IWPC) and Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) also meant it was politically strategic for men to take women’s concerns seriously.

New structures like the ICSW also led to cognitive changes. For example, Ralph Brown, who was appointed to the ICSW in 1970, exhibited man privilege, being admittedly unaware of women’s inequality and the blatant sexist laws that privileged men over women. Through his appointment, his consciousness was raised and he was able to advocate for women’s rights as well as spread the word about women’s issues through his men dominated networks in the state Republican party and in the legislature (Brown 2010; Durden 2003; Jensen 1970; Quad-City 1969). When the ICSW became gender balanced, which was not the norm for CSWs across the country, this increased the number of men genuinely engaging women’s rights issues (C. Nelson, PC, 2018). This also translated to change through relationships. Speaker Pat Murphy (D-Dubuque) recalled Francis Guinta as a man he was close to that contacted him asking for his support for the 2009 gender balance bill. Guinta
was from Dubuque and a local labor leader who had managed Murphy’s campaign. Guinta had served on the ICSW from 2000 to 2008 (Burt 1999; Failor 2004; ICSW 2005; P. Murphy, PC, 2018).

Institutional changes alter how people come together in relationships. For example, Brown said that he was comfortable working with women in the ICSW because, though his law school had few women, there were women involved in student government at his undergraduate institution (Jensen 1970). Contact theory argues that interactions among people who are different (e.g. men and women) can reduce prejudice toward the target identity, especially if they have a personal relationship, are working toward the same goals, and/or have equal status (Allport 1954; DellaPosta 2018). Relationships serve as an empirical confrontation and an educational opportunity. Men working with women who seem equally qualified can create dissonance with the view that women are less qualified (DellaPosta 2018). Indeed, men legislators often came away from their interactions with women legislators with the impression that women legislators were more diligent in their policy and legislative work than men usually were.

Though context and circumstance certainly matter, contact theory has empirical support. One study of U.S. adults from 2006 to 2010 demonstrated that (with or without controls) those with a gay or lesbian acquaintance were more likely to increase their support for marriage equality and belief that same-sex sexual relations were not wrong. This is also an example of how sustained engagement is important. In the study, these effects were especially pronounced among those who were less likely to have such a contact (DellaPosta 2018). This makes sense of legislators’ consciousness-raising when they came to the legislature from areas that lacked a substantial racial minority presence or from areas that did not have many women in leadership positions and then began working across difference. Representative Roger Thomas (D-Clayton) spoke about how his experience being in a caucus more diverse than his home community changed not only his perceptions of women, but exposed him to different ideas and gave him an opportunity to learn
about issues of gender and racial diversity and to hear about experiences with which he had been unaware (R. Thomas, PC, 2018). Intimate contact across difference on an equal playing field, working together in deliberation, creating policy, socializing, etc., can help humanize one another, break down stereotypes, and increase sensitivity to issues of diversity, inclusion, and people’s diverse needs and experiences. This happened through diverse appointed bodies as well as through men and women legislators and electeds serving together (as well as in nongovernmental sectors).

Representative Larry Pope (R-Polk), who had been in the legislature from 1979 through 1982, was working in 2009 as one of the League of Cities lobbyists (Iowa Legislature 2018c, 2019d; R. Scott, PC, 2018a). Pope had served alongside four Republican women legislators from his home county. ICSW E.D. Rachel Scott noted that Pope had an enduring and professional respect for the women legislators he worked with. Pope told Scott about Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson, House 1963-1968, Senate 1969-1978, House 1981-2000)’s involvement with women’s rights issues such as the ICSW, taking gender discrimination out of the code, and gender balance (R. Scott, PC, 2018a, 2018c). Doderer had passed away four years prior to the 2009 legislation (Minnette 2018). In 1991, Doderer also fondly recalled her relationship with Pope and his respect for her (Schenken 1991c). In 2009, the League of Cities initially opposed the gender balance legislation. Scott thinks Pope made a personal choice to not stand in the way of the local gender balance requirement. She thinks he probably could have stopped the legislation if he had wanted to—if he had actively opposed it, but he was able to take the official League position and then “just kind of not really insert himself” (R. Scott, PC, 2018a, 2018c). Pope told Scott that Doderer would be so proud and basically “for her, I’m not gonna tank this” (R. Scott, PC, 2018c).

Another study showed that men soldier recruits in the Norwegian Armed Forces demonstrated through a vignette experiment that they perceived women recruits as less suitable leaders for their squad. However, men randomly assigned to share a room and work in a squad with
women soldiers during their boot camp did not discriminate against women recruits as less suitable leaders for their squad (Finseraas et al. 2016). Developing personal relationships and having genuine interactions across difference is a pathway for change, for challenging preconceived gender notions and altering gender ideologies. This was the case among men legislators serving with women as well as among state board and commission members that, as a result of appointment projects and then the late 1980s gender balance law, are serving on gender diverse bodies.

Through these relations, women become humanized and de-othered. Men broke down stereotypes and become more supportive of diversity and inclusion and sensitized to diverse needs and experiences, including women’s issues. In the 1980s, some men legislators became strong allies to the women’s rights movement and to women legislators in their chamber. They accepted sexism as a structural problem that was prevalent in Iowan society and they supported challenging it. They had developed relationships of trust with their women colleagues and were willing to defer and support them on issues like gender balance that otherwise would not have been a priority. Men’s relationships with women gave them perspective on why such a policy is necessary, countered the idea that women are unqualified, and had the potential to generate trust and deference to women legislators, if they were somewhat ideologically aligned, to lead on these issues.

At the interpersonal level, relationships impacted men’s gender ideologies and understanding of and evaluation of issues like gender balance. As women’s roles in society and the workforce shifted, men and women encountered each other and interacted with each other regularly in professional and policy-oriented environments. Gender balance rules within political parties furthered this and was especially important in terms of state legislative policy because legislators often came through the party system. The state gender balance law also created opportunities for men and women to engage as individuals on state boards and commissions. While women entering traditionally men’s domains impacted women as they experienced exclusion and discrimination and
were connected to women’s stories in society about exclusion and discrimination, women’s increased presence in these institutions also impacted men’s perceptions of women: their roles, qualifications, and value, which in turn affects perceptions of appropriate women’s rights. This was especially realized as a result of men and women increasingly being in the same settings and as part of the same governing bodies together, interacting and developing professional and personal relationships. Breaking down exclusive social networks in these contexts also brought new perspectives to these spaces; connecting men and women’s social networks meant men were exposed to an array of women’s issues and perspectives to which they had previously been ignorant. Disembedding gender segregation meant that men developed a more egalitarian gender ideology.

Men’s family relationships also mattered. In 2009, House Republicans with daughters were more likely to support gender balance than those without (Iowa House 2018; Iowa Legislature 2018c; Jack 2015; State 2009a). There are a number of studies that also point to how men with daughters develop more egalitarian gender ideologies than those without daughters (McClintock 2013; Peck 2017). Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) took advantage of the important pull that relationships can have by contacting women family members in men legislators’ lives and facilitating them being included in the policy conversation around gender balance with the man legislator in their family. Representative Elesha Gayman (D-Scott) said this “personal connection” can help “break down barriers” and show another side as to why a policy might be important (E. Gayman, PC, 2018). Family may then become an important affinity group to be considered that otherwise may not have been part of the legislative decision-making process.

For allied men legislators, their cognitive liberation partially came from interacting with women legislators and having some buy-in in seeing that there are gender inequality issues in our society to rectify. They were willing to trust some women legislators that those women legislators
knew what they were doing and that their ideas were positive. For men legislators who sincerely believed in women’s rights and were in touch with women legislators or women’s rights advocates or advocacy organizations, the signals they received would have been that supporting gender balance made sense. Some men legislators were members of the IWPC or the League of Women Voters of Iowa. Some attended the IWLC lunch meetings. Representative Jack Hatch (D-Polk) recalls that having an active ICSW, with E.D. Charlotte Nelson in regular communication, gave him a way to know what he could do to be supportive of women’s rights that otherwise would have required a lot more effort on his part (J. Hatch, PC, 2018).

**Normalizing and Institutionalizing Gendered Representation Practices**

The status quo serves as a path of least resistance for social actors (Johnson 2014a). New ideas and change often require a period of adaptation and adjustment. Abrupt attempts at change are often met with resistance, especially if people have not been sufficiently primed to consider the change (Cummings, Bridgman, and Brown 2016). In Iowa, the legislature rejected initial legislative attempts for state and local gender balance.

The status quo has (by definition and through a social process) been institutionalized, and before change can happen, it has to be made more permeable, what social psychologist Kurt Lewin calls an “unfreezing” process (Cummings, Bridgman, and Brown 2016). The status quo can be unfrozen and even a different status quo normalized through sustained discussion and action around the proposed change, acclimating decision-makers to the idea. People’s conceptions of what is normal encompasses blending together perceptions of what is typical and practiced as well as perceptions of what is normatively ideal (Bear and Knobe 2016). I refer to this process as normatizing rather than normalizing. Normalizing refers to a practice becoming not abnormal, as in people do it and it is not considered strange. However, norms are about what should be done. The
process of normatizing and institutionalized gendered representation practices led not only to gender balance being the usual way of governing, but to it being conceived as the fair good government way of governing.

This approach is also referred to as creeping normality, which goes along with popular metaphors like the mythical frog who boils in a pot of water because it is slowly brought to boil from a comfortable temperature, or the camel who, after being given permission to put its nose inside a room (or tent), ends up with its whole body inside. Creeping normality is usually conceived of as a warning to prevent adapting to negative and potentially disastrous changes (Schneider, Leifeld, and Malang 2013). However, as a theory operationalizing how changes can become normal through incremental steps, there is no reason it cannot also be applied to positive changes. House Speaker Pat Murphy (D-Dubuque) spoke of his family’s experience with curbside recycling, instituted in the early 1990s. He remembers thinking of the change as pretty radical, maybe a little ridiculous (though he voted for it anyway): government forcing people to “clean [[their] garbage.” Murphy noted that now this is normal for his family and does not seem like a big deal. Murphy compared this to how people would “look [back] at…. the fights that they had” over women’s issues in the 1990s and consider the fact that people were fighting against these things to be “stupid” (P. Murphy, PC, 2018).

The process of normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices made gender balance familiar, more like the status quo than like a radical departure from existing practice. Broad shifts in society with women’s increased participation in the workforce and civic sector led to new norms around gender representation and inclusion. Legislators became used to women’s representation on boards and commissions, as well as women’s representation being a policy issue, through the prioritization of the issue of women in appointed office by the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) and Iowa Women’s Political Caucus (IWPC), with the ICSW having
an active roster project beginning in 1970 that substantially increased women’s representation. By the time Iowa’s state gender balance law was adopted, the ICSW’s appointments project had resulted in women having substantive overall representation on state boards and commissions, the highest out of any state, though this was still unequal and typed.

Nationally gender balance became institutionalized within the women’s rights movement as an equitable practice and positive goal in particular through 50-50 rules for political parties, the International Women’s Year (IWy) agenda, and following Iowa’s law from the late 1980s, the National Gender Balance project. In Iowa, where the women’s rights movement was among the strongest in the country, the embrace of this issue by the ICSW, IWPC, and in particular the strong bipartisan Iowa Women’s Legislative Caucus (IWLC), all three of which had relationship and coordination, was crucial to support for gender balance among legislative leaders and other legislators. Gender balance as a serious policy option for consideration was legitimated through its organizational support from the IWLC (and in 2009 an informal group of progressive women legislators), IWPC, ICSW, League of Women Voters of Iowa (LWVI), American Association of University Women (AAUW) Iowa branch, and in 1987 the Iowa Supreme Court’s endorsement and instituted internal practices. After the 1980s, local gender balance remained a policy item on the ICSW’s extensive list of policies it supported, and organizations such as the AAUW continued to work on the issue at the local level.

The 50-50 party rules also contributed to differential deradicalization among Democrats versus Republicans. The departure of policies between the Democratic and Republican parties (Democrats went to enforced quotas and Republicans to a gender balanced national committee, but otherwise voluntary encouragement) is indicative of their increasing separation on women’s rights issues, an issue that was not substantively partisanly marked prior to the 1970s (Freeman 2008). It also helps explain why the lead Iowan proponents of gender balance from the 1980s to present have
been Democratic women. State legislators, who must run for office, are involved in party politics. Democratic legislators thus participated in party processes embedded with gender balance requirements; the 50-50 rules then socialized them to view gender balance as a normal rather than radical practice.

In addition to political party 50-50 rules, legislators grew accustomed to the idea of gender balance as a policy tool through similar tools such as the political party balance law for boards and commissions, gender balance legislation tailored to specific boards and commissions, prior advocacy attempts aimed at more comprehensive gender balanced boards and commissions legislation, and through implementation of existing gender balance laws once they were part of Iowa code.

The 1987 state law played a key role in the 2009 legislation’s adoption. In 2009, when Iowa adopted the local gender balance law, Iowa was the only state with an outright state gender balance requirement. Having this state law and practice for over twenty years institutionalized gender balance, such that in 2009 most legislators viewed gender balance as how business is done rather than as some anti-Iowa big government radical quota system. Once people gain certain rights and benefits, it can be difficult to take them away. They become part of what is expected.

The 1987 legislation also normalized the idea of gender balance being a requirement and not just a suggestion. The state gender balance law shaped the political culture in Iowa and the expectations of policymakers around gendered representation on boards and commissions. Besides legislators still in the legislature in 2009 that were there in the late 1980s, there was also overlap and other shared experiences. For example, Senator Pam Jochum (D-Dubque) joined the House in 1993, and as part of the IWLC attended their June 1993 “fishing trip” retreat at Representative Betty Grundberg’s (R-Polk) condominium at Lake Panorama, with women legislators like Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson, House 1979-1986, Senate 1987-1994), Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson, House 1963-1968, Senate 1969-1978, House 1981-2000), and Johnie Hammond (D-Story, House 1987-
1994, Senate 1995-2002) that had led gender balance efforts, and actually discussed the issue with them (Hannon 1997). Jochum herself introduced a gender balance bill in 2006; she also served on the subcommittee for the 2009 bill.

By 2009, gender balance was already normative among legislators, including the internal legislative decision, continually affirmed across party lines, to require public appointments to their own study committees be gender balanced, and for Democrats active in party politics through their party’s continued use of internal delegate gender quotas. While 2009 was a much more contested environment than the late 1980s in terms of being partisan and in relation to issues of affirmative action, gender balance was viewed as how Iowa does business. The gender balance vote, rather than being something radical, was basically a vote to codify extending existing practices. This context is unique to Iowa; other states would encounter such legislation as a more radical change from their operating procedures.

Besides these macro changes, gender balance advocates also used what Senator Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) called the “piecemeal” approach (Schenken 1991c:22). This is also known as the “gradation” or “foot-in-the-door” technique, as illustrated by the saying, “if you ‘give them an inch, they’ll take a mile.’” The idea is that if one agrees to a small request, one is then more likely to make more significant concessions in the future (Freedman and Fraser 1996:195). This is a psychological technique named after the idea that a door-to-door salesperson who gets their foot in between the door and doorframe can continue their sales pitch (Daly 2011). Gaining initial agreement can lead to further agreement for bigger asks going forward (Cialdini et al. 1975).

This process need not be individual. It can also happen on a more structural level. Named the “layering” process, change can begin through small, minor changes that seem aimed at refining, correcting, amending, altering, adding, or revising current existing institutions. Because these incremental changes “do not… directly undermine existing institutions” and indeed appear aimed at
shoring up the existing system’s stability, they are often not controversial, usually do not generate much attention, and “typically do not provoke countermobilization by defenders of the status quo.” In this way, they are strategic, avoiding backlash while over time creating “new arrangements.” If these changes are qualitatively different from the original system, then they can lead to “deep transformation” as they become the dominant framework and replace the prior framework, resulting in “fundamental… institutional change” (Streeck and Thelen 2005:22-24).

This technique requires meeting someone where they are and then pushing them a bit beyond that. Iowa’s gender balance law in the 1980s could be viewed in part as a longer-term piecemeal approach: getting women the right to vote, getting women the right to hold office, getting women on boards and commissions, and increasing their appointments were all advocacy efforts that increased beyond the one before. However, it can be even more specifically applied to the 1980s gender balance law in terms of the technique that legislators used (when they did not yet have support to pass a comprehensive gender balance bill) in what became known as the “usual amendment.” Amending one piece of legislation that dealt with state boards and commissions at a time helped the legislature become more comfortable with and used to voting for gender balance, and its routineness institutionalized gender balance as a comfortable new status quo for boards and commissions in the state.

This same strategy was applied to local gender balance, with legislation addressing local boards and commissions amended to require gender balance on a piecemeal basis until support existed or the opportunity presented itself for a more comprehensive successful local gender balance law. Doderer said that the “piecemeal” strategy of applying gender balance to one board at a time was the strategy because “that was the only chance we had” (Schenken 1991c:22). But the strategy works, and Doderer used it for other things, too, “because people get adjusted to change. Then after you’ve done it a few times, it isn’t radical, or whatever the proper word is” (Schenken 1991c:22). The
passage of the 1986 legislation also increased the likelihood for successful passage of the bills strengthening and clarifying gender balance law in 1987 and 1988.

Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) also referenced this strategy and the need for getting stakeholders familiar and comfortable with an idea, making it something that they can adjust to as the new way of doing business. She said, “I think again it just takes that amount of time…. You plant the seed about a bill and why you think it’s important and then you nurture it and help it grow by educating others and making sure the public understands that it’s possible and that we’re gonna do everything we can to make sure it happens” (M. Mascher, PC, 2018a). In this case, “creeping normality” does not simply mean passing laws or agreeing to particular smaller changes. It can also represent a discursive shift, such that by the time a particular vote is before legislators, it almost seems like the proposed change is already what they do.

Prioritizing an Ideology of Good Governance

While social movement and public policy studies pay attention to the role of obstructionism in U.S. politics, policy formation, and political culture, outside of deliberative democracy work, similar attention to good governance has been limited. Good governance seems most operationalized by social movement organizations working on traditional government reforms (e.g. money in politics, freedom of information, redistricting, etc.). However, I found this to be a key ideology operationalized in Iowa to move gender balance forward.

Governance refers to the “practices and norms meant to facilitate the processes of government and civic decision-making” (National 1999:30). Governance is a broader term than government in that it includes activities and collaborations both with and beyond government that are oriented toward how a community operates (Bingham 2005). There are a range of definitions of good governance, but they generally come together around consistent threads. Good governance
involves: openness: transparency, clarity, predictability, and accessibility; professionalism and accountability: honesty, absence of corruption, fairness, impartiality, and equity; democratic participation: robust civil society and community engagement in governance through institutionalized means from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors; diversity and representation; efficient and effective processes and outcomes; and political stability and legal rules (Siregar 2019). Good governance requires “those in authority to pursue the good of the political community they govern” and gives individuals the right “to be governed in a good manner,… conducive to the attainment of human rights” (Bach-Golecka 2018:90,91). The concept of good governance and people’s right to it makes the concept one that “enable[s] the population to make claims for the proper conduct of public authorities” (Bach-Golecka 2018:93).

The process of prioritizing an ideology of good governance framed gender balance as good policy. Gender balance became about instituting good government practices, in contrast to enabling a good ol’ boys system. It was about holding government accountable, whether that was holding Governor Terry Branstad (R) accountable for his 1987 appointments that flouted the 1986 law or holding local governments accountable in 2009 for not making their own substantial progress toward gender balance on their own. For some legislators, good governance also fostered support for gender balance as a result of a commitment to pragmatism. In prioritizing good governance, ideas about gender balance as a radical or discriminatory quota both were deprioritized as well as made incongruent. Can a policy that is oriented toward good governance and contesting the good ol’ boys network really be discriminatory?

The Good Ol’ Boys

Good governance stands in opposition to the ‘good ol’ boys’ network. Good ol’ boys functions similarly to an ideograph. It is employed for political means to connect gender balance as a remedy
for the good ol’ boys club, as connected to good governance ideology. Everyone is opposed to the ‘good ol’ boys,’ though no one claims membership. While no one shared a specific definition of good ol’ boy with me, it functions more like a collective action frame than like an ideograph. Unlike with terms like quota or fairness, everyone referencing the good ol’ boys seemed to be referring to the same general exclusive and culturally biased practices, processes, and networks. This frame was not available to opponents to operationalize against gender balance (McGee 1980).

This was a salient frame. Unlike the ‘quota’ ideograph, the term ‘good ol’ boys’ came up regularly both in my archival research and during my interviews, and was used by opponents and supporters alike. It was used in direct connection to support for gender balance, whether by Representative Todd Taylor (D-Linn, 1995-2019) stating that “we’re trying to open some doors here where it used to be a good ol’ boys network” or by Representative Roger Thomas (D-Clayton, 1997-2014) stating that gender balance was “as opposed to the good ol’ boys system running everything” (R. Thomas, PC, 2018; T. Taylor, PC, 2018). The good ol’ boys network serves as an explanation for women’s exclusion and implies that gender balance is not going to occur naturally; it requires government intervention.

Women legislators experienced the good ol’ boys network through their own exclusion and thus saw a need for policies that intervened against it. For example, women legislators in the 1980s sometimes had difficulty getting subcommittee appointments (Hannon 1986a, 1995b, 1995c). Over in the House, when Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) came to the legislature in 1983, she served for six years on the Judiciary and Law Enforcement Committee (1983-1988). Despite it being one of the busiest committees in the legislature, with many bills going through it, the bills did not go to women to chair (to serve as subcommittee chair and floor manage). Hammond recalls having a total of two bills assigned to her over six years, one that was a legalizing act and another that she was told to kill and not run. Representative Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) was also on the committee
from 1981 to 1988 and similarly did not “do much better in terms of committee assignments.”

Representative Kay Chapman (D-Linn), an attorney, was Vice Chair from 1983 to 1986 and a member thereafter and also did not get assignments. Hammond said of this that,

> This is the good old boys committee in the extreme, and I have no role here…. I’m not sure these folks really want to discriminate against women. I think it’s just because they think about, ‘Who can floor manage this bill?’ They’ve got a friend there on that committee, and they know that friend can do a good job (Schenken 1991a:47).


A good ol’ boys culture was still in operation in the legislature in 2009, with women legislators often not part of men legislators’ social networks and social culture (Anderson 2018; Basu 2009; Eby 2009b, 2009d; K. Anderson, PC, 2018; Mahoney 2013; Ridolfi 2009). Legislators who live further from the Capitol live in Des Moines during the week and many attend frequent lobbyist-sponsored receptions (Basu 2009; K. Anderson, PC, 2018). In 2009, based on the lobbyist disclosures filed by July, there were 100 receptions between January and April, sometimes more than
one on a given evening. The Iowa Farm Bureau had a reception on Tuesday, February 24, spending over $15,000; the next day the Iowa Hospital Association spent over $2,000 on their reception. The Iowa Bankers Association spent over $8,000 on their reception (Basu 2009). At most of these receptions, “Lots of alcohol flowed and they would live it up.” After lobbyist receptions, legislators’ socializing would often continue at local bars (K. Anderson, PC, 2018).

In 2009, Representative Kent Sorenson (R-Warren) was in the House (and voted against gender balance). Sorenson resigned from office in 2013 after pleading guilty and being sentenced to 15 months in prison for campaign finance violations, including accepting illegal payments tied to Michele Bachmann and Ron Paul’s presidential campaigns. In 2015 Sorenson was arrested for domestic abuse of his wife (Wikipedia 2018). Another state representative, Erik Helland (R-Polk), who also voted against gender balance, was arrested for drunk driving in June 2010; nevertheless, five months later his caucus elected him majority whip (Belin 2010c).

The Center for Public Integrity’s 2003 report on states’ lobbying regulations and compliance placed Iowa 42nd out of 50, and the Center for Public Integrity said in 2006 that things had since gotten worse. There are a number of areas of disclosure lobbyists are not required to report (e.g. business dealings), and the Senate and House Ethics Committees, made up of legislators that themselves are lobbied, administer the state’s lobbying rules (Basu 2006, 2009). Part of how a good ol’ boys system functions is for decision-making to occur in both informal settings and outside of an open democratic process. Iowa legislative culture includes many limits to open government. As of 2008, “enforcement of open-meeting and open-records laws continue[d] to be rare” (Rood 2008b). “Backdoor deals” occurred frequently in the legislature, increasing from 2002 through 2009 (Rood 2009).

The good ol’ boys network was marked in the legislature by corruption, inappropriate partying, sexual harassment, closed door decision making, and especially exclusion of women from
access to power. It is not necessarily an institution or space without women or a men-only policy. Instead, men are in power, seemingly unaware or unbothered that they are excluding women in the process, extending their power to other men and operating in ways that make women having a genuine impact on decision-making relatively inaccessible.

The good ol’ boys system fosters the identity component for collective action, which is about defining the “we” but also often about defining the opposition (Gamson 1992b). In this case, the constructed enemy was the good ol’ boys system. The good ol’ boys network was the common antagonist that no one wanted to appear to support. This was a powerful frame, and gender balance opponents necessarily had to locate their position within a framework of also being in support of women’s rights and against corrupt good ol’ boy government. This frame also connected to other frames and ideologies, from egalitarianism and open government to making sense of the frame that women were being excluded from appointed office due to insular social networks.

**Good Government**

Gender balance is related to good government through opposition to the good ol’ boys network and all that entails, but gender balance is also connected to good government through valuing boards and commissions as ways for community members to contribute to governance and through public administration and democratic governance best practices of inclusion and diversity.

The strongest advocates of gender balance were primarily motivated by their egalitarian gender ideology. However, this overlapped with good governance, as they felt women should have proportional representation in government, that women were being kept out due to practices antithetical to good government, and that increasing women’s representation in government was necessary for getting more women-friendly representation and public policy outcomes. The issue of gender balance on boards and commissions reflected good government in two additional related
ways. The first was that boards and commissions are a way of connecting citizens to government, giving citizens advisory, decision-making, and/or oversight capacities. The second was that having diversity on boards and commissions is considered a best practice in order to ensure optimal processes and outcomes.

Good government was also articulated and important in particular ways at different times during the gender balance campaigns. In 1986, good government was part of the work of the state reorganization committee. Representative Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson), socialized through her experiences with the League of Women Voters of Iowa, was committed to diligent, ethical, and considerate government reform. She found the inclusion of gender balance quite germane to their work. Catt Center E.D. Dianne Bystrom said that in the 1980s gender balance bill was not partisan in part because “it was framed as part of government reform” (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018).

This good government theme continued for 1987 and 1988. In 1987, the gender balance legislation was, for many (especially Democratic) legislators, about holding the (Republican) governor accountable and ensuring he implemented legislative mandates. For women’s rights advocates, it was important that the subject of accountability was gender balance. For others, especially Democrats who were in the opposite party of Governor Terry Branstad (R), the subject matter may have been less important. In 1988, the gender balance legislation was a noncontroversial fix to make it better written policy. This further held the governor accountable to the exact intent of the legislation and addressed an oversight that allowed the governor to make gender imbalanced appointments to boards with an even number of members.

In 2009, part of the push for having gender balance be a requirement rather than a goal or recommendation was due in part to the 1987 experience and ensuring accountability. It was also because good government means adopting policies that work effectively. Finally, as noted above, good government in 2009 was about breaking up the good ol’ boys networks as well as about
particular good governance practices that were involved in that, such as encouraging broader and more diverse participation and having a transparent and open government that advertised board and commission members so that anyone could apply, as opposed to a system of favoritism and cronyism. Ensuring that local government appointers use open processes and recruit and ask women necessitates a law that has a requirement rather than one that simply encourages gender balance.

**Pragmatism**

Gender balance was also viewed as a sensical policy rather than as a radical quota because it was crafted to be pragmatic. Support for gender balance, as well as a lack of intensive opposition, came from those who viewed policy as a toolbox and had a commitment to, in their positions as state legislators, working with their colleagues to craft the best public policy they could to move Iowa forward. This was the mentality of rolling up one’s sleeves and diving down into the mechanics and details of the legislation to figure out what was possible and what made sense and what did not, crafting policy that would cause more good than harm.

This is encompassed by the ideology of pragmatism. While pragmatism is often set up in the social movement literature as in competition with ideology, here it is reconceptualized as an ideology (Heywood 2017). Pragmatism as a bound reaction to circumstance is not ideological: When Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) agreed to remove the reporting requirement, this was in reaction to the bill getting pulled off the floor agenda and Representative Geri Huser (D-Polk) being part of the Six Pack and therefore potentially able to kill the bill. This was constraint; it was “contingent” pragmatism that serves an “instrumental” purpose, being “partly about survival” (Moore 2005:2,10).

Pragmatism as an ideology is “the adoption of pragmatism itself as an appropriate and virtual professional orientation, typically connected to notions of adapting a balanced, ‘non-political’ view”
(Moore 2005:2). It is a commitment to pragmatism for the sake of pragmatism, pragmatism as an “appropriate, ‘balanced’ and virtuous approach to professional life” (Moore 2005:10). Legislators who subscribe to this ideology enmesh it in their self-concept, it is a “professional identification” (Moore 2004:125). Legislators think of “being a good [legislator as being]]] competent and reflective practitioners,” “a competent craftsperson and technician,” focused on being ‘effective’ and on “what works” rather than being “political” (Moore 2004:3-4,40-41).

For those who prioritized their commitment to the policy making process and were involved in this legislation, gender balance moved forward as an acceptable or even good public policy. Outside of those driven to support this legislation because of their egalitarian gender ideology, those who engaged heavily with the bill and activated their pragmatism ideology prioritized that commitment to good governance over thoughts about patriarchy or individualism or whether systemic inequality exists. Thinking of law crafting as making use of a policy toolbox, these legislators were concerned with whether the bill seemed to move Iowa forward and whether it was feasible and could be well implemented. They had a commitment to “democratic processes.” Rather than think of themselves as a liberal or conservative, these policy makers saw themselves as drawing from what works, using the policy toolbox, keeping an “open mind,” and seeking out and following best practices (Moore 2004:123,133). Pragmatism is marked by an eschewing of politics and a focus on “what works” (Heywood 2017:10).

Education researcher Alex Moore interprets pragmatism as conservative because “it becomes an ideology that [necessarily] conceals its own ideological nature” and “condemn[s]] ideology as undesirable” (Moore 2005:11). For Moore, considering educational practice, this means that pragmatism “sidelines issues of gender, race, class, and power relations in the classroom,” though I would challenge Moore on this and argue that one could hold multiple ideologies and, for example, simultaneously subscribe to gender egalitarianism and pragmatism (Moore 2004:137).
Mascher seems to do so in her commitment to gender balance and women’s opportunities while simultaneously having a commitment to the subcommittee process and leaning in to work with Representative Doug Struyk (R-Pottawattamie) and other committee members to listen to concerns and craft policy together, even if she may be able to have enough votes without doing so.

Struyk and some of the other Republicans on the committee seem to be drawing on pragmatism as their primary ideology connecting them to the gender balance legislation without it interacting strongly with other supportive or oppositional ideologies. They do not interpret gender balance as inherently discriminatory, nor do they all see a problem with gender imbalance or view it as something that needs fixing. Nevertheless, they lean in to crafting the best policy they can and evaluating what is effective, focusing on the “local [and] instrumental” (Moore 2004:12). They do not go searching for giving the policy meaning from a feminist or identity-devoid perspective. While Moore argues that deference to general institutional practices and norms is problematic, if institutional practices and norms such as gender balance and affirmative action are normative, pragmatism can be oriented toward advancing these causes rather than questioning or challenging them (at least advancing them in comparison to opposition to such practices). The House Republicans who subscribed to pragmatism as ideology were comfortable hearing Mascher call opponents anti-woman or Horbach call supporters discriminatory because they can bypass these ideological fights and not engage with external politics. However, they were willing to engage with the internal politics of working with Mascher on crafting and adopting gender balance policy legislation (Moore 2004).

Potential opponents may not support or care about advocates’ primary frame (e.g. in this case women’s rights), but that does not mean they will not support the policy before them. Struyk voted for gender balance because, while he did not think gender imbalance was a problem, he thought the bill was fair and valued the give and take policy construction he had engaged in on the
House State Government Committee. Similarly, Representative Kevin Koester (R-Polk), who was also on the House State Government Committee, felt “there was no problem to be solved. It was just a view of what is most equitable and what’s best for representation.” Koester said he knew of “no significant board… at a local level that failed to respect equality for women in terms of the voice in the process. So it was a philosophical and policy discussion, that started a little too strong and landed well” (K. Koester, PC, 2018). Advocates can choose to discount stakeholders like Struyk and Koester, both of whom did not identity women being less than 20% of county board members as a problem. Or advocates can engage them, in this case through their ideology of pragmatism, and craft a policy that they feel makes sense and is feasible and will be good for Iowa, and therefore that they can support. In this case they were engaged, invested, and had some ownership in the legislation. Genuinely connecting with and working with these legislators meant being open to compromise, but it also meant bringing more people along.

To this end, crafting policy was not about subscribing to or rejecting quotas; it was about figuring out the best way to craft public policy that would accomplish its intended goal(s) while minimizing any negative consequences. Neoliberal ideology tended to be an obstinate barrier to gender balance support. While the group of legislators who subscribed to the pragmatism ideology certainly did not consistently favor government intervention, this was nonetheless a different set of legislators than the ones who vocally allocated for a market fundamentalist vision for government.

In 1986, the members of the conference committee really had to engage with one another and the state reorganization bills passed by the House and Senate. The 1987 legislation also required a good deal of engagement and work, as gender balancing the judicial nominating commissions was more complicated than other boards and commissions, since half of state and district judicial nominating commission members were elected by Iowa members in good standing of the bar (attorneys).
The 2009 bill was more partisan, with 16 Republicans in total voting for the measure. While some right-wing Republicans were outright opposed to the 2009 legislation (Republicans in the late 1980s in Iowa were overall supportive, but the party shifted ideologically to the right between the two laws), some moderate Republicans who were very committed to the idea of crafting public policy for the good of the state engaged actively with the legislation, become invested in its outcome, and through that engagement come to support it. These engaged legislators were focused on the bill's pragmatic mechanics; even for those with less enthusiasm for the end goal, their inclusion in crafting the final legislation invested them in supporting a good government bill with their co-crafters rather than deferring to the Iowa State Association of Counties, the House minority floor manager, or traditional frames put forward by Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama), Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story), and others.

Committee member Representative Jeff Kaufmann (R-Cedar) said the House Republican votes formed “a familiar list of legislators,” most but not all of whom fell into the camp of co-sponsoring bills across party lines and collaborating to “try to get something done” rather than being obstructionist or worrying about credit (J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018). The House Republicans who voted for gender balance also tended to be more urban and moderate Republicans, though there were exceptions (Iowa legislature 2018c; State 2009a). Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn), one of the House Republicans to vote for the legislation, said that, to her, being in a purple state meant that maintaining “good relations” with the opposite party is useful, as “you never know when” the majority will again be the minority. She said, “In Iowa it’s super smart to be more thoughtful about how you do things and not insulting people’s ideas because it’ll come back to bite you” (R. Schulte, PC, 2018). Not everyone abides by this rule, but as Schulte noted, if Democrats take over in an upcoming election, the “Republicans that have treated the Democrats poorly… are gonna have a rough go” (R. Schulte, PC, 2018).
All Republican votes in 2009 were in the House. While there may be other reasons for this (e.g. partisanship, ideology), one additional reason may be that the House engaged with the legislation more than the Senate. The bill went through the House first, and while there were conversations during that time on the Senate side, Senate amendment votes were all just to bring the bill into compliance with the House version. House Republicans were the ones to dive in.

Representative Donovan Olson (D-Boone) shared that sometimes there can be “some animosity” with bills coming from the opposite chamber. Olson said that for example, “I don’t like the Senate telling us what to do…. Those sort of things happen” (D. Olson, PC, 2018).

However, the factor that most determined whether a House Republican voted for or against gender balance was whether or not they were part of the House State Government Committee. This committee has historically been known for being able to work together and move policy forward in Iowa, including gender balance legislation and many of the “usual amendments” in the late 1980s. The Republicans on this committee were mostly the pragmatic Republicans, those committed to the idea of crafting public policy for the good of the state. While I heard from some of those Republicans that they thought this was a good bill, I never heard the same level of passion about the bill’s merits that I heard from the bill’s primary advocates, who in 2009 were all Democrats. They had different social networks and cognitive landscapes. Struyk, ranking member on the committee, said that the bill “was certainly not on my radar. Was it something that jumped up at me and said, We gotta do this? No” (D. Struyk, PC, 2018). However, he found his way to support it. Struyk worked with Mascher, who chaired the committee, to collaborate and create bipartisan legislation. Struyk said, “If there was a way,… we would do it.” He said that it was a matter of “reasonable people working together to solve common problems,” and that that was him paraphrasing Senate Majority Leader Mike Gronstal (D-Pottawattamie) (D. Struyk, PC, 2018).

The House Republicans on the State Government Committee generally also shared this
philosophy, and all of them voted for gender balance except for Representative Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton), who had a negative across-party relationship at this time, part of the fall-out from when she had switched parties. Working on the legislation at the committee level, House Republicans became invested in the legislation in a way that positioned them differently than other House Republicans who may have had similar ideological leanings. On the House floor, some Republicans took their cue from the Republican floor manager, Pettengill, while the other House Republicans from the State Government Committee were invested enough in the legislation to follow their own lead.

This was able to happen because Mascher chose to engage the Republicans on the committee in the bill. Representative Doris Kelley (D-Black Hawk) noted that this was not necessary. She said, “They could’ve passed that. They could've passed that bill without any Republicans, because we had control” (D. Kelley, PC, 2018). This may be numerically true, but it also did not mean the bill would go through smoothly, which means it might not have ended up getting a floor vote (P. Murphy, PC, 2018). Regardless, Mascher was committed to good governance, which meant engaging with the committee and stakeholders and holding subcommittee hearings on the bill. Kaufmann, speaking to me in 2018 while chair of the Iowa Republican Party, said that while Mascher could “ram” a bill through (“she could run you over if she needed to”), “Mary also has a streak of pragmatism in her, that if she has a bill that she truly believes in,… she also was capable of reaching out” (J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018).

Mascher’s commitment also came from Democrats’ experience in the minority. Mascher said that when Republicans were in control, many times they would skip the subcommittee hearings that were supposed to have 24 hour notice and provide an opportunity for the public to speak and instead just walk a bill around to get signatures. “We were adamant that we were not going to do that…. We were going to make sure that we held our subcommittees, that we actually had public
input. People put the notifications out and anybody and everybody could come, because again that’s the only time [for public testimony]” (M. Mascher, PC, 2018b). Representative Cindy Winckler (D-Scott) also shared this perspective, that being “in the majority, we wanted to make sure that we did not treat them as we were treated. We were trying to set an example, so we were much more inclusive” (C. Winckler, PC, 2018). With the committee chair working to engage the minority party in crafting bipartisan legislation regularly, and inviting them into a process that, as Kaufmann said, “I know this meant a great deal to her,” committee members responded and engaged (J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018).

The pragmatism ideology also explains why these Republicans had sincere and serious concerns about practicality and implementation and why they were comfortable supporting the bill once barriers to its perceived feasibility were removed. Iowa Commission on the Status of Women E.D. Rachel Scott had been surprised the Republicans on the committee did not want to exempt rural communities. These legislators had felt that it was not fair to women living in rural communities, but this was again less ideological and more practical. Struyk said that Mascher accepting some of their amendments did not require them to vote for the bill, but made that the right thing to do as a colleague who co-crafted the bill. Struyk said, “If you ask me to take your amendment, okay, and I do, I really don’t expect you to be voting against my bill. If we’re gonna work together, you should be helping. Mary and I worked together” (D. Struyk, PC, 2018). Struyk here speaks to the compulsion to reciprocate (Caldini 2009). Mascher accepted, for example, the good faith effort clause, addressing concerns expressed from local government organizations. In exchange, Struyk and others supported the legislation. This, too, is a pragmatic decision. This “social exchange” is characterized by trust and reciprocity, in which one actor doing something for another creates “diffuse future obligations,” which in this case were at least substantially met through voting for the legislation (Blau 1974:209). Not voting for the legislation could have damaged the overall
working relationship.

Pragmatism led to the 1986 law having “as much as possible” in it in order to provide flexibility for technical and professional boards, the 1987 law removing that clause because it turned out to render the whole law ineffectual, and including the “good faith effort” in the 2009 law to address concerns raised by local governments, especially in more rural areas of the state. However, it also is the reason that all of these laws were drawn up written with the intent of being a requirement. Anything less and the only guarantee of changes to women’s representation would be based on civic pressure on appointers. A requirement means that the policy should have an actual effect and achieve at least some of what it intended. A focus on accountability, interrupting the good ol’ boys network, and crafting effective policy contributed to legislation with an outright gender balance requirement and to rejecting attempts to make the policy a goal rather than a mandate.

*Process Reproduction*

Implementation of these gender balance laws has continued to stimulate these three processes—disembedding gender segregation, normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good governance, further shifting engaged Iowans’ perceptions of gender, governance, and affirmative action. In order to comply with gender balance laws, state and local governments have had to reach out across networks, change their networks, recruit and ask women to serve, recruit and ask men to serve for traditionally women-dominated boards, and practice good government in terms of things like open advertising, having an application process, etc. The law also fosters new spaces for men and women to co-govern, and both the Catt Center’s reporting on gender balance at the local level and newspaper reporting on violations at the local level lead to conversations and attention to its purpose and vision. Applying these open government principles and being more thoughtful about recruitment and appointments has also led
to more diverse appointments beyond as well as intersecting with gender. The law has created new expectations in terms of norms for governing and appointments, contributing to an ethos of good governance and diminishing space for good ol’ boys networks to function.

Women’s lack of appointments was in part due to insular social networks and an embedded gender segregation. To implement the law, people are reaching out through and forming new networks and noticing women who are qualified. With appointments projects, men are not necessarily developing their own networks of women to appoint or getting more involved themselves in women’s organizations, though they are using networks of women. For example, when the governor had trouble finding a woman for a particular board, he reached out to the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW), which advertised the position and in turn received applications (Nelson 1993c). This segregation makes sense of how much of society is structured, from sisterhoods and men’s clubs to gendered roles in churches to fraternities and sororities. However, this is changing, from Boy Scouts welcoming girls to communities transitioning from gender-specific events like Daddy Daughter Dances to gender-inclusive events like Family Dances. As gender balance continues to increase, and as more women are elected, these networks begin to expand, intermingle, and meld together.

The state gender balance law is being implemented judiciously. While implementation of the local gender balance requirement has been uneven, local boards and commissions are much more gender balanced in 2018 than they were in 2009. Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn) explained that the gender balance law requires appointers to challenge their beliefs about gender and qualifications through creating an empirical confrontation between the law and more traditional beliefs. She said, “So what it did, it challenged them to have to think about it, to be like, You know, there probably are some women that would be more qualified. Why haven’t we thought about them?” (R. Schulte, PC, 2018).
Implementation has also positively shifted many people’s perceptions of the law, including among people who opposed it in 2009. People are becoming used to thinking of it in a positive light, or at minimum as the normal operating procedure, and in shifting their views on the role of government regarding enacting gender balance are also contributing toward a shift in their relationship to the idea of affirmative action. Increased gender balance practices and appointments reinforce this as normal.

In terms of disembedding gender segregation, the aftermath of the 2009 gender balance bill provides further evidence that breaking down exclusive social networks and increasing interactions across gender in policy-making changes people’s views on policies like gender balance and on women’s qualifications and their roles in society. Theoretically, this idea gives evidence to the ability of diverse intimate relationships and contact having potential to increase empathy and support for social change in support of target populations. Just like some legislators, through their encounters with diverse colleagues, altered some of their worldviews, these boards and commissions create genuine interactions across difference and can challenge preconceived notions, including opening up people’s perceptions of gender roles in our society. Both increased gender diversity on varied boards and commissions and the relationships fostered on these bodies help dismantle gender typing that considers women’s roles to be primarily in domains like the library or social welfare board and men’s domains to be in land use and economic oriented boards. Gender balance laws have also led to an empirical confrontation between the inclusion of nonbinary individuals and laws, rules, and procedures oriented toward the gender binary. The reckoning and forward movement on this within the Iowa Democratic party and national Democratic party are examples of continued shifts related to disembedding gender segregation. The ICSW, American Association for University Women (AAUW), and Catt Center have created new projects and forged new relationships since the 2009 legislation in order to assist with implementation and create public accountability for
implementation.

In terms of normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, the gender balance law has had a symbolic impact. As gender balance became the default for how local governments operate, the concept has continued to be internalized as normal. For example, Representative Jeff Kaufmann (R-Cedar), now a county board supervisor for Cedar County and Iowa Republican Party Chair, said that gender balance has “become such second nature now” for what Cedar County does. Indeed, Kaufmann observed that many people think of gender balance now as something “we have to have,” while at the same time, “it doesn’t feel like a mandate anymore.” Instead, Kaufmann said, “It’s really become a part of the everyday process of what you do if you are on a board of supervisors or city council” (J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018). Similarly, political scientist Kim Lanegran said that, in her interviews following the law’s implementation, “people all over the state and of all political persuasions… say it makes absolute sense that we do this.” Lanegran said even “stauchly Republican councilors” felt that “of course we can find as many women to do this as there are men to do it.” They viewed the law as a “common sense” way to put “skilled” community members from across their community, “a variety of voices,” onto their boards and commissions (K. Lanegran, PC, 2018).

After the law was implemented, a number of people who had opposed it in 2009 shifted their views. As they became used to gender balance, they began to think of it in a relatively positive light. This included shifts in views of whether women are qualified and in the role of government in enacting gender balance (affirmative action). People’s experiences in the aftermath of the legislation spurred personal growth in their views on gender, government, and representation. Part of the reason for this was because women’s lack of appointments was due to insular social networks and an embedded gender segregation. Creating genuine interactions across difference and forcing people to make changes (such as broadening their recruitment networks) can challenge their preconceived
Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn) said that gender balance has contributed toward helping change how people think of women in leadership. Schulte said that gender balance made it okay now to have women as Speaker, as governor, as senator, and everybody voted for that. So it just raised the bar of expectation for women, cuz you don’t have people now questioning whether Kim Reynolds can be governor. She is governor, right? So I think it helped kind of start a conversation in Iowa, cuz we were all very, very stuck in our ways (R. Schulte, PC, 2018).

Gender balance as a normatized practice interacts with the idea of Iowa as fair and exceptional to continue to contribute toward acceptance of Iowa’s unique gender balance law. It can be contextualized as part of Iowa’s culture and background of trying to support all Iowans. Gender balance becomes part of Iowa pride regarding how it does business in a way that is fair.

In terms of good governance, perceptions about the appropriate role of government, including executive power and/or local mandates from the state, differentiated support for the legislation. However, now that the legislation is law and not part of a legislative campaign, good governance means that local government organizations’ relationship to the law, like that of the governor’s office, is now one of education and assisting with implementation. This change in positional relationship to the bill removes concerns about government roles as predominant ideology. People in these positions can now address the law in terms of their feelings on the substance of the matter instead. Now people like Iowa State Association of County Supervisors lobbyist Mike Wentzien, who because of their positionality were opposed to gender balance, can support the law as beneficial. This is in part still because of their positionality, but also because they have observed the law’s impacts. Originally Wentzien thought of the legislation as “totally unnecessary” and felt like it was attacking local officials by falsely accusing them of “being discriminatory towards females” (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018). Looking back, Wentzien modified his position. He reflected that,
The main purpose of the bill was to try to create gender balance on boards and agencies appointed by the supervisors. Well, it worked…. So, it got done. So, you know what? I didn’t fall on my sword. I didn’t bleed. I didn’t. It wasn’t a bad deal. It’s something that ended up being beneficial to all county government because balances were then sought after and ultimately obtained…. I don’t like being on the losing side, but in this case I think ultimately I was not on the losing side. We were all on the winning side (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018a).

League of Cities E.D. Alan Kemp also expressed a more positive view of the legislation in 2018 compared to in 2009. He still felt there is cultural change that needs to occur before sufficient numbers of women (“the next generation of women”) feel they have the interest and/or time to serve in appointed and elected office, and that that change is going to take some time. However, he said that “it’s good that we did this [gender balance]…. If we don’t make it a requirement, nothing will get done…. It certainly puts this on mayor’s minds when they look at filling these commissions” (A. Kemp, PC, 2018). While Kemp feels like this is a longer-term transition, his reflection on the law seems to bypass his concern over local mandates and focus on the benefits gender balance can bring.

In addition to the law shifting some Iowans’ perceptions around gender, it has also impacted some Iowans’ ideas regarding governance. Catt Center Director Dianne Bystrom said she felt that the law impacted how people think about not just gender, but issues like the role of government, affirmative action, and government service (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018). In particular, the law led appointers to be more thoughtful and intentional about not just considering gender but bringing diversity and different and new stakeholders to appointed bodies. To implement the law, local bodies also had to consider open appointment processes that would lead to appointments beyond their insular networks. Gender balance impacted at least one aspect of how local governments interact with the community.
GENDER BALANCE AS NORMATIVE: WITHSTANDING IOWA’S RIGHT-WING GOVERNMENT

Occasionally gender balance has proved difficult for particular boards, in particular gender-typed licensing boards, which was why Hammond had included the “as much as possible” in the original 1986 language, “trying to be reasonable” (Bullard 1988; J. Hammond, PC, 2018). In order to make gender balance easier to implement, other changes were also made to boards and commissions. For example, Hammond believes that in reorganization they got rid of the Watchmakers Board, which was both an unnecessary board for the state to have and a potentially more difficult board to find women to serve on (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). The governor’s office also pushed for an exemption for the Board of Nursing in 1988, but legislators resisted this and future changes, instead in this case amending the Board of Nursing membership requirements in other ways. The Board of Nursing had been required to have three members who teach at a four-year college, nursing school, or area community college, but in 1988 there was only one man nurse who fit that criteria. They updated the requirement such that only one of the Board of Nursing members had to be in one of those teaching roles. Changes have been similarly made to the Engineering and Land Surveying Examining Board and the Commission on Veterans Affairs to ensure gender balance can be adhered to faithfully (Bullard 1988; Des 1988; Hammond Nd, 1995; Iowa Legislative 1988; Iowa Legislature 1988b, 1992b; J. Hammond, PC, 2018; Petroski 1987; Women’s 1988a).

There have been two instances in which Iowa has created exemptions from gender balance, one in 2000 and one in 2018. In 2000, the commission on tobacco use and control exempted the three youth members of the commission from political party balance and gender balance. These three members are selected at the annual statewide youth summit by its participants. They select one person each year for a three year term. The law does require that “the selection process shall provide for diversity among the members and at least one of the youth members shall be female” (Iowa
Legislature 2000).

Since 2009, Iowa has taken a hard turn to the right and become even more partisan. Representative Linda Upmeyer (R-Hancock, now Cerro Gordo), who was Minority Whip in 2009 and 2010, Majority Leader in 2011 through 2014, and Speaker from 2015 to the present, served as National Chair of the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) in 2014 and is still on ALEC’s Board of Directors (American 2019; Iowa Legislature 2018c). Iowa Republicans have adopted extremely conservative positions. The 2018 Iowa Republican party platform includes such positions as: “aggressively support[ing] a ‘life begins at conception’ bill without exceptions, eliminating all public sector unions, opposing any ‘mandates associated with alleged global warming, or climate control,’” opposing “any United Nations initiative”, eliminating gun free zones, removing sexual orientation from the Iowa Civil Rights Code’s list of protected classes, repealing “any laws allowing any marriage that is not between one natural man and one natural woman,” interpreting the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution to deny citizenship to persons born in the United States whose parents are not citizens, repealing the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution that authorizes Congress to create and collect income tax, and repealing the 17th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution to return election of U.S. Senators from a states’ voters to its legislature (Iowa GOP 2018).

Iowa is Republican controlled. The state has passed very right wing legislation and has weakened the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) tremendously. While I was in Iowa in March 2018, the legislature held a public hearing on a bill to ban abortions if a fetal ‘heartbeat’ could be detected. The legislation passed and was signed into law, though it has since been struck down in court (Pitt 2019). While I was in Iowa, that same week, the Iowa legislature also passed the first leg of a constitutional amendment to add gun rights to the Iowa constitution, using language that goes further than the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and that would
make it more difficult for the state to adopt or maintain gun regulations (Petroski 2018c).

In addition to Republicans’ ideological shift in policy, there was also an ideological shift in approach, including governing practice, moving away from the roll-up-your-sleeves policy toolbox approach that characterized many House Republicans on the State Government Committee. Multiple legislators as well as political scientist Chris Larimer and ICSW E.D. Rachel Scott told me that the legislature is even more partisan now than it had been in 2009 (C. Larimer, PC, 2018; C. Winckler, PC, 2018; J. Kearns, PC, 2018; R. Scott, PC, 2018c; S. Sodders, PC, 2018a). In 2015, then governor Terry Branstad (R) also said the legislature had become much more polarized, and that both sides have “gotten more shrill in attacking” (Munson 2015). No one I interviewed shared that they thought the legislature had become less partisan. Representative Cindy Winckler (D-Scott) said that in the House, working across the aisle was “more typical” in 2009 than it is now (C. Winckler, PC, 2018). Scott shared that “in both parties the sort of whip system and voting party-line… [has] gotten far more political” (R. Scott, PC, 2018c).

However, even with this swing to the right, there have not been any attempts to repeal gender balance, even with Republicans rather than Democrats being in control. “No one has brought it up,” said former Representative Doug Struyk (R-Pottawattamie) (who has been involved with the legislature in various capacities since his time in the legislature) (D. Struyk, PC, 2018). Study committee guidelines adopted by Legislative Council each session have continued to require public member appointments to be gender balanced (Legislative 2011, 2018).

The other instance of a gender balance exemption occurred in 2018, when the legislature removed the gender balance requirement from a portion of state and local Workforce Development Boards (WDBs). However, this case actually demonstrates that the legislature considers gender balance for boards and commissions normative and that it has been institutionalized and continues to be part of Iowa ‘fair.’ This exemption came about because Iowa’s WDBs were out of compliance
with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). This put over $50 million in federal funding in jeopardy. The legislation was also controversial because, to comply with WIOA, the board changed from having business-labor balance to being very business heavy. The community colleges were also worried about higher education-business partnership changes (Evans 2018; Iowa Legislature 2017, 2018d; Kacena 2018; State 2016; Townsend 2017; Quinn 2017).

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL)’s regional administrator, while outlining Iowa’s noncompliance with WIOA, noted that Iowa’s political party and gender balance policies went beyond WIOA requirements, and “make it virtually impossible to find members and fully compose a local board.” The regional administrator wrote that the “state’s process for appointing members to the LWDBs [local WDBs] as required under WIOA are impeding the establishing of WIOA compliant LWDBs.” Iowa Workforce Development (IWD) therefore wanted to propose eliminating the gender and party balance requirements, because its top concern was to ensure the state and local WDBs were WIOA compliant, and they wanted to cooperate with and follow the direction of the DOL (Iowa legislature 2018d). While past concerns about the effect of gender balance on a state board or commission led to modifying the board/commission structure rather than removing the gender balance requirement, federal board/commission structure requirements were in this case what drove the change (Evans 2018; Iowa Legislature 2018d).

After being met with pushback, IWD submitted to the legislature what it viewed as a compromise study bill (Iowa Legislature 2018d). For local WDBs, the bill exempted the members who were “representatives of governmental and economic and community development entities,” which included sometimes a minimum of two members, one from the state employment service office appointed by the IWD director and one from the vocational rehabilitation services program appointed by the administrator of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Education or by the director of the Department for the Blind (Iowa Legislature
For the state WDB, the study bill designated that political and gender balance would still apply to the governor’s 26 appointments of voting members, but would no longer apply to the governor’s appointed non-voting members (e.g. each public university president or designee, a representative from various departments, a representative from the U.S. DOL office of apprenticeship, etc.), or to the other seven appointed voting members, which included 1) the governor, 2) a senate senator appointed by senate majority leadership, 3) a state representative appointed by house majority leadership, 4) the Department of Workforce Development director or designee, 5) the Department of Education Director of designee, 6) the Department for the Blind Director or designee, and 7) the administrator of the Department of Education’s Division of Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services or designee (Iowa Legislature 2017, 2018d).

While this legislation did impact gender balance, neither the ICSW nor the Iowa Department of Human Rights (IDHR) were registered on the bill (Belin 2015a; Iowa Legislature 2019e). The issue was not mentioned in any of the ICSW’s monthly e-newsletters or in the minutes of any IDHR Board meetings during this period (IDHR 2017, 2018b). ICSW E.D. Rachel Scott lobbied on over 50 bills in 2009 on behalf of the ICSW. In 2010, Scott lobbied on behalf of the whole IDHR rather than on behalf of the ICSW, and registered on over 100 bills. In 2011, the IDHR director registered on seven bills. The next IDHR director registered as a lobbyist through 2014, but did not declare on any bills (Iowa Legislature 2019e). In 2011, IDHR staff for ICSW were no longer allowed to lobby the legislature, so the Friends of the ICSW hired a lobbyist to advocate: Karla Fultz McHenry (Iowa Legislature 2019e; R. Scott, PC, 2018c). McHenry registered on four bills in 2011, one bill in 2014, two bills in 2015, four bills in 2016, zero bills in 2017 or 2018, and undecided on one bill in 2019 (Iowa Legislature 2019e).

Senator Kirsten Running-Marquardt (D-Linn), who was also on the state WDB, filed an amendment to strike the language in the WDB bill that exempted some appointments from
gender/political balance. After a 14 minute debate, the House voted on Running-Marquardt’s amendment. It failed 41-54-5. It was a party line vote, with Republicans opposed and Democrats in support, with the exception of Representatives Chip Baltimore (R-Boone) and Guy Vander Linden (R-Mahaska), who voted for the amendment. The House then voted for the bill 88-7-5. At this point Running-Marquardt as well Representatives Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) and Mary Gaskill (D-Wapello), who had spoken in support of Running-Marquardt’s amendment on the House floor, voted for the bill, as did Representative Todd Taylor (D-Linn), who had voted against the bill in committee and was concerned about the bill’s changes to the business-labor balance on WDBs. The Senate concurred with the House resolution and adopted the legislation 46-2-2 (the two no votes were Democrats with concerns about effect on the labor unions) (Iowa Legislature 2018d).

During the floor debate, no one critiqued gender balance or said anything negative about it. A handful of Democrats spoke out in support of the amendment. The Republican floor manager, Representative Jarad Klein (R-Washington), defended the bill by placing the reasoning for it solely on the DOL letter and interest in ensuring WIOA compliance, emphasizing that they were trying to protect gender balance to the extent possible by keeping it for most positions despite what the DOL letter said and what IWD had initially proposed based on DOL’s guidance. When asked about qualifications, Klein expressed his full confidence that there were qualified women across Iowa and in all of the positions that were being exempted. Democrats tried appealing to diversity, fairness, bipartisanship, the exemption creating a “slippery slope” that would lead to undoing gender balance further, the exemption being “anti-woman,” and the IWD being either insincere or lazy. A few legislators struck an impassioned and morally indignant tone, saying this sent the message that the legislature did not care about gender or political balance.

Klein channeled the ideology of pragmatism and did not raise any other ideological concerns about the bill. In fact, within that context, he positioned himself as empathetic and sympathetic to
the Democratic position, as a supporter of gender egalitarianism that had tried to do what he could within the confines of governing and competing concerns to ensure the legislation still met the intent of gender balance. Klein focused on how not passing the law and getting in compliance with WIOA could cost Iowa $50 million and how the DOL regional administrator had specifically called out their balance provisions as unnecessary and “impeding the establishment of WIOA compliant LWDBs.” Klein said that the bill kept gender and political balance for appointed positions, but that it “recognize[d] that there are elected officials, there are professionals within the departments that sit on these boards” (Iowa Legislature 2018d).

For the state WDB, the 26 appointed members currently consist of 12 women, 11 men, 13 Republicans, seven Democrats, three no party, and three vacancies, making these positions gender and party balanced, as required by law. The other seven voting positions include three women and four men. The governor and two legislators are Republican, and the other state employees are more likely to share political views with the governor than not (since directors, at least, were appointed by the governor). If party balance had applied to these members as well, without changing other parts of the makeup of the committee, many more of the appointed members would have had to be Democrats or no party (in this case, because Governor Kim Reynolds is Republican). The three vacant positions are for business members; normally there are over four times as many business members as labor organization representatives on the restructured board (IWDB 2019a, 2019b; Office-Governor 2019).

The regional workforce investment boards are required to be gender and party balanced except for the WIOA Title III and Title IV representatives of the Wagner-Peyser Employment Service program and the Vocational Rehabilitation program. Region 15 did not have its membership listed on its website, but the other 14 regional boards had 15 or 16 women and seven or eight men in these roles. There were two regions with only men, one with three men and one with two men,
but these regions included Black Hawk County and Scott County, so were not areas considered “more difficult” to find women. Four of the regions identified party affiliation with their membership list; Region One had one Democrat and one independent, Region Two had one Democrat and two independents, Region Three/Four had two no party, and Region Five had two independents (IWDB 2019a, 2019b; Office-Governor 2019).

In the end, this law amended one area of coverage for Iowa’s gender balance law that was fairly limited in scope. Unless Democrats voted for Running-Marquardt’s amendment because they knew it was not going to pass and so did not have to worry about its repercussions with the Department of Labor, if party control had been different in 2018, the workforce development boards would not have gender or political party balance exemptions. Nevertheless, this amendment was quite different from the gender balance legislation in the late 1980s and the one in 2009, because it had potentially substantial fiscal impacts for Iowa, with federal funding on the line.

The floor discussion on Running-Marquardt’s amendment is particularly enlightening. First, while diversity and balance were discussed, gender balance, not political party balance, was the primary concern. This could be because formal party balance does not involve ideological balance as the governor can make non-party appointees, but it could also reflect a strong commitment to the gender balance policy as a matter of principle and women’s equity. However, the most interesting part of the discussion was the framing of gender balance. The Democrats who spoke were forceful in their views on the issue, and Klein was on the defense. Gender balance advocates spoke about fairness, the idea of there not being qualified women, government laziness, and the ideal of balance and women’s opportunities. In response, no one objected that gender balance was a quota system or discriminatory or that what was there was too much. Indeed, no one openly objected to the concept of gender balance. Instead, the focus was on deference to the federal government (in exchange for federal funding), which manifested as a focus on ensuring the bill was in compliance with the federal
government’s asks and requirements, while otherwise still preserving the good government tradition of gender balance.

Legislators could also have been concerned that if they opened up the process, they would need to address other concerns like the pushback they were getting on the bill from labor and from community colleges about membership changes. The smoothest and slickest path forward for those managing the bill was to stick to the DOL recommendations with fidelity. Klein, who was on the defense in this matter, framed himself as saving gender balance through pursuing this compromise, not as someone advocating its removal. There was no public discussion on gender balance as being ideologically problematic, let alone a socialist quota or un-American.

Gender balance continues as the standard operating practice for state and local boards and commissions, including legislative study committee’s public membership and judicial nominating commissions. It is not regularly questioned or challenged. Supporters of restructuring the WDBs and including a limited gender balance exemption focused on how the case was exceptional rather than normal. Both the discourse for the legislative campaign around WDBs as well as it being the only legislative campaign to challenge the gender balance law for boards and commissions indicates that gender balance is well embedded as Iowa’s current institutionalized status quo.
CHAPTER FOUR: NAVIGATING IOWAN STAKEHOLDERS’ IDEOLOGIES ON GENDER BALANCE

Chapter Four extends existing theoretical paradigms on ideology and extends research on moderators of support for affirmative action. I unveil the way actors negotiated multiple competing ideologies as gender balance legislation was framed, reframed, and interpreted in a variety of ways by a variety of stakeholders. Advocates used collective action frame management to attempt to steer actors’ negotiations of their ideological beliefs toward support for the legislation. I argue that ideology in this case study can best be understood through navigation theory: people’s understandings of situations and issues within particular contexts impact how they activate, understand, prioritize, negotiate, and apply the multiple ideologies they simultaneously hold.

STRAIN THEORY HELPS EXPLAIN IDEOLOGIES

Chapter Three provided evidence that interest theory can only partially explain ideology in Iowa. Another theoretical paradigm for ideology is strain theory, which was crafted specifically due to interest theory’s limited empirical validity (Geertz 1973). Strain theory supposes that people find ideologies to make sense of their diverse lived experiences, their contradictions and strains (Geertz 1973). With strain theory, some actors hold on to traditional ideologies because it is functional for them to do so. Individuals construct a (cognitively bounded) reality to make coherent sense of their lives. Strain theory also enables a more diverse array of ideologies. Ideology can be a “non-partisan, non-pejorative,…. neutral concept” (Adams 2001:2).

People oppose what they view as “special rights” because of their own subjective sense of exclusion (Goldberg-Hiller 2003; Hochschild 2018; Picciolini 2017; Stein 2002). “Emotional tension is drained off by being displaced onto symbolic enemies” (Geertz 1973:205). This perspective, rooted in strain theory, could explain why rural legislators, or right-wing religious legislators, or even
Representative Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton), for whom most Democrats refused to consider supporting her bills and amendments, would feel connected to the idea that other groups do not deserve “special rights” that they themselves do not get or ask for.

This also ties into individualism and privilege: acknowledging structural inequality and that there is a biased system that produces biased results challenges one’s sense of self in terms of one’s own self-made accomplishments (Johnson 2014a). Local government associations and appointers interpreted local gender balance as an attack on their fairness. Gender balance implies they are discriminatory. If they are using an individualistic lens, given that they do not want to think of themselves as discriminatory, it is functional for them to reject that there is a problem or that the problem is that they are producing bias. Instead, they wanted to believe that local governments are appointing those who are interested and best qualified. Taking an identity-devoid approach was thus functional for local government organizations and officials.

When systemic issues like sexism come up, U.S.-Americans tend to react defensively because they think in individualistic rather than structural terms, and so feel personally attacked instead of recognizing they are part of a larger system (Johnson 2014a). To this end, Mike Wentzien, lobbyist for the Iowa State Association of County Supervisors, said of the legislation:

We felt it was not needed, in that we had a lot of women elected officials. County recorders made up probably 95% of the elected offices in county government, county treasurers probably made up 80% of the amount, so we were pretty diverse as far as elected officials. Supervisors much less than that, but there was no feeling that we were being discriminatory towards females or toward any other gender or any other particular position in one’s life. We just felt it was totally unnecessary. And that was our position (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018a).

Wentzien defended current supervisors but also positioned himself as egalitarian. Wentzien iterated that “way back” when he was a supervisor, “I appointed several women on Zoning Boards and Adjustment Boards, and always made an effort to get balance, just because I thought that was wise” (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018). Wentzien reacted strongly to ICSW E.D. Rachel Scott’s meeting with him.
Wentzien said, “My immediate reaction with Rachel was not very pleasant, cuz I thought she was very overbearing and demanding.…. I felt she did not understand local government at all, and she was after one purpose in life and that was it. And I felt it was somewhat politically motivated and not really necessary” (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018a).

Internationally, gender quota advocates often do not highlight arguments centered on discrimination because they would be both asking parliamentarians to vote for gender quotas and calling the same body sexist. “Because gender quotas are passed by male-dominated assemblies the politicians would in fact by such arguments criticize themselves for discrimination” (Dahlerup 2006:300). In Iowa the discrimination argument could be made because the appointers were by and large not the legislature, but the governor for state gender balance and local officials for local gender balance. Wentzien felt attacked by what he heard as accusations of discrimination, causing him to react defensively. In response to one of my first questions, when I asked Wentzien about what he recalls from 2009 about how the issue came to his attention and about their position on the bill, Wentzien brought up in his response that county board supervisors in Iowa do not discriminate. When I shared the ICSW’s fact sheet with him a couple minutes later, which also included the ICSW study results, he again iterated that “There was never any discrimination on sex,” and that supervisors were appointing the most qualified people, which can sometimes differ by gender. Wentzien noted that public health boards are usually made up of nurses, “so they were mainly 100% women” (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018). Strain theory explains Wentzien’s belief in meritocracy, gender roles, and that Scott has a political agenda, because these provide an explanation for gender imbalance that addresses the strain he feels by the implicit accusations of discrimination in the gender imbalance data.

Strain theory can also explain ideologies found among supporters. Supporting women’s rights, women’s equity, and believing the root of a lack of women’s representation is an exclusive
good ol’ boys network is functional for women advocates who have experienced discrimination and want more women represented, as well as for Democrats more broadly who identify a world needing fixing. Senator Swati Dandekar (D-Linn, 2003-2011) witnessed women’s exclusion from community decision-making roles. She said that “I was on so many boards that I was the only woman there” (S. Dandekar, PC, 2018). This contributed to her support for gender balance. As someone who was witness to exclusion and isolation, she saw a need for the law. She therefore subscribed to gender egalitarianism and social liberalism. Social liberalism is an ideology that believes the state should work toward social justice and intervene in the market to do so. Subscribers to social liberalism support state intervention (Sawer 1994). Legislators may support gender balance if they believe appointing bodies are not going to make substantive changes to include women without being required to do so. Just like neoliberalism, social liberalism is connected to liberalism and thus freedom, but while neoliberalism perceives government intervention as threatening, social liberalism perceives government intervention as necessary to address problems like poverty or racism that dampen people’s freedoms (Adams 2001).

However, strain theory only partially explains actors’ ideologies. People are intentionally and unintentionally socialized into ideologies, regardless of whether or not they are experiencing strain. From modeled and taught family values to religious teachings, someone may hold an egalitarian ideology because of their socialization rather than as a result of personally felt strain. Children have egalitarian gender and racial ideologies until they are socialized otherwise. While strain between one’s ideological positions and one’s experience of the surrounding world may make these ideologies more salient, ideologies do not solely result from strain. To make sense of ideology, strain theory requires a “wide model” that incorporates other concepts from outside of strain theory in order to improve the scope of its empirical validity. This results in theorizing that is fundamentally different
from its origins, with strain more a component than the core determinant for ideologies (Brezina 2002).

MULTIPLE IDEOLOGIES

To an extent, interest theory and strain theory both have validity. Traditional ideologies are present and internalized. Other ideologies are present that help people make sense of their diverse experiences. However, actors in my case study did not subscribe to a singular cohesive ideology or set of ideologies that either benefited those in power or made sense of their experiences. Instead, actors simultaneously subscribed to a multiplicity of ideologies that they situationally navigated. To an extent, supporters and opponents alike subscribed to the ideologies mentioned so far as well as other complementary and competing ones. Strain theory posits that individuals change their ideologies in order to cope with disturbances to their cognitive equilibrium (Geertz 1973). However, “ideologies are complex and deeply held” and individuals rarely simply “adopt whole new ideologies” (Oliver and Johnson 2000:10-11). Strain theory presumes that the individual leaves behind their former ideology rather than brings it along with them.

Interest theory conceives of ideology “constituting the whole” of one’s belief structure, whereas another perspective on ideology is that it is “constituting only a segment” of one’s belief structures, leaving multiple ideologies space to co-exist (Berger and Luckmann 1966:21). When it comes to political issues like affirmative action, “there are competing interpretations,” rather than one ideology available to draw from. “Particular frames ebb and flow in prominence and require constant updating to accommodate new events” (Gamson 1992b:67). These different frames have multiple ideologies already present to which they can connect.

This is not a new idea. W.E.B. DuBois’ theory on double consciousness and Dorothy Smith’s theory on bifurcation of consciousness are both theories aimed at making sense of the
empirical phenomenon of holding multiple internalized belief systems, both dominant and resistant ones, that generate struggle (DuBois 1903; Smith 1990). Strain theory argues that people subscribe to ideologies that are functional for them, and this is at least partially true. Sometimes, however, this means holding more than one contrasting view, even if the views are connected to conflicting ideologies. People’s cognition relies on their environment and affinity groups. One example of this in the cultural cognition literature was a religious surgeon who believed in evolution at work and did not believe in it at home, and perceived this as nonproblematic (Kahan 2015). At work belief in science was functional. At home belief in traditional religion was functional. Both of these cognitive belief structures were present for this individual, but depending on the circumstance, one loses salience and the other becomes activated.

Living with and having to navigate contradicting and dissonant ideas and spaces is an everyday experience, and dealing with public policy is no exception to this (Francis and Bakehorn 2013). In Iowa, everyone tended to support meritocracy and equal opportunity. People had various ideologies about the role of government, from neoliberalism to social liberalism, but even those who seemed to have one particular ideology also had others that impacted their decision-making processes such that in different situations they favored more or less government intervention. We are all part of the social systems we constitute, and as such we internalize various ideas within these social systems (Johnson 2014a).

As an example, Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux, 2009-2019) has a website dedicated to his political philosophy, saturated in ideologies such as neoliberalism, tradition, and meritocracy (Feenstra 2018). As mentioned earlier, Feenstra positioned himself as subscribing to an identity-devoid ideology and told me that considering social identities is discriminatory. However, he also stated that “affirmative action… had a time… [and] place,” that time and place being when Feenstra felt discrimination was salient in U.S. society, which he locates as in the past.
Contradicting his earlier statement that “we shouldn’t care” about people’s “backgrounds,” Feenstra also said he does support identity-conscious decision-making as a best practice, just not as a regulation. He said that while merit and qualifications should be “the number one thing,…. Yes, we all should try to have some type of gender neutrality [as in balance]….. As governments and stuff, we should try to push that as much as possible.” Feenstra said that local governments should work toward having “as much gender balance as possible,” and that while this should not be a requirement, “they should be very cognizant of it,” and of other minorities and stakeholders in their community. He said, “I think you gotta have a balance of your community, meaning that if you’re a little more minority, than maybe you should have somebody in the minority on your board. I mean those are things that you need” (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018).

Feenstra is simultaneously adopting two opposing ideologies: identity-devoidedness and multiculturalism. However, both of these ideologies arise historically from attempts to uphold American ideals of equality and fairness, and they may represent well-intentioned efforts to achieve social equality. As a consequence, the ideologies need not be considered mutually exclusive. Conceptually, there is a commonality between these ideologies in the fundamental interest to be fair to groups that are not in the majority (Aragón, Dovidio, and Graham 2017:202).

Multiple studies have shown these ideologies to be “at times modestly positively correlated among dominant groups members in the United States” [emphasis in original] (Aragón, Dovidio, and Graham 2017:202).

Feenstra’s beliefs are drawing on his own varied experiences with boards and commissions, both that of “it’s just amazing to see both men and women and their expertise on different things” and that of a woman with knowledge and expertise on utilities being replaced on a local utility board by a man without that knowledge, for the sake of gender balance. Feenstra is also drawing from ideological and knowledge resources and affinity groups, including the Republican party and the religious right wing of it that he belongs to, as well as his public administration graduate education
from Iowa State University and his experiences as the City of Hull’s city administrator (Iowa Legislature 2018c; R. Feenstra, PC, 2018). “Since social members are members of several groups, they’ll bring to bear several ideologies in their models of everyday events, so that the models may become seemingly incoherent. The same is true for their practices and discourses” (Dijk 1998).

Social psychologist Oriana Aragón, along with John Dovidio and Mark Graham (2017:202), explain Feenstra’s subscription to both identity-devoidedness and multiculturalism as a process by which Feenstra subscribes to aspects of each one that are actually compatible aspects—“Individuals may endorse some principles of both [ideologies].” While this can certainly be true, Feenstra’s ideology subscription does not entail selecting compatible principles from both ideologies. He simultaneously posited that 1) considering background characteristics like race or gender is discriminatory and that “we shouldn’t care” about these identities; and 2) that governments should be “very cognizant” of gender and ensure minorities and other segments of one’s community are included in their appointments (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018). While neither ideology may be fully developed, Feenstra nevertheless subscribes to the primary features of both.

Feenstra was able to reconcile and navigate these two competing ideologies when it came to taking policy positions by relying on his belief in neoliberalism (identity-conscious approaches should be informal and not regulatory), his belief in meritocracy (qualifications come before identity), his descriptive evaluation of meritocracy (minimization of contemporary discrimination), his understanding of the intersection of neoliberalism and meritocracy (unencumbered markets will generate meritocracy), and the lack of resonance gender egalitarianism ideology had for him (“I just think I don’t care”) (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018).

NAVIGATION THEORY: NEGOTIATING MULTIPLE IDENTITIES

In general, stakeholders held multiple competing ideologies, and interpreted and prioritized them
depending on how they viewed the particular situation, which often embraced some level of complexity. I call this framework for understanding ideologies navigation theory. Some differing ideologies that are more separate, like religious views on social issues, tend to give clear direction to actors, who then act in a more predictable fashion, though even this is open to negotiation under the right circumstances (e.g. Dubowski 2001). However, actors often face situations that are more ambiguous. Gender balance is an issue that has “ambiguous expectations” because it draws on multiple competing ideologies (Calarco 2014). In the Iowa case study, ideologies remained relatively consistent and often universal, with an exception of how people viewed the role of government, though even that allowed for fluidity based on evaluation and interpretation of the policy subject matter.

Actors have to travel from ideology to decision, with frames serving as the vehicle. There is not one path, but there are (rational and irrational) reasons an actor will take a certain path and end up at a certain location. The focus here is on the “expressions or uses of ideologies,” which are “situational [and] contextually bound” (Dijk 1998). There was ample room for negotiation of how actors’ ideologies were prioritized and of how they were interpreted and applied to the issue of gender balance on boards and commissions. Their situational interpretation varied among social groups. When confronted with empirical situations, people’s interpretations of the situations activated different ideologies and led to markedly divergent perceptions on what appropriate policy responses entailed. Actors decided what to do through an interpretive process that “hinges on an interaction between individual orientations and situational constraints” (Calarco 2014:203).

For example, people universally and consistently supported meritocracy, but had different interpretations of whether Iowa had it or needed it, or what should be done about it. Different interpretations positioned them on opposite sides of the gender balance debate. Differences were based on interpretations of the empirical situation (Is there gender inequality? Are there qualified
and interested women? In rural areas?) and then negotiations among conflicting ideologies to activate a policy response.

For some stakeholders, the issue of meritocracy and gender balance were secondary. For example, the House Minority Leader, Representative Jeff Kaufmann (R-Cedar, 2005-2012), prioritized following his floor manager’s leader over evaluating the merits of the bill and the various ideologies embedded in it on a policy level.

Additionally, local county government associations opposed the measure because it was a local mandate, and similarly oppose legislation across the political spectrum that involves the state imposing regulations onto local governments. However, a local government official may be against state government policies that mandate or restrict local governments, but may otherwise be a strong supporter of social liberalism. Local government officials in Iowa that had taken their own steps toward gender balance for their local government prior to 2009 certainly may believe in gender balance from a place of social liberalism, gender egalitarianism, structuralism, and/or opposition to the good ol’ boys network, but they may still oppose the state government requiring them to do something they otherwise believe in.

However, even within the frame of local mandates, local elected officials can decide how much to prioritize or deprioritize their opposition to the measure. Local elected officials associated with the League of Cities, generally more liberal and urban than their county supervisor counterparts, had to negotiate their ideology around the role of government with their ideologies around gender equity, and also had to evaluate what amount of inequality was necessary for them to accept taking on what level of additional work [“another burden” (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018)]. For example, during the 1991 local gender balance legislation, Waterloo Mayor Bernie McKinley was asked his opinion on the bill, he said, “The bill is not a bad idea. ‘Philosophically, I have a problem with it, just because I see an erosion by the state of home rule. But philosophically, on the other
hand, I’m for it because blacks and females have been overlooked too long in the past” (Kinney and O’Rourke 1991). McKinley had to negotiate these competing ideas to come to an outcome. Ultimately he found a compromise—he would accept a state requirement to promote egalitarianism and good government, so long as it did not go too far in creating a burden or turn into a bad government situation. McKinley said he supported the legislation, with the exception of a concern about boards associated with particular professions that have historically not had many women involved (e.g. plumbing, heating) (Kinney and O’Rourke 1991). McKinley also questioned replacing existing board members, though the 1991 legislation did not require that (Kinney and O’Rourke 1991; Roos 1991).

In addition to considering local mandates and gender equity, local elected officials and local government organizations further had to negotiate their beliefs about how governing works and about political power and relationships. Thus the League of Cities went neutral after the good faith effort was added “because… it was no longer the straight up mandate” and because “when you’re lobbying on something to modify it,… if legislators work with you to change something, they’re going to want you to back off or support it” (J. Hyland, PC, 2018). Here the League of Cities initially prioritized their opposition to a local mandate, but in the end prioritized a pragmatic amendment and continued political capital in maintaining relationships and good faith with legislators, and their views on the local mandate issue became less salient.

In contrast, Mike Wentzien with the county board supervisors association said that while the initial bill “created that little home rule explosion… with me,” after the good faith effort he found the bill “totally acceptable.” However, he did not change his registered opposition to the bill, because he followed his policy book, which he referred to as his “bible,” and there were no exceptions in there regarding “home rule and local control.” Now that local gender balance is a law rather than legislation that threatens local government’s autonomy, Wentzien can again re-evaluate
the legislation. Now he feels the legislation is “something that ended up being beneficial to all county government.” While he was defensive about what he felt were accusations that he and his colleagues are discriminatory, when he thinks about the law’s impact, he frames it differently, noting the challenges with finding people in general to serve on boards and commissions, but also commending women’s increased representation and noting that “habit is a terrible thing to be in” (M. Wentzien, PC, 2018).

I mentioned role of government as a stickier area, meaning it had more sustained resonance and salience, particularly with those who believe in a very limited role for government opposing gender balance. Stickiness implies that the idea has some attachment. However, even this was a negotiation. For example, while Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux, 2009-2019), a religious right advocate for drastic reductions in government’s role in our society, opposed the gender balance legislation in 2009, even he said that affirmative action laws like gender balance used to be necessary, but that he hoped we were past the need for it. His belief regarding government did not lead to an automatic dismissal of the bill. He evaluated his beliefs around small government with his beliefs about current levels of discrimination in order to make his decision.

Actors hold internalized dominant ideologies, ideologies aimed at making sense of strain, and other ideologies, and actors negotiate these in light of their social memberships and interpretations of the empirical situation they encounter in order to make a decision of the extent to which they support or oppose particular legislation.

To argue that ideologies can be navigated is not to argue they are static and unchanging. While ideologies are theorized as “relatively stable,” they are malleable. In this study, some women legislators became more feminist within the legislature. Some men like Representative Roger Thomas (D-Clayton) changed his gender and racial ideologies to become more egalitarian (van Dijk 1998). Thomas is not simply negotiating ideologies and prioritizing egalitarianism—his conception
of race and gender were fundamentally changed through his interactions and listening, making the very ideologies he draws from for negotiation different. “Ideological change” such as “changes in feminist… ideologies are well-known examples of such transformations” (van Dijk 1998).

Ideologies may have a common core. However, not only do we not each have a congruent carbon copy of the same ideologies, our ideologies are open to constant shifts and changes, just not usually ones, outside of particular events or circumstances, that affect the core. Ideologies are composites of a multitude of belief structure determinants. According to political scholar Jonathan Leader Maynard (2017:5),

Ideologies are built from…. core concepts, values, political ambitions, [] dominant narratives,… and a vast array of other sorts of idea or idea-cluster: identities, myths, memories, stereotypes, epistemic rules, beliefs about matters of fact, rhetorical repertoires, strategic preferences, exemplars, expectations, horizons of possibility, images, lived experiences, and so forth.

Interest and strain theory seek to explain the cause of an ideology (Geertz 1973). However, considering the multitude of ideologies people simultaneously subscribe to, and to different extents and sometimes in different forms, seeking an understanding of ideological determinants is a quite partial area for analysis. To understand ideologies in the empirical world, it is also important to consider how people make sense of and situationally negotiate their ideologies, how some ideologies become activated and prioritized while others remain dormant, and how this process generates particular outcomes.

MANAGING DISSONANT IDEOLOGIES THROUGH NAVIGATING COLLECTIVE ACTION FRAMES

Advocates (overall) successfully negotiated how stakeholders interpreted, prioritized, and applied their ideologies to the gender balance policy issue. While gender balance on its surface conflicts with allegedly hegemonic ideologies around meritocracy, individualism, and traditional gender ideology, it
simultaneously appeals to egalitarian gender ideology and social liberalism (Blekesaune and Quadagno 2003).

While ideologies are “deeply held,” people have a surprisingly robust flexibility in how they activate, interpret, and apply these social constructs (Oliver and Johnson 2000:10). Gender balance advocates used collective action frames to guide stakeholders’ negotiations of their ideologies to come out in support of the legislation, or at least to neutralize their opposition. Collective action frames are cognitive structures that connect to ideologies. They are ways of thinking about an issue that offer discursive explanations for the issue (Gamson 1992b; Snow and Benford 1992). Advocates “employ collective action frames” by “framing information and facts in alternative ways” to offer forward a way of cohesively and simply interpreting empirical phenomena and connecting it to ideas about correct and necessary social change (Gamson 1992b:67; Snow and Benford 1992:137).

To the extent that I observed “consciousness-raising,” it was through this “symbolic contest over which meaning[s] will prevail” (Gamson 1992b:67). As the legislative campaign transpired, how people connected to the issue and the frames they found salient also were open to movement (Gamson 1992b). The job of advocates was to ensure the facts under consideration and the frames for interpreting these facts steered stakeholders’ navigation through collective action frames that helped them negotiate their existing ideologies to come out with a final positive outcome in terms of their support of and willingness to take positive action for meaningful gender balance legislation.

Advocates encountered pushback against gender balance legislation and initial failures. However, as discussed in the last chapter, in the late 1980s and in 2009, opponents’ limited attempts to frame the legislation as a radical quota project failed due to shifts in how gender balance was interpreted, including advocates’ normalization and integration of prescriptive board and commission composition as well as gender balance laws, political party balance, acculturation
through voting for gender balance on specific boards and commissions prior to a comprehensive law, and relationship-building. The process through which gender balance was deradicalized and became institutionalized and indeed normative provided a context that was vital for the ability of comprehensive gender balance legislation to move forward.

Advocates can increase the likelihood of policy victories through successfully managing collective action frames to achieve policy victories. Legislators had a variety of positions they could take on gender balance: they could actively support it, vote for it, vote against it, actively vote against it, remain neutral until and even through voting, or reserve judgement, and in any of these capacities they could work to make specific changes to the legislation. Stakeholders as well could choose to involve themselves with the legislation or not, and if they were involved they could advocate for its adoption or against it, as well as push for specific changes to the legislation.

An example of proponents’ successful framing of gender balance was their explanation of the bill as simply being about broadening opportunities for women, creating (especially elective) leadership pipelines for women, and getting government officials to do the work and “just ask.” These frames corresponds with egalitarian gender ideology. However, the actual law could also be interpreted as a quota bill. When Representative Beth Wessel-Kroeschell (D-Story) wrote an editorial responding to Senator Herman Quirmbach’s editorial (D-Story), she did not accept and use his framing or even address discrimination or quotas. She bypassed this and focused on a good government and the women’s rights message. While Quirmbach’s editorial did not inspire substantive opposition to the gender balance bill, that was also because of advocates’ work to affect how empirical phenomenon are interpreted. In this case, gender balance passed in 1986, 1987, and 2009, all times that were quite busy for the legislature and during which potential opponents had more pressing concerns. Pursuing these policies during busier times contributed to the legislation being received as fair and innocuous. For example, in 2009, the religious right social conservative
group Family Leader did not get involved in the legislation (Iowa Legislature 2019c). Chuck Hurley of the Family Leader [and state representative from 1991 through 1996 (R-Fayette)] said, “we can’t recall any discussion or lobbying on the bill” (C. Hurley, PC, 2018; Iowa Legislature 2018c). Given other timely issues like marriage equality or persisting issues like abortion, gender balance on local boards and commissions was likely not as much of a priority for them. Their cognitive workload was already highly saturated. They employed their resources towards other issues in which they interpreted their efforts as being more worthwhile, important, and effective.

Another example of this is Governor Terry Branstad (R)’s position on the bill in 1987. Then-Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) said she does not remember Branstad pushing back against the new legislation. Hammond says, “He had gotten his friend on the Board of Regents. That was his goal” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). Branstad was willing to trade off trying to sustain the “as much as possible” clause with keeping his appointments, following the same trope Governor Bob Ray (R) had employed a dozen years earlier on the issue of political party balance.

Gender balance advocates believed gender balance legislation was a way to create equity and opportunity for women and to have the government intervene to correct for a biased system that, left on its own, had continued to reproduce boundaries of power and exclude robust participation of women from decision-making and from access to that power. However, the traditional ideology of meritocracy, which corresponds with neoliberalism and individualism, suggests that women are not excluded because of their group identity and that the best way to appoint board and commission members is through appointers evaluating each individual on their merits. Supporters and opponents of gender balance both believed that a merit-based system was a social good. The remainder of this chapter explores what differentiated gender balance supporters and opponents, and how advocates moved stakeholders, in light of this potential initial inclination toward meritocracy, to support gender balance.
Government Roles: Evaluating Government Intervention

Perceptions about the appropriate role of government are connected to the ideology of meritocracy. People’s divergent views on the role of government differentiates whether they are disposed to government intervention, in this case the state requiring the governor, other appointers, and local governments to make gender balanced appointments. Iowa stakeholders have variation in their stated views on appropriate roles for government, both at the state level as well as for local mandates. This seemed like one of the stickiest ideologies. In general legislators who favored extremely limited government opposed gender balance.

However, there was still a negotiation with these legislators’ perceptions of the particular social control being imposed. Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux) was invested in a self-concept of being for very limited government. However, he was not libertarian. Feenstra believed gender balance and affirmative action were necessary steps for the government to take decades earlier, as that is when he thought a substantive problem existed. Feenstra has a government orientation: he has a Master of Public Administration (MPA) degree and worked for the City of Hull as their city administrator. While he did not support the government imposing gender balance onto boards and commissions, he was a social conservative and supported government intervention to further this agenda, such as by imposing gendered marriage restrictions and making abortion illegal. Feenstra’s belief in small government did not lead to his automatic dismissal of the bill. Instead, he evaluated the bill while holding simultaneous ideologies, and in this case his beliefs around small government and his belief in meritocracy were aligned and thus did not require negotiation.

Differences in views on government’s role can lead to differences on an issue like gender balance; for example, Representative Geri Huser (D-Polk) was consistently concerned about government regulation, and as such she opposed the 2009 legislation until advocates removed its reporting requirement. With a victory that decreased regulation in the bill, she deprioritized other
potential concerns about regulation with this legislation and instead prioritized other ideologies that
enabled her to support the legislation.

Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) observed that local gender balance was more
difficult to pass than state gender balance because it was a local mandate, which is why she felt they
did not get it adopted in the late 1980s or in the 1990s. Nevertheless, legislators exercise substantive
flexibility in evaluating whether they view local mandates as problematic. Conservative legislators
who may ideologically be less supportive of the 'big arm’ of government telling local governments
what to do have voted to ban local governments from raising the minimum wage, restrict guns
beyond state law, provide sanctuary for undocumented immigrants, or have autonomous taxing
authority. Similarly, social progressives who support 'local control’ for education often support
intervention, including in the realm of education, when it comes to issues like nondiscrimination, or
for example in Iowa to ensure sex education is science-based.

It is not the case that someone who opposes local mandates (including even a former county
official who is in the state legislature) suddenly abdicates this ideology when they come across a
policy that they want to impose on local government and then is forever changed in their views on
local mandates. Instead, depending on the issue, beliefs regarding local mandates get prioritized or
deprioritized. If someone thinks an issue is a serious enough problem that can and needs to be
addressed, and that government is the best or necessary avenue for addressing it, their views on local
mandates are deprioritized as their views on the issue at hand become prioritized. On the other
hand, if there are not strong reasons for them to prioritize other areas, then their belief against local
mandates can remain salient and prioritized for the legislative issue at hand. As noted by House
Minority Leader Kraig Paulsen (R-Linn), “All legislators are opposed to telling local jurisdictions
what to do until there’s something they want to tell them to do” (K. Paulsen, PC, 2018).
Thus, conservatives who oppose affirmative action because of their support for limited government are usually not libertarians who actually oppose any government intervention. It is the subject of the intervention that bothers them. Conservatives opposed to affirmative action are generally social conservatives who do want to impose government controls, such as expanding government restrictions on abortion (which Iowa Republican legislators unanimously voted for in 2018, while ‘big government’ Democrats all voted against the bill). This can also be seen in that many conservative opponents to affirmative action, including those who espouse meritocracy and identity-devoid rhetoric, do not similarly oppose or feel moved by identity-conscious university admissions decisions based on factors that benefit whites, such as preferencing legacy applicants, even though legacy-based admissions is not part of an affirmative action program to redress discrimination (Gratz 2014; Meyers 2019; Murphy 2019; Walker 2017). Ideologies, such as those around neoliberalism and roles for government, are not held sacred; they are flexible and interactive.

Another example of negotiating priorities around government intervention can be found with the Iowa Supreme Court in 1988. Whether or not the Iowa Supreme Court originally wanted the government to intervene in judicial nominating commissions by making them gender balanced, they were strongly opposed to government intervention that would make the commissions political party balanced. When they felt they could prevent party balance on these commissions by supporting gender balance on them, their opposition to party balance for judicial nominating commissions led them to take active steps in support of the government requiring gender balance for judicial nominating commissions, including elected ones, as well as within the judiciary bureaucracy.

Additionally, while there is some variation, most people who are in government (e.g. legislators, local government officials) are there because they believe government has a purpose. As discussed in the last chapter, a key factor in support among House Republicans who voted for the
bill, especially those on the State Government Committee, was the pragmatism ideology of government as a policy toolbox that could be used to craft good public policy. Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) was able to activate that ideology and help members prioritize it over even their party’s position on the issue by engaging them substantively in working on the bill, and thus engaging this ideology and bringing it to the forefront.

The 2009 bill was not simply the state legislature regulating how state government operated. Instead, it involved the state government telling local governments how to operate. This generated significantly less opposition than legislation would to require gender balance in the for-profit corporate sector (One step closer to this are the bills requiring quotas for public company boards). However, the issue of local control did activate opposition from local government organizations. The Iowa State Association of Counties (ISAC) and the county supervisors association chose to prioritize local control over any other ideologies. Indeed, this was their path of least resistance; for example, these organizations had policy statements they followed, with opposition to local mandates a central position. This makes sense in particular because these are organizations structured with a particular interest in mind, and so, while they are still made up of people, their nature is less multidimensional in evaluating positions.

Still, even the most ideologically entrenched views on local mandates are rather flexible. Following the good faith effort amendment, ISAC and the supervisors association softened their opposition to the issue and deprioritized the issue. Their support for Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Johnson)’s bill that required reporting also showed that they were pragmatic more than ideological, willing to support one form of government mandate on local governments (reporting) if it might prevent another (gender balance). Only the county attorneys association opposed all iterations of local mandates during the 2009 process, including Quirmbach’s bill, but they also were less impacted by the outcome and so, as discussed later in this chapter on empirical confrontations
and engagement, were both less susceptible to and less a target of advocates’ collective frame
management attempts.

League of Cities E.D. Alan Kemp said that “we always try to avoid… mandates,….
notwithstanding whether or not we think the end result is admirable” (A. Kemp, PC, 2018). Paulsen
also said that was his experience, that the League’s opposition was usual for local mandates and did
not necessarily have any connection to their “position on the substance of the bill” (K. Paulsen, PC,
2018). The good faith effort diminished local rule as an ideological barrier, which had been
preventing local government officials and local government organizations from activating and
prioritizing other ideologies on the issue, such as those around gender equity. The League of Cities
(a comparably less socially conservative organization than the county associations), after securing the
good faith effort provision, was willing to no longer oppose gender balance, even though it
remained a local mandate.

In 2009, ISAC Public Policy Specialist Hanna DeGroot had opposed gender balance, both as
part of ISAC’s opposition to local mandates and because she perceived it as impractical and
burdensome. When I asked her in 2018 about the bill’s effects, and whether it had been beneficial or
detrimental to counties or had not had much impact, she replied,

I don’t know if it’s necessarily detrimental. You know, it wasn’t a life and death issue, it
wasn’t a… this needs to be done or services are gonna be cut or, y’know, roads are gonna
fall into disrepair and busses are gonna be crashing because bridges are breaking. And so I
don’t think it was detrimental. It’s a good thing for people to be thinking about (H. De

One interpretation of this response is that De Groot shifted her ideology on local
government, meritocracy, gender ideology, or other ideologies in coming to labeling the law’s effects
as “a good thing.” However, another way to interpret this is that De Groot still has the same
ideological perspectives, but a different evaluation of gender balance because she is evaluating it
from a different context and vantage point. When legislation is before the Iowa legislature, De
Groot and ISAC’s opposition to local mandates is activated. However, once a local mandate becomes law, so long as it is not causing continuous substantive hardship (e.g. a robust tax cap), ISAC’s relationship to the law becomes very different—focused on education and assisting local governments with implementation. As De Groot put it, “You just move forward” (H. De Groot, PC, 2018). Furthermore, this mandate has now largely become just a part of the process for how local governments do business. When DeGroot evaluated the law in 2018, local gender balance already was a law, not a piece of legislation to contest, and she could therefore evaluate its effect outside of the context of it being a local mandate. Instead, her relationship to it is one of helping with education. The ideology of opposition to local control was not activated by the question.

Overall, while those wearing a local government hat were generally genuinely invested in the issue of local control, they still had some flexibility, and for most legislators, their relative prioritization of local control depended on their evaluations of the substance of the legislation being considered. Legislators and stakeholders supported intervention if they felt that there was a problem that needed fixing and felt that the state legislature was the right tool to use to fix it. To that end, people’s construction of the problem mattered greatly.

*Structural Inequality: Evaluating Gender Imbalance*

One reason some legislators and stakeholders supported gender balance instead of opposing it as a local mandate is because they thought it was a potentially useful tool to help address a continuing social problem. However, the extent to which people perceive social problems as existing, let alone how problematic they think they are, is different for people based on the extent to which they interpret the phenomenon as causing harm (Blumer 1971). Nobody I spoke with supported discrimination. Everybody I spoke with supported fairness. However, support for gender balance depended in part on people’s evaluations of whether meritocracy was a descriptor or goal, i.e.
whether meritocracy described the empirical state of current events (board and commission appointments are already meritocratic) or whether meritocracy was a normative goal and worthy objective that required addressing the current non-merit-based decision-making process in order to move closer to meritocracy.

Neutralizing traditional gender ideology.

Legislators and stakeholders can agree that gender imbalance exists on board and commissions without agreeing as to whether or not this is a problem. From a traditional gender ideology perspective, men should be engaged in public decision-making while women should be engaged in domestic and care responsibilities. In this case, women’s underrepresentation and men’s overrepresentation on boards and commissions is positive because it reflects their respective societal roles.

A consistent theme throughout gender balance debates has been the premise that women are not qualified (or that there are not enough qualified women) for boards and commissions. In a meritocratic system, women’s underrepresentation may not represent an unfair situation. Instead, it could reflect that women are not as qualified. This could relate to traditional sexism, that women are inherently less qualified, but more often women’s underrepresentation was interpreted through cultural sexism, in which sexist outcomes are attributed to supposed “distinctive cultural practices” (Bonilla-Silva 2018; Stoll 2013). This concern was expressed in the late 1980s, and while implementation of the state gender balance requirement demonstrated there were qualified women for boards and commissions, it repeated in 2009 when the “universe” to draw from for boards and commissions was smaller (local jurisdictions compared to the entire state). This was also raised in both the late 1980s as well as in 2009 regarding women’s qualifications for professional and specialized or technical boards.
Gender balance advocates navigated traditional gender ideology through changing whether people thought of women as unqualified, providing alternative explanations for women’s underrepresentation, pointing to women’s underrepresentation on the types of boards and commissions that traditional gender ideologues would think women were especially qualified for (e.g. education, health), and through amendments to the gender balance legislation that made this ideology less salient (e.g. amending board requirements, proposals to exempt rural communities and professional/technical boards, and the ‘as much as possible’ and ‘good faith effort’ clauses), enabling other ideologies to be prioritized instead.

To say women are not qualified overall is a culturally outdated sentiment and difficult to substantiate. While U.S. society still has a strong gender ideology, it is difficult for opponents to make a persuasive case that women are not qualified. Arguments that women should fulfill traditional feminine roles in society and not have full citizenship rights and status were robust and present in initial women’s rights advocacy efforts to get women the right to vote and to get women initial representation. The results of this advocacy carved a pathway for advocacy around issues like gender balance, but similarly, by the time gender balance was the issue of discussion, legislators were no longer advocating against women being integrally involved in governance. While it is clear that in the 1980s, men, including men legislators, made dismissive comments about women and their abilities, times had changed and such overtly discriminatory views had fallen out of favor. In the late 1980s and in 2009, those expressing overt and explicit beliefs that women are unqualified for public office were less likely to be in the legislature or among associated stakeholders. Legislators do not want to come across as sexist, many because they oppose sexism, but universally because they do not want to isolate their electorate. Men legislators and lobbyists were also in the legislature with women legislators, and it is very difficult to make an argument that women are not qualified with women legislators in the room without impugning their abilities. Direct statements about
qualifications were met with swift pushback, such as the Des Moines Register’s editorials responding to Governor Terry Branstad (R)’s press secretary’s comments.

Given this, there is not a strong and effective argument to be made that women are not qualified for boards and commissions. Indeed, many advocates saw traditional views on gender as a reason to support gender balance, because it meant such a law was necessary to move women’s rights forward. In 2009, Representative Donovan Olson (D-Boone) supported gender balance in part because he felt traditional gender views were still present in some areas, especially more rural areas, and he felt gender balance could help stimulate cultural change in this area (D. Olson, PC, 2018). Women legislators pushed back against Branstad’s claims in the 1980s that women were well-represented overall on boards and commissions as well as against the League of Cities’ attempt in 2009 to replace gender balance on each board and commission with overall gender balance within a jurisdiction because of their commitment to women being fairly represented on boards that were viewed as more powerful and because they wanted to stimulate cultural change around men and women’s societal roles, which meant more women on planning and zoning boards and more men on social welfare and library boards.

Gender balance advocates supported women’s equity and women’s rights. Opponents had to manage this frame to mitigate any perceptions that they were anti-woman. In order to do this, opponents in 2009 put women at the forefront of their debate, making women the spokespeople for opposition to gender balance [beyond ideologues like Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama) and Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story), though Quirmbach also used this tactic]. Next, opponents proposed alternatives to try to demonstrate they were committed to women’s rights. The Iowa Supreme Court went out of its way to ensure women legislators and women’s groups were aware their opposition to the constitutional amendment proposal had nothing to do with its gender provisions, and that they indeed would support gender-based legislation. Quirmbach and Horbach
both proposed alternative legislation which called for fair processes, and in Quirmbach’s case
broader recruitment and a reporting requirement. Pettengill followed up her vocal opposition and
vote against gender balance with hosting women’s leadership and training sessions across the state,
encouraging women to serve on boards and commissions.

Opponents, as well as stakeholders who were simply not active supporters of the legislation,
were also quick to give examples that showed how gender balance could be detrimental to women
(including in my 2018 interviews). Some suggested that gender balance was anti-meritocratic and
could have the unintended and perverse consequence of preventing a qualified woman from serving.
Boards that were overrepresented by women (e.g. historic preservation, library, social welfare) were
brought up as reasons this bill was not supportive of women and indeed decreased their
representation and ability to serve. Quirmbach’s editorial specifically raised women’s achievements
and overrepresentation in areas like college, and noted that gender balance would limit women’s
opportunities.

Without being able to make an effective argument for opposing gender balance as part of
traditional gender ideology, what remained possible for opponents were more specific arguments
about whether women were qualified for particular positions based on their status in society. This is
an argument that is concerned with details, and it changes gender ideology from a salient ideological
argument against the legislation to a pragmatic concern that is open to negotiation through working
on the bill’s specifics.

One other area of gender ideology also warrants discussion. Different views exist about the
constitution of gender, with some people adopting a more contemporary scientific understanding of
gender as a social construct and others taking a more essentialist perspective that conceptualizes
men and women as two different types of humans that have markedly dissimilar dispositions. These
views, as well as various hybrids, certainly existed in Iowa, and are discussed further in Chapter Five.
However, these gender ideologies were non-germane to support or opposition for gender balance legislation. Someone who believes sex and gender are identical concepts, thinks of them as binaries, and believes men and women are quite different creatures, with stereotypical attributes, can support gender balance as completely necessary because men and women therefore bring something different to boards and commissions. Someone who believes gender is a social construct and understands that phenomena that are socially constructed still have power and consequences can believe gender balance is necessary (Merton 1995). Indeed, they may view gender imbalance as especially problematic given the lack of natural difference in abilities and interests across gender.

*Gender-devoid ideology versus recognizing a systemic problem.*

When confronted with an empirical situation, people first attempt to make sense of the facts before them in a way that fits into their existing repertoire of ideologies. “In the political world we encounter, meaning is already organized. Information and facts are always ordered into interpretive frames” (Gamson 1992b:65). Identity-devoid (in this case gender-devoid) and meritocratic ideologies serve as lenses through which to interpret gender imbalance; those who subscribe to these ideologies are likely to explain gender imbalance as a phenomenon that is not tied to systemic discrimination. If gender imbalance is not a problem, it does not warrant intervention. If gender imbalance is an individual-level and not systemic problem, it warrants an individualistic solution. Gender-devoid and meritocratic ideologies correspond with interpreting affirmative action as promoting rather than challenging discrimination. These ideologies provide a few different pathways for interpreting gender imbalance: as not problematic, as a minor problem, and as an individual-level problem.

One potential interpretation is that gender imbalance is simply not a problem. If people believe women are not qualified, either due to some innate characteristic tied to a biological view of gender or due to a devaluation of women’s comparative experiences in society, including their
makeup in professions with relevance to particular boards and commissions, then imbalance on boards and commissions is potentially desirable. During my interviews, I also heard stakeholders explain gender imbalance as a consequence of gendered interests and of women being too busy with other things to have time for boards and commissions. Again, in these cases, gender imbalance is understandable and not a problem that needs fixing.

Those with a gender-devoid ideology may claim they do not see or think about gender. This is of course not true in a literal sense, and even Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama), who subscribed to this philosophy, had ideas about gender, such as that women might tend to be better at the library board than men. However, for those who subscribe to a gender-devoid ideology, even in these cases gender is not needed as an evaluative factor. Individual qualifications may be patterned by gender, but it is still the individual’s merit, and not aspects of their identity such as gender, that is to be evaluated. If women tend to care more and have more insights into library boards, then women applicants will tend to be more qualified and will tend to be appointed more frequently. Gender need not be considered.

Another potential pathway for interpreting gender imbalance is to evaluate it as a minor problem, one lacking substance. In this case, gender imbalance might be an issue, but women’s representation, like women’s status in society, has been and is continuing to improve. Or, gender imbalance might be an issue, but women have some representation on boards and commissions, and indeed are overrepresented on some boards and commissions—the problem is not drastic. In either of these cases, the response to this conception is that gender imbalance does not require the type of intervention proposed by advocates. This concept corresponds with Stoll’s modern sexism frame of “minimization of sexism” (drawn from Bonilla-Silva’s new racism frame of “minimization of racism”). Society is now “post-gender” (Bonilla-Silva 2018; Stoll 2013).

Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story) seemed to embrace this approach to some degree,
believing men and women were more or less equal in status, and thus all that was truly needed was a bit wider recruitment. Quirmbach made a point that women are outnumbering men in college, and that a gender balance policy actually limits women’s opportunities. One other idea about gender imbalance that falls under this ‘minor problem not warranting intensive intervention’ pathway is that gender imbalance is simply a product of our current culture and society. In this scenario, women are just as meritorious as men, but gender imbalance exists because society has not gotten to the point of recognizing that, or because there are not enough qualified and interested women because of the sexist structure of our society, or because women are still burdened with domestic responsibilities disproportionately and so do not have time to commit to boards and commissions. In these cases, the response is that local jurisdictions are doing their best, but that this change cannot be legislated. Instead of government action, women’s rights advocates just need to let our culture continue to evolve toward equality. This belief was exemplified in particular by League of Cities E.D. Alan Kemp, especially through his sharing of Ames Mayor Ann Campbell’s perspective on why she opposed a gender balance law.

A third pathway for interpreting gender imbalance is to accept that it is problematic, but view is as an individual-level rather than structural-level problem. Senator Johnie Hammond (D-Story) noted the prevalence of this frame, the “phony argument that was made… [and] still made today… We want the best qualified, and that may not be a woman” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). An individualistic understanding of the problem makes sense of gender imbalance as a result of who applied for boards and commissions and, out of those applicants, who was selected. For example, in 1986, Governor Terry Branstad (R)’s appointments to the Board of Regents were characterized by his administration as not being about gender or systems but instead about Branstad selecting his top choice for who he thought would be best for the particular position.
In 2009, local government organizations and their allies on this issue stressed citizens’ low interest in serving on boards and commissions and the limited number of applicants they have. With this frame, gender imbalance is a result of who is applying. Appointers are making fair decisions to appoint the best people available as vacancies occur. Individualism suggests that appointers are responsible for their decisions and related outcomes, so gender balance becomes an attack on individual appointers for discriminating. This was exemplified by Mike Wentzien, lobbyist for the county supervisors association, who took offense to gender balance advocacy that he perceived as unfairly accusing him and his colleagues of discriminating. Wentzien did not take a systemic view on gender imbalance, viewing advocates as taking aim at individual appointers rather than at a system that produces sexist outcomes without any individual in that system needing to be intentionally sexist in their decision-making. A gender-devoid ideology complements individualism by enabling those involved to maintain they are not responsible for or complicit with systems of sexism (Moore and Bell 2011).

Enacting gender-devoid ideologies entails not acknowledging gender as a salient identity in terms of it having any direct impact on quality or as a means of evaluating an individual’s qualifications. However, comparative evaluation of men and women for the same employment often requires women to be more qualified than men to beget equal consideration. This implicit bias is present in gender-devoid individualistic ‘meritocratic’ appointments, but it is assumed to be absent. In reality, women often have to be more qualified than their male counterparts to become political appointees (Carroll 1986). Blacks have to be more qualified than their white counterparts to obtain equivalent jobs (O’Sullivan, Mugglestone, and Allison 2014). All else being equal, women and racial minorities still face decreased prospects of successful outcomes (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004; Castilla 2008; Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Pager 2007).
In addition to statements by ideologues like Horbach and Quirmbach who advocate specifically for identity-devoid decision-making as the only ethical pathway forward, there are numerous instances regarding board and commission appointments as well as other candidate selection processes in which people go out of their way to say that appointments are not about gender, have nothing to do with gender, or that gender is not a factor (Boshart 2015; Roderer 1994; Stout 2012:17; Vilsack 2001). For example, when Representative Mary Lundby (R-Marion) voted for gender balance in 1991, she clarified her support, saying of the bill, “This is a fairness question. This isn’t a gender question” (Roos 1991). This intentional posturing that gender can be ignored and is in no way a consideration can also be applied to other social identities. For example, it is similar to the position of the Iowa Supreme Court on political balance for judicial nominating commissions. They advocated that political party balance would bring politics into the commissions and judiciary, whereas with consideration of party being illegal, the commissions could maintain their apolitical and thus meritorious nature. Instead, the party-devoid approach meant commissions were and continue to be stacked with individuals aligned with the governor’s ideology.

I previously discussed the reasons a gender-devoid ideology leads to opposition to gender balance, noting Bonilla-Silva’s and Stoll’s abstract liberalism frame in which consideration of gender is viewed as giving preferential treatment to women because it contrasts with formal equality (Bonilla-Silva 2018; Gamson 1992a; Stoll 2013; Williams 1998). Bonilla-Silva also notes that liberalism entails embracing individualism and an emphasis on “choice,” and that these are both also contributing factors. Imposing policies that attack systemic discrimination are viewed as preferential treatment in part because individuals are supposed to have the right to make their own choices; the aggregate impact of these choices cannot be considered. Bonilla-Silva gives the examples for race of the choice of individuals to send kids to segregated schools or to live in segregated neighborhoods (Bonilla-Silva 2018). For gender balance, individualism and choice translates to the right of elected
officials and other appointers to decide who they want to appoint, who they view as best qualified for a position, and whether or not they choose to, for example, reappoint a longstanding member of a particular board or commission, regardless of whether or not this has a disparate impact.

When affirmative action was rolled out in the 1970s, critics called it “reverse racism or reverse sexism” (Wicker 1975). Opponents still consider it “preferential treatment” that unfairly takes into account supposedly irrelevant attributes such as gender or race (Gamson 1992a). There is a movement away from identity-devoid and identity-neutral ideologies and perspectives toward embracing people across identities, toward fostering identity-inclusive spaces that value people’s identities as meritorious. However, this is not the dominant frame used by affirmative action proponents or opponents. With consideration of identity considered discriminatory by affirmative action opponents, the ballot initiatives against affirmative action were thus characterized as civil rights initiatives, not only as a strategic matter of framing and to confuse voters, but because affirmative action opponents sincerely believe they are fighting against discrimination. In the New Hampshire legislature, advocates for banning affirmative action sincerely invoked Martin Luther King, Jr. as an inspiration for their actions. Governor Mike Foster (R) of Louisiana similarly invoked King when he banned affirmative action in 1996, as did Governor Pete Wilson (R) of California repeatedly during the 1996 ballot initiative there (Rockwell 1996). However, clearly King’s opposition to discrimination does not solely belong to those appropriating it. King himself was a strong supporter of affirmative action (Martin 2019; Rockwell 1996).

King’s words and principles can be engaged by both proponents and opponents of affirmative action because affirmative action is a complex concept that deals with both real culture and ideal culture. The idea that affirmative action challenges discrimination and the idea that it is discriminatory are two sides of the same coin. Indeed, the very language banning identity-based (gender) discrimination could be proposed: 1) by advocates of affirmative action who perceive
banning discrimination as a requirement for affirmative action and what they believe affirmative action is designed for, as well as 2) by opponents of affirmative action who perceive banning identity-based discrimination as eliminating what they view as preferential treatment. To this end, a 1989 gender balance bill in New Jersey was sent to the Commission on Sex Discrimination for work to revise its language because it had been deemed to have “sexually biased language” (Spencer 1989; Valin 1990). With opponents of affirmative action turning from blatant racism and prejudice to “new racists” who embrace a formally post-racial post-identity environment, the line separating opponents and proponents of civil liberties, civil rights, and affirmative action becomes more ambiguous and contested, also making stakeholders and the public less easily able to pick sides, since they seemingly have lost their previously stark distinctions (Berrey 2015; Bonilla-Silva 2018; Gamson 1992a).

In opposing gender balance in 2009, Representative Annette Sweeney (R-Hardin) stated, “I think we should be elected and appointed on our merits” (Clayworth 2009b). The crux is, affirmative action advocates believe the same thing. In a 1975 memo, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Civil Rights Director Peter Holmes clarified that affirmative action is meant to prohibit “differential standards based on race, color, sex, religion or national origin” (Wicker 1975). Overall, contemporary advocacy for and against affirmative action is focused on one identical goal: ending discrimination.

While gender balance opponents who subscribe to a gender-devoid ideology interpret gender balance legislation as challenging meritocracy, gender balance supporters interpret the legislation as supporting meritocracy. Affirmative action advocates believe discrimination is the cause of women’s continued underrepresentation. In 1978, the Iowa Women’s Political Caucus (IWPC) sent a letter to Governor Ray advocating for Janet Johnson to be appointed to the Appeals Court. In the letter, Acting Chairperson Linda Hanson wrote about the IWPC’s concerns: “We wish to take this
opportunity to thank you for your efforts over the past ten years in making appointments on the basis of qualifications, thereby increasing the number of women serving the State of Iowa” (Hanson 1978). Affirmative action seeks to remedy ongoing and often informal discrimination that its advocates understand as producing disparate outcomes.

Affirmative action has an explicitly gender-devoid goal. For example, going into 2009 when Iowa voted on local gender balance, the 2008 Democratic national party platform stated,

We support affirmative action, including in federal contracting and higher education, to make sure that those locked out of the doors of opportunity will be able to walk through those doors in the future. As the late Ann Richards said, ‘We offer a vision where opportunity knows no race, no gender, no color, a glimpse of what can happen in government if we simply open the doors let the people in’ (Democratic 2008).

Another example of this goal came up in my interview with Senator Johnie Hammond (D-Story), who discussed her successful work transitioning the Story County social welfare board from being a woman-only board. Hammond noted that the first man she got to be on the board “really came to appreciate and value it.” She proudly stated that “So I think anymore, they don’t even think about gender when they make appointments of those boards” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018).

The difference between opponents and proponents is that gender-devoid ideologies attempt to ignore gender in the present, evaluating a merit-based system as already existing and thus embracing the myth of meritocracy, whereas gender-conscious ideologies bring gender to the forefront, evaluating a merit-based system and meritocracy as a goal that needs to be created through “remedial action” (Gamson 1992a). Opponents live in the world of observable power in which appointers grapple with their options and then make decisions based no qualifications, or alternatively discriminate and make decisions based on identity (Dahl 1961). Supporters of gender balance consider institutional bias, “nondecision-making,” and how gender as a salient social system produces discriminatory outcomes as a result of such factors as insular social networks, a legacy from historical legally enforced power stratification, and gender stereotypes and stigma that
influence who appointers are, who they recruit, who applies for positions, and how their qualifications are evaluated (Bachrach and Baratz 1962, 1970; Gaventa 1995; Gaventa and Martorano 2016; Lukes 2005). “Norms, institutional arrangements, and social identities and exclusions” shape the decision-making of appointers such that they can reproduce unequal power dynamics even while unaware of how they are participating in and reproducing a larger sexist social system (Hayward 2000; Johnson 2014a).

President Nixon’s Task Force on Women’s Rights and Responsibilities released their report, “A Matter of Simple Justice,” in June 1970. The report called addressing women’s underrepresentation in appointments by urging that “the President and his Cabinet should place stronger emphasis on appointments based on merit rather than sex, and wherever possible urge the private sector to follow suit” (Presidential 1970:28-29). While this seems very different from policies like gender balance, in both cases advocates believed sexism was the culprit that was preventing women from their basic right to be “able to participate effectively in political choices that govern one’s life” (Nussbaum 2007). The underpinning of this 1970 call was for removing overt discrimination to enable women to be appointed. Gender balance advocates in the 1980s and beyond recognized that even after gender discrimination was illegal, it still happened, and manifested in both explicit and implicit manners. Advocates believed a gender-conscious and gender-affirmative rather than gender-devoid policy was necessary in order to actually have appointments reflect “merit rather than sex” (Presidential 1970:28-29). Advocates recognized the different “background conditions” men and women encounter in their pathways to appointments, with women having substantive barriers that interfere with their equal opportunity to be considered, compete for, or be given appointments (Williams 1998).

A key difference, then, between advocates and opponents of gender balance, is that advocates make a gender-conscious evaluation of the empirical situation at hand, leading to
recognition of gender imbalance as a systemic problem that causes harm. This is necessarily gender-conscious as it requires considering women as a systemically marginalized group. As noted earlier in this section, it is necessarily systemic or else it would not require a systemic solution. At the beginning of this section, three pathways were laid out for interpretations of affirmative action corresponding with gender-devoid and meritocratic ideologies. The alternative pathway, taken by supporters who see gender imbalance as a systemic problem, corresponds with a gender-conscious ideology and meritocracy-seeking orientation, with interpreting affirmative action as challenging rather than promoting discrimination. Following this pathway, women and men are equally qualified for board and commission appointments. While there may be individual-level variation, overall there is nothing inherent about men or women that makes one gender more or less qualified. Therefore, robust inequalities in outcomes can only be due to a lack of meritocracy—to an unequal system (Phillips 1995). The good ol’ boys network, insular social networks, women consistently not being asked to serve, evaluations of women’s competencies, and women’s lack of symbolic representation affecting their cognitive self-concept, all contribute towards systemically producing a disproportionate underrepresentation of women among appointees.

This differentiating factor—believing society is already meritocratic versus believe there is systemic inequality—is a key differentiator for affirmative action support. In the late 1980s, Gamson’s focus groups found that everyone supported meritocracy in principle, but those who believed U.S. society was not meritocratic in practice supported affirmative action (Gamson 1992a). While Gamson was studying affirmative action in the context of race, not gender, and he was analyzing focus groups and not actual behavior in a non-research environment, his finding that acknowledgement of the existence of systemic discrimination moderated affirmative action support seems to extend to gender as well (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003; Gamson 1992a).
Gamson (1992a) found generally universal acceptance the idea of individualism and evaluating people based on their individual (and not group) merits. Still, this did not lead everyone to oppose affirmative action. Gamson identified two competing frames that those who otherwise subscribed to individualism and merit-based decision-making fell under. Opponents viewed affirmative action as “preferential treatment.” In contrast, supporters viewed it as “remedial action.” This latter frame recognized that racial discrimination still exists and viewed affirmative action as “an expression of an ongoing incomplete struggle for equal opportunity in American society” (Gamson 1992a:3). In particular, overall, black groups justified affirmative action as giving them equal opportunity rather than as preferential treatment. Even with equal qualifications, blacks still face hiring and job discrimination. Given ongoing racial discrimination, affirmative action was necessary for black people to have sufficient opportunities to obtain quality jobs.

Gamson (1992a:74) found that “many black groups framed affirmative action as the latest chapter in a long, unfinished story of the black struggle for inclusion… The civil rights movement appeared as an earlier and successful chapter in that effort.” Similarly, Iowa women’s rights advocates framed gender balance as part of the broader struggle for gender equity. In Iowa in the late 1980s, women’s rights advocates considered gender balance to be one strategy to move gender equality forward in the wake of the failure of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) and in a way that aligned with the ERA’s principles. In 2009, women’s rights advocates considered gender balance a strategy to continue the efforts of the 1980s that had begun to change the makeup of women’s representation on boards and commissions in Iowa but had not translated to many local governments adopting the practice of proportionally including women in decision-making.

Bonilla-Silva calls cultural racism, abstract liberalism, minimization of racism, and naturalization “frames or set paths for interpreting information” and argues these pathways are “the central component of any dominant ideology” (Bonilla-Silva 2018). For advocates to manage
collective action frames and help stakeholders navigate ideologies such that they came out in support of gender balance, these frames needed to be suppressed or otherwise overcome rather than activated or prioritized. If advocates could convince stakeholders that gender imbalance is a problem and results from systemic sexism, Gamson’s study suggests that stakeholders will not activate the meritocracy myth or gender-devoid ideologies and thus will not travel down the path toward opposing the legislation. Supporters of gender balance recognized that the “good ol’ boys network”, a men-dominated system, was not already meritocratic. Due to their recognition of systemic sexism, they considered legislation like gender balance necessary to work toward creating a meritocratic system in which women would have a fair opportunity to participate.

On the surface, this moderating factor Gamson identified seems quite straightforward. Everyone supports meritocracy, but not everyone believes we have one. Those who do not believe we have one may also identify systemic inequality as the reason we do not have a meritocracy, and thus they support affirmative action as a corrective. People’s evaluations of whether or not a systemic problem exists directly informs whether the existing system is meritocratic, moderating support for affirmative action and in this case gender balance.

However, this oversimplifies the interpretive process and how people navigate ideologies and navigate their perceptions of empirical phenomena to come to particular outcomes. First, if the current system is not meritocratic, what is the scope, scale, and form of the problem? Depending on answers to these questions, stakeholders may believe the appropriate corrective action is to encourage more widespread recruitment or to keep records and report the gender makeup of appointed bodies. Viewing a lack of meritocracy as systemic also leads to different policy solutions in comparison to viewing the issue as more individualistic. Having an understanding of ineffective versus effective policy measures can impact policy support. For example, support for a requirement rather than goal statement is more likely if stakeholders know that voluntary measures to encourage
increased representation generally have little impact if not met with some form of accountability or a decision among someone with power to exercise leadership to implement the encouraged idea.

Quirmbach, the sole Democratic vote against gender balance in 2009, did take the step Gamson recognized as pivotal—he recognized the large gender distribution gap on boards and commissions as a problem. However, he was also invested in meritocracy, in part, he claimed, because of his experiences with his partner in academia, an institution he believed was heavily based on meritocracy. Quirmbach, however, did not perceive gender imbalance as a problem requiring regulatory intervention in the selection process. Quirmbach trusted that if there was broader recruitment, appointers would make meritocratic decisions. He felt that reporting would make appointers aware of the need to recruit more broadly, but that this gender imbalance, a natural phenomenon but perhaps a bit too extreme in practice in Iowa, needed to be addressed without destroying an overall fair and nondiscriminatory system. Gamson identified belief in “institutional racism” as the moderator, which for gender balance translates to understanding how patriarchy functions. Quirmbach lacked a structural view of gender imbalance.

Gamson identified views on systemic racism as differentiating people into two discrete subuniverses of symbolic meaning (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Gamson 1992a). However, people are not simply in one camp or the other. People hold multiple ideologies at once, which can complement and conflict with one another, and which need to be navigated. Representative Dolores Mertz (D-Kossuth), along with many House Republicans, voted both for Horbach’s amendment to support gender-devoid appointments as well as for the overall bill to require more women on boards and commissions. Not all legislators who voted for the bill rejected the idea that the bill was formally discriminatory. Instead, this idea (based in traditional ideologies) coexisted alongside other prioritized ideologies and views on the bill, which had to be weighed against one another.
Representative Renee Schulte (D-Linn), who voted for the bill, also voted for Horbach’s amendment. She recalls feeling torn about the overall bill. Schulte generally agreed with opponents’ criticisms of the measure. She said, “I’m a person that’s about the best candidate, not just about what their gender is and that shouldn’t just be qualified for something because you’re one thing or another.” This is an expression of commitment to meritocracy and gender-devoidedness. On the other hand, Schulte also drew on a gender-conscious ideology and her evaluation that the current system did not always produce the best candidate, noting that that “being female I got that part of not being included” (R. Schulte, PC, 2018). Her vote was not a rejection of dominant ideologies or evidence that they were not present, but instead evidence of holding complexity within, of negotiating ideologies, priorities, and interpretations of the facts on the ground to determine her position.

Indeed, even gender balance champion Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) opposed Senator Mark Chelgren (R-Wapello)’s political party balance bill for state university faculty because she believed that to “judge people on the basis of their race” or other category goes against “protect[ing] equity” and “would be clearly discriminatory” (Pfannenstiel 2017c). Mascher thus employed an identity-devoid and meritocratic frame on an issue in which she does not view there being a systemic problem, while she employs an identity-conscious justice frame for gender balance.

Unlike in Gamson’s model, in Iowa belief in systemic inequality was not the sole determinant differentiating support and opposition to gender balance. Legislators and stakeholders navigated a variety of ideologies. Catt Center Director Dianne Bystrom said that “Some of the objections to it really wasn’t about gender balance. It was about putting another layer of regulation on counties and cities…. The arguments that I tended to see at the time is that it’s just really hard to find board members, this is gonna put another burden on our city and county administrators” (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018).
Considering the role of government, some individuals prioritized good governance, like Representative Doug Struyk (R-Pottawattamie), who supported the legislation as good and fair policy, but as of 2018 still did not think the gender imbalance that existed in 2009 was a genuine “problem” that needed to be fixed. For Struyk, by 2009, over 20 years after the state gender balance law, gender balance had become a regular part of the policy toolbox at legislators’ disposal rather than a more radical intervention that needed a systemic problem in order to employ. Struyk was also a former Democrat, and so had been politically socialized through a party apparatus with standard operating procedures that included 50-50 rules.

Waterloo Mayor Tim Hurley, who in 2009 was president of the League of Cities Board, also prioritized his organization’s opposition to local mandates and the role he played as president of that organization in opposing the bill. Hurley was quite sympathetic to the substance of the bill, though he also held and recognized that he held conflicting gender ideologies that both made him think gender balance was important for women’s progress and that drew on his own socialization growing up in “a pretty patriarchal society” that made him worry that local governments would not be able to find enough qualified women.

Stakeholders even had additional pathways to support of gender balance beyond the role of government or notions around meritocracy and inequality. In 1986, Governor Branstad signed gender balance into law because he wanted his reorganization bill. In 1987, Branstad signed the stricter gender balance legislation into law because he viewed it as a fair enough tradeoff for getting his gender imbalanced appointments confirmed in what was at least a violation of the spirit of the 1986 law. Additionally, while the 1987 legislation was very much one made in a gender-conscious environment as a result of Branstad’s controversial appointments and the Des Moines Register’s response, the 1987 debate was not about whether or not gender balance is good or bad policy; it was
about whether or not it could be accomplished without exception, as well as about good governance and holding the executive branch accountable.

A gender-devoid ideology leads people to believe affirmative action is discriminatory, whereas a gender-conscious ideology leads people to believe affirmative action challenges discrimination. While these seem like separate contrasting ideologies, in reality people tend to support addressing inequality and to support leaving fair systems alone, and people tend to support (certain forms of) diversity and inclusiveness and to support not stigmatizing constructed characteristics that are discriminated against. People may agree, to an extent, with arguments that activate multiple potentially dissonant ideologies simultaneously. Nevertheless, evaluating whether we already have meritocracy (the myth of meritocracy) or whether we have structural inequality is largely a descriptive rather than ideological question. Evaluations of meritocracy in combination with an existing gender imbalance brought up disagreements over the extent to which qualified women existed for board and commission positions. However, these discussions were inevitably processed at a micro and negotiable level. Strong advocates for gender balance evaluated gender imbalance as a structural as opposed to individual, non-existent, or minor problem. Advocates looking to gain support for gender balance worked to ensure legislators and stakeholders were aware that gender imbalance existed, was substantial, and was due to systemic inequality.

_Socially Patterned Groups and Beliefs_

While there was universal agreement on many worldviews and values, there was also some differentiation, especially in interpretations. Beliefs regarding ideologies such as egalitarianism, gender ideology, meritocracy, individualism, neoliberalism are socially shaped, influenced and differentiated by social networks and groups as well as by positionality, one’s lived experience and relational positioning based on social location (Blekensaune and Qaudagno 2003). Groups serve as
subuniverses of symbolic meaning, crafting how we understand reality, serving as ideological resources and informing our descriptive understanding of the reality we encounter. Our group memberships and social locations come with particular positional statuses, which have associated roles that include ways of acting and thinking (Blekensaune and Quadagno 2003). Our group memberships shape our everyday experiences, which in turn impact our interpretation of the social world (Berger and Luckmann 1966).

Socially patterned belief structures came into play for gender balance in a number of areas, such as rural versus urban residents, social conservatives, including members of the Dutch Reformed Church, local government associations and their memberships, the Women’s Legislative Caucus, etc. While these were important, social patterns that pertain to groups are just that—patterns. They do not apply equally or necessarily at all to individual members of the group in question. The categories that correspond with these patterns are also varied rather than uniform and have many different intersections (e.g. a rural town could have a population of 200 or 5,000, and it could be a river town or in an area where the Dutch Reformed Church is prevalent). For example, one pattern is that the university towns of Ames and Iowa City tended to produce feminist gender balance advocates who were well-supported by their community in their advocacy efforts. However, Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story) is also from Ames. There is also robust political diversity across Iowa communities, including in Ames and Iowa City. Public officials do tend to employ ideologies and adopt positions that are not regularly drastically different from their constituents’ typical beliefs and stances, because if they do not, they may not get re-elected. This happened to Senator David Hartsuch (R-Scott), who was primaried out of office in 2010 by a fellow Republican who thought Hartsuch was too right-wing, particularly for the district. Individuals also do not fit into just one category for analysis. For example, Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) is not just a woman, or just from Iowa City, or just in the House. Identities and social locations are similar
to ideologies in that there are multiple simultaneously held ones that co-exist and require meaning-making and navigation.

One important social location was gender. There were certainly more conservative women who opposed gender balance, such as in 2009 the more rural Republican women in the House and a couple local government leaders in Story County. In 2010 and 2011, during the years between local gender balance passage and implementation, political scientists Rebecca Hannagan and Chris Larimer (2017) conducted a study evaluating local board members’ feelings about the gender balance law. Their study included 50 randomly selected local boards and commissions in 18 different cities. They found that the only subgroup to oppose local gender balance was women conservatives on boards that were majority women. In 2009, among House Republicans, the two women yes votes were from representatives who lived in counties with over 150,000 residents, and the five women no votes were from representatives who lived in counties with under 30,000 residents.

However, the women’s organization establishment [e.g. the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW), Iowa Women’s Political Caucus (IWPC), American Association of University Women (AAUW), League of Women Voters (LWV), etc.] was a source of unbridled support for women’s rights in Iowa. Iowa women’s groups had active knowledge about the issue of women’s representation on boards and commissions and of gender balance and had collectively subscribed to an egalitarian gender ideology that gave them a history of and continued support for women’s rights issues including gender balance (Grunow, Begall, and Buchler 2018). A number of legislators, stakeholders, and activists were members of these groups, especially women, and many more engaged with these groups through forums, meetings, as colleagues, and in other capacities. Many of the women legislators who began their service in the 1960s through the 1980s became engaged in politics and policy through these organizations and were stimulated to run for office because of their involvement with them.
While the Women’s Legislative Caucus (WLC) connected women legislators in the late 1980s, many women legislators were still connected in 2009. Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn), who voted for gender balance in 2009, was a member of the LWV, the Professional Women’s Network, and had attended a Catt Center Ready to Run® training (Des 2008; Iowa Legislature 2018c; K. Winfrey, PC, 2018). Schulte was part of a social network that saw women’s empowerment, public policy, and gender equity in appointed office as vehicles for addressing gender inequality.

Senator Swati Dandekar (D-Linn) was also involved with women’s groups and served as chair of the National Foundation for Women Legislators (Iowa Legislature 2018c). One way Dandekar kept in touch with the communities in her district was through regular forums throughout her district, many organized by the LWV. Dandekar volunteered that the response of women and women’s groups to gender balance in 2009 was that “they wanted gender equality.” Dandekar said “all” the women she encountered at various forums throughout her district were gender balance advocates, across generations. She felt that women were strong supporters in part because they knew the problem. Dandekar said that while, because of her scientific background, she makes decisions based on reason and studying issues, she felt that the ICSW’s study of women’s representation on county boards and commissions was unnecessary. She said, “I mean, we didn’t have to show them any numbers…. [Women’s underrepresentation] was very obvious for them to see” (S. Dandekar, PC, 2018).

Representative Elesha Gayman (D-Scott) had been socialized into the issue of women’s representation on boards and commissions by the AAUW. When she joined the legislature, she learned about the idea of gender balancing boards and commissions. Gayman said she remembered gender balance being “continually talked about…. It was definitely a prominent topic that was coming up in various circles (E. Gayman, PC, 2018). Mascher also spoke about the strong backing and support she felt shoring her up on this issue. She said that, “Certainly we were getting a lot of
women back home who were asking us to stay firm and make sure we did get it through” (M. Mascher, PC, 2018b). For women in these circles, the goodness of gender balance laws was taken for granted and universal.

Hammond recalled that in 1985 she and the other bipartisan group of women on the House State Government Committee were quite surprised when men on the committee did not support her gender balance amendment. They had thought that at least a more substantial number of these men were on board with moving women’s rights forward in Iowa. Similarly, women in 2009 assumed that awareness of the issue and support for gender balance went well beyond their networks. Dandekar talked about the “general public” being aware that women were substantially underrepresented and Mascher said she thought that prior to the 2009 bill, “Everybody was very well aware of [the state gender balance requirement]…. The general public is well aware of it and they watch those things closely” (M. Mascher, PC, 2018a). However, these perceptions imposed their group’s norms onto other groups and people that had very different networks and conversations. In particular, in 2009 many men were unaware of the issue of gender balance on boards and commissions.

Generally speaking, this issue was not part of men’s cognitive landscape in 2009 prior to the bill being put before them. There were particular exceptions to this: men who had been involved in the 1980s campaigns and debacles, in particular with Governor Terry Branstad (R)’s appointments and the judicial nominating commission issues, were aware of gender balance. Those who focused on issues of social justice were aware, like Representative Wayne Ford (D-Polk) who had introduced his own gender balance bill in the past. Senators were aware of the gender balance law because they were responsible for confirming the governor’s appointments.

However, even men state representatives were often unaware of the state law. In contrast to women legislators’ experiences, House Minority Leader Kraig Paulsen (R-Linn), who was in the same county as Dandekar and Schulte, said that, “I’m guessing this is something somebody brought
forward and thought it was a good idea and they got the attention and it moved through the process—I mean, I don’t remember anybody ever identifying this as an issue before or after [2009]” (K. Paulsen, PC, 2018). Likewise, when I asked Representative Donovan Olson (D-Boone), a former county supervisor who had been in the state house since his election in 2002, when he had first heard of the idea of gender balance, he responded, “Uh, it was just a bill that was introduced in the House. I don’t know if it was introduced by an individual legislator or multiple,… [but] it wasn’t something that had been building for years” (D. Boone, PC, 2018). When I reached out to Representative Chris Rants (R-Woodbury), who had filed an amendment to unexempt local jurisdictions and was quoted in the newspaper about the gender balance bill, he said he did not remember the bill or how he had voted on it; this indicates this was not one of his top priorities or an area he took particular interest in (C. Rants, PC, 2018). Overall, men’s networks and connections to this legislation were very different. This is another example of embedded gender segregation as a consequence of exclusive social networks.

On the one hand, the history of women’s representation on boards and commissions in Iowa played an important cognitive role in getting gender balance bills adopted, from a strong appointments project and increased state representation to the impact of having the law from the 1980s that normalized the practice of gender balance for boards and commissions. On the other hand, this history was limited to those familiar with or products of its legacy. Legislators who only learned in 2009 that Iowa had had a gender balance law for state boards and commissions for over 20 years did not have the same connection to the law or internalization of its merit or of it as being the status quo. In contrast, those that were involved in women’s networks, like 2009 ICSW member Phyllis Peters, and who advocated for the bill, were connected to its history. Peters was involved in politics and knew “good powerful women” in politics and on state boards and commissions, and had thus been told about the 1980s history and fight for gender balance. ICSW members were also
aware of Iowa’s exceptional status regarding the law due to their participation in the National Association of Commissions for Women (NACW). In 2009, Peters, along with some other ICSW member and board members from the Friends of the ICSW group, helped further socialize particular groups of Iowans and expand knowledge of gender balance throughout the state, especially through women’s networks. Peters herself went to “many,… maybe six or eight” group meetings, among them Business and Professional Women (BPW) of Iowa, the National Association of Women Business Owners (NAWBO), and AAUW, LWV, and Democratic groups (Peters was a known Democrat). She also recalled that the Friends board had members active in NAWBO and Girl Scouts and talked to Girl Scouts leaders all over the state (P. Peters, PC, 2018b).

Men and women tend to be in different symbolic subuniverses of meaning on issues of women’s rights that differentiate their ideological and social resources on the issue. They are also differentially positioned within the patriarchy. As discussed in the previous chapter, women’s exclusion and women’s engagement with men’s attempted domination has often served as a cognitive awakening force for women, fostering feminism and conscientization process away from internalized traditional dominant norms around gender. For men, however, living in a patriarchal system results in a privileged position, and without experiencing systemic gender-based disadvantage in the arena of power, this cognitively distorts men’s worlds. Men take their experiences as normal and universal, lending themselves to a gender-devoid ideology and to not recognizing women’s oppression. Even those with a strong egalitarian ideology may simply be unaware of the issue of women’s underrepresentation on appointed office or may experience the issue as comparatively inconsequential (DiAngelo 2011; Dyer 1997; Johnson 2014a, 2014b; McIntosh 2008; Simons et al. 2014).

This kind of oversight—failing to notice women and their positionality—was present in Iowa on issues of women’s rights in general. For example, a 1983 Des Moines Register editorial
suggested that “to get a politician’s attention, write him a personal letter,” taking men legislators as the universal (Carl et al. 1983). This also came forward on the issue of boards and appointments. When President Richard Nixon (R) made about 200 high level appointments, he and his top staff did not realize that only three were women; women journalist Vera Glaser did (Stout 2012). As previously noted, women in appointing roles tended to appoint much higher percentages of women compared to men appointers (National 1978).

This translated directly to the issue of gender balance in Iowa. As previously discussed, local government associations did not think of themselves as discriminatory and also had not on their own identified women’s underrepresentation as a salient issue. Iowa State Association of Counties (ISAC) Public Policy Specialist Hanna De Groot said that, regarding gender imbalance and women’s underrepresentation, even with the ICSW study, the issue was not one that they had brought forward to address. She said, “That’s not the standpoint we were coming from, of trying to get more females on boards.” De Groot was quick to follow up on this by noting ISAC “celebrated and welcomed” all county officials, including women. DeGroot continued, “But to say that we were concerned?.... That issue’s never been…. I don’t recall in our conversations with the policy team if we were concerned.” DeGroot noted their concern about boards and appointments was about, when “you get into these really small, small counties, I mean they’re basically begging people to be on these boards and commissions, let alone trying to find a female” (H. De Groot, PC, 2018).

Differential cognitive landscapes result in different individuals and groups encountering the same circumstances with divergent noticings and ideas about what is relevant (Simons et al. 2014).

Informal social networks also played a role with other individuals and in other patterned ways. Differing ideologies and ways to interpret ideologies for this phenomenon were spread through these relatively closed social networks. For example, both Representatives Lance Horbach (R-Tama) and Donovan Olson (D-Boone) said they were legislators their colleagues would come
talk to about these types of issues. Horbach was a Republican who especially had other Republicans come to him. Horbach gave feedback based on his business experience; he shared how gender balance is discriminatory and never something one would do in the business world. Olson was a Democrat who would thus especially have had other Democrats come to him, though he also was a former local official who was on the Local Government Committee. Olson gave feedback based on his rural local government experience; Olson told his colleagues that yes, making diverse appointments and achieving gender balance is difficult, but that it is necessary for the cultural change needed in these communities (D. Olson, PC, 2018; L. Horbach, PC, 2018). Another informal social network was between legislators and their local government officials. Local government associations sought to support and foster these connections. Representative Doug Struyk (R-Pottawattamie) recalled ISAC playing this connecting role, encouraging him to call his local government officials, like his mayor, and in turn asking local electeds to contact their legislators (D. Struyk, PC, 2018).

One other key social group and differentiator of social networks, particularly in politics, is political party, as was noted above in terms of people seeking Horbach or Olson for expertise on the legislation. In the 1980s partisanship played a factor in the legislature’s relationship to the governor’s office (two different parties), and by 2009 the legislature was quite partisan, including on women’s rights issues like gender balance. As of 2009, the 2008 Democratic and Republican party platforms both addressed women’s rights and affirmative action. The Democratic national and state platforms supported gender balance and women’s rights (Democratic 2008; Iowa Democratic 2008c). In contrast, the 2008 Iowa Republican national party platform stated, “We reject, preferences, quotas, and set-asides…. We affirm the common-sense approach of the Chief Justice of the United States: that the way to stop discriminating on the basis of race is to stop discriminating” (Republican
The Iowa Republican Party platform stated, “We call for an end to all forms of Affirmative Action” (Iowa Republican 2008).

As of 2009, the Republican party was officially opposed to any affirmative action measures. In contrast, Senator Steve Sodders (D-Marshall) noted that gender balance was specifically “a priority for Democrats.” While this was ideological—the Democratic party supports affirmative action—Sodders noted this was also in part because the organizations that were committed to gender balance were also ones that supported Democrats (S. Sodders, PC, 2018a). These overlapping social networks helped connect women’s rights organizations to the legislature, through unions, good government organizations, other nonprofits and advocacy groups, and through legislators themselves.

As previously noted, social groups should not be essentialized. In this case, the status of being in the legislature moderated the effect of party on views on gender balance. First, partisan legislative bodies are structured, more than most organizations in civil society, to encourage partisanship. Iowa AFL-CIO lobbyist Jan Laue noted that by 2009 there did not seem to be any labor-allied Republicans left in the legislature. However, she noted that, “I think left to their own devices, they probably would have been a little bit more friendly….., but on labor issues, there was just a clear line” (J. Laue, PC, 2018). The gender balance issue in 2009 was very partisan, again with no Republicans in the Senate voting for the bill, a majority of Republicans in the House voting against the bill, and only one Democrat in the entire legislature voting against the bill. However, while the legislature broadly acted as a partisan body on gender balance in 2009, outside the legislature, partisanship was deprioritized.

While gender balance was a starkly partisan issue in the legislature in 2009, it remained nonpartisan among ICSW commissioners (other than among the ex officio legislator members). The ICSW was both political party and gender balanced, and all ICSW members in 2009 supported the
gender balance priority (P. Peters, PC, 2018b). Similarly, Governor Kim Reynolds (R), who had been a Republican senator from Clarke County in 2009 and had spoken out against gender balance in 2009, in 2018 was speaking out about “the value… of a more inclusive Iowa” and actively supporting the ICSW’s work to develop an appointments project mobile application (an ‘app’) to help implement local gender balance, including through providing funding. Peters, who worked with the governor’s office over the past few years in her role as ICSW chair, said she had a positive relationship with Reynolds and that Reynolds is “totally behind this tool for the talent bank.” Peters attributed Reynolds’ opposition in 2009 to her networks at the time: a former county office holder who was “very active in ISAC” (P. Peters, PC, 2018b, 2019). Reynolds now is removed from those environments and is supportive of the law’s implementation.

Catt Center Director Dianne Bystrom similarly said that “the governor herself has spoken in favor of gender balanced boards.” Bystrom also said she is “in constant contact with the governor’s office and their person that does the state boards, and like I said, I feel like there’s a commitment.” Bystrom said that the governor’s office appointee in charge of appointments is “totally committed to the project, and you don’t hear them griping about it or like, I wish we didn’t have [this law]” (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018). Bystrom extended this both to the state gender balance and local gender balance law. Bystrom said “Reynolds is a conservative Republican and she’s very much in favor of this legislation,” and that the staff in the governor’s office who have been implementing state gender balance—Republican women—have also all been “very much committed to the law.” Bystrom said she finds the same support when she meets with local government staff, regardless of their party (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018). Similarly, it was previously noted that Lanegran also found even Republican local government staff to be generally supportive of the law (K. Lanegran, PC, 2018).

Bystrom, who is a political scientist, said that “from a political science perspective that often happens: you have a divided legislature that makes everything partisan,” while outside the legislature
the issue may be much less partisan (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018). For gender balance, the 1980s bills had bipartisan support, but by 2009, votes were very partisan. However, this does not mean that the bill was necessarily partisan among the public. To the extent that the public was aware of and engaged with the issue of local gender balance, there are a number of social group membership and social networks that could differentiate their support for the law.

People tend to evaluate and interpret factual information related to public policy issues based on their affinity group’s position on said policy, unless there is some other personal benefit that would lead them to evaluate the facts before them in a different way (Kahan 2015). Among House Republicans, representatives who lived in higher population density municipalities and/or counties were more likely to support gender balance compared to their more rural counterparts. However, it was their lived experience, social networks, and socialization in that setting that mattered. The extent to which representatives’ legislative districts were urban or rural made little difference. It was their community of residence that mattered (Iowa Legislature 2018c; State 2009a).

In particular contexts and settings, some stakeholders self-identify with a master status. In the realm of the 2009 gender balance legislation, Horbach identified as a business advocate, Representative Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton) as a rural legislator, Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux) as a small government advocate, and Mascher as a women’s rights advocate. For evaluating gender balance as a policy, this was their starting position and thus perspective. From this vantage point, “the entire society now makes sense” (Berger and Luckmann 1966:121). However, in modern “pluralistic” societies, multiple groups exist, with different ideologies and beliefs, and this in and of itself embeds doubt into any one ideology or belief structure (Berger and Luckmann 1966). People are also members of multiple groups, which can lead them to have to sort through an issue or approach their beliefs differently in different contextual spaces (Kahan 2015). Gender balance advocates sought to influence stakeholders and legislators that were part of groups different from
their own. Their strategies and tactics for navigating their targets’ ideologies, and its impact on the trajectory of the gender balance legislation, is discussed next in this chapter.

Social Persuasion through Creating and Resolving Dissonance

Gender balance advocates seeking policy support sought to convince stakeholders and legislators to support gender balance through collective action frame management. Specifically, advocates helped facilitate a process where targets encountered an empirical confrontation relating to the policy and then were offered a cognitive explanation to make sense of that empirical phenomenon that favored support of gender balance legislation. Continued engagements over time had the potential to garner additional schematic support, but advocates had finite resources and time, as well as other ongoing priorities. Nevertheless, their strategy and tactics succeeding in getting enough support to successfully adopt the legislation.

Empirical confrontations.

Advocates can employ collective action frames to help steer stakeholders as they evaluate gender balance within various potential ideological contexts. As previously noted, one key moderator of whether a stakeholder’s meritocracy or egalitarian ideologies will be activated is whether or not they believe that a systemic problem exists. Advocates can help manage stakeholders’ cognitive trajectory by showing them an interpretation of the everyday world that is consistent with support for gender balance. If this is done with someone who is already sympathetic or believes there is probably a problem, this will reinforce and strengthen their conviction, providing facts that resonate with their belief system. Advocates can also target someone who either has generally given little thought to the issue (if it is outside their cognitive landscape), because of their privilege and/or often because the issue is one they do not perceive as regularly impacting them, or to someone who is unsympathetic
and may not believe there is a problem. Advocates can create an empirical confrontation with ideologies that are serving as barriers to policy support, putting forward to the target a world not reconcilable with dogmatic adherence to an ideology that opposes gender balance. The target is then forced to consider the evidence before them and grapple with the issue so that they can find a way to reconcile the empirical confrontation and their belief structures.

Snow and Benford discuss a successful empirical confrontation as “frames being overwhelmed by events” (Gamson 1992b:70). Adherents to meritocracy, facing a situation they interpret as incompatible with meritocracy—decisions being made for reasons other than merit, excluding people from fair opportunities, and preventing the most qualified people from being selected—may change their descriptive evaluation of meritocracy, which can lead them to reject traditional meritocratic ideology within this policy area and pursue policies compatible with an egalitarian ideology. Here reconciliation is not actually a rejection of one ideology for another, but the pursuit of a policy option that will offer a corrective and re-enable the target to believe in meritocracy. Similarly, adherents to a gender-devoid ideology, facing a situation with few ways to interpret other than as gender-conscious discrimination, are forced to reckon with a world in which gender is a salient institutional force and make policy decisions within that context.

For example, in 1994 the Tennessee legislature passed a gender quota law for university boards. Among the bill’s supporters were Republicans who opposed quotas and recognized the bill before them as a quota. However, these supporters had their egalitarian ideologies activated by being presented with Tennessee’s current gender distribution on these boards (the University of Tennessee Board, Tennessee Higher Education Commission, State Board of Education, and Board of Regents each had only one or two women members out of their nine to 24 members each). In the words of one of these legislators, “Quota systems are repugnant. But what is even more repugnant to me is what has happened to these boards. Women are grossly underrepresented.” Clearly struggling with
the dissonance caused by this empirical situation activating multiple competing ideologies, Tennessee’s lieutenant governor, “by his own admission, changed positions three times during the discussion before voting for the bill” (Associated 1994; Daugherty 1994a, 1994b). The Tennessean newspaper characterized the vote as “a necessary evil” (Roberts 1994). Not all Tennessee legislators voted for the bill—a number chose to abstain, unsure what to do given the dissonance between their traditional ideologies and the world before them (Associated 1994; Daugherty 1994a, 1994b).

Regardless, it is clear that this empirical confrontation made the status quo more permeable and open to contestation and negotiation.

Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) E.D. Rachel Scott shared with me that their empirical study of gender distribution on county boards and commissions impacted legislators and stakeholders who may have started from a place of individualism, meritocracy, and gender-devoid ideologies being activated or on alert. Scott said,

People were like, Well, we’re not intentionally discriminating. We’re, y’know, we’re just looking for the best person for the job. And so I think it wasn’t until people saw the deficits that said like, Surely you know that it’s not 80% of men in your county are qualified and y’know, 20% of your women are. So I think it was that thing of like saying, you don’t see gender hasn’t solved the problem. Because in y’know, little Van Buren County, who said it’s required, they were having it, so, y’know, seeing gender and particularly looking for those volunteers worked (R. Scott, PC, 2018b).

So long as someone’s gender ideology did not explain 82% of county board and commission members being men as reflecting a gendered division of qualifications, the ICSW’s 2009 study of women’s underrepresentation on local boards and commissions demonstrated that, unless one believed fewer than one woman was most qualified for serving on a board and commission compared for every four men, the system in place was not meritocratic.

Scott not only presented this data, she customized it to her targets, for example showing legislators the gender distribution in the county or counties they represented. This brought the data from abstract to the actual goings-on in their community. Scott said that this facilitated support,
because it showed legislators the size and substance of the problem and that it was not something that was simply going to change without intervention. Scott recalled that “I would show up at these meetings with legislators and be like, Here’s your county. And they’d be like, Oh my gosh. So when they saw it with their own eyes, they thought, Okay, you do need to require this. It isn’t going to be, y’know, natural” (R. Scott, PC, 2018a).

Scott also took advantage of the “negative argument” in the “politics of presence”—that if we had a merit-based system, if we had equality, there would not be substantially disproportionate underrepresentation when compared more or less to a group’s proportional representation in that community (Phillips 1995). Since women made up half of Iowa and half of each county’s population, one would expect to find women represented in about half of board or commission seats, more or less. If this is not the case, there is a discriminatory force at work intervening to prevent this otherwise natural outcome. The ICSW’s empirical study enabled advocates to respond to stakeholders who argued that governments should appoint the most qualified people to boards and commissions by questioning whether those stakeholders think women are so unqualified that over fourth-fifths of appointments are men. As the ICSW’s 2009 fact sheet stated, “If local board and commission appointments were indeed based on qualifications of the citizenry, it would be astounding that so few women are appointed” (ICSW 2009f). The fact sheet then pivoted to discussing women’s qualifications (ICSW 2009f). This was also Representative Doris Kelley’s (D-Black Hawk) response to the argument that gender balance interferes with an otherwise meritocratic system. Kelley said, “I don’t buy what they’re saying, because there are women out there who are gonna be just as competent as men” (D. Kelley, PC, 2018).

In the Tennessee case, The Tennessean’s editorial in support of the legislation recognized this exact argument, noting that men and women would have been appointed rather equally “as a matter of course,” but that this had never occurred and still was not occurring, leaving the legislature
“no choice but to force the issue.… While the law could be correctly perceived as a quota measure, the numbers of men and women on the boards is so out of whack the legislature is right to make this affirmative move” (Roberts 1994). Most legislators may normally be unaware or not required to think about the gender distribution on boards and commissions. However, when they are confronted with a substantive imbalance and forced to reconcile it with their beliefs, one outcome is that, while still holding on to their more traditional ideologies, the importance of those ideologies can diminish, and instead ideologies around egalitarianism and social liberalism (government intervention to correct for inequality) can take precedent.

From Montana to California to North Carolina, these empirical confrontations were often a lever toward change (Sands 1991; Spencer 1989d, 1995, 1999b; Spillar and DiFiglia 1990; Valin 1990; Women’s 1999). Indeed, studies show that facts can influence ideology, especially when those facts are one’s here and now lived experiences (Margalit 2013; Naumann, Buss, and Bähr 2016).

In Iowa, confrontation with the empirical reality of the situation meant recognizing a problem existed, either strengthening supporters’ resolves or providing an empirical confrontation with the idea that there was not a problem. This helped spur action forward. In 2009, the empirical confrontation was the ICSW’s study showing women averaged 18% on economic-oriented county boards and commissions. In 1987, the governor’s gender imbalanced appointments and subsequent comments were juxtaposed with the response of the Des Moines Register. The Des Moines Register’s editorials with lists of qualified women served as an empirical confrontation that directly disputed the governor and his press secretary’s statements that there were not such qualified women to serve on the Board of Regents.

In the 1980s and in 2009, women’s presence in the legislature also served as an empirical confrontation to traditional gender ideologies. Their presence made it more difficult for men legislators to assert there were not qualified women to serve on boards and commissions.
“Frame disputes” may focus on understandings of a social phenomenon, appropriate policy and programmatic interventions, and/or how well various belief structures seem to resonate in making sense of the phenomenon (Snow and Benford 1992). Opposition to gender balance could be rooted in any or all of these interconnected areas: the scope, scale, and cause of gender imbalance, appropriate policies to address gender imbalance, and congruence of explanations about the issue with one’s existing values, beliefs, and ideologies. The general social science consensus has been that generally, when people are confronted with facts that conflict with their belief structures, they reject the facts, not the frames (Gamson 1992b; Lakoff 2010).

There are many ways that people rationalize away facts or otherwise justify them, finding a way to interpret them that fits within their existing dominant belief structures (Johnson 2014a). In terms of policy support, the interpretation of facts matter, not the facts themselves (Gamson 1992b). While information that contests one’s belief structures may lead one to question those particular belief structures, one can also deny the information’s validity. The initial stage of denial involves either denying that a problem exists or denying that it is serious. If that stage is overcome, the next stage is to blame the victim or say that the problem has a different (non-systemic and non-sexist) cause. If that is overcome, if “it becomes impossible to avoid seeing the reality of things,” the next stage is to not let oneself care, not make sense of it as a moral problem, or believe that addressing the problem is an impossible task (Johnson 2014a:149). While each of these stages may be surmountable, the notion that opposing frames will invalidate a presented seemingly objective reality makes empirical confrontations overall seem impotent. Thus the question becomes, when does an empirical confrontation with facts not lead to rejecting the facts, and instead lead to different policy outcomes?

My first response to this question is to reject its premise. People have multiple frames that they hold simultaneously, and while facts may contest certain frames, they fit into others. Facts may
contrast with a currently prioritized frame, but may simultaneously be interpreted as valid and meaningful among other frames. This contrast exists among what are contested issues, and the advocate’s job is to engage in “symbolic signifying” that convinces a target that the facts have “empirical credibility,” doing the work of making sense of the facts, of connecting them to a frame (Gamson 1992b; Snow and Benford 1992). It is not enough to give people facts; they need a context in which to understand those facts, and a context that resonates with them. I will discuss gender balance advocates’ offering of replacement frames in the next subsection. However, advocates use of terms like gender balance, gender equity, and gender parity, rather than gender quota, seem to be one obvious linguistic tool that can activate and has the potential to connect with egalitarian ideologies rather than meritocratic ideologies around “preferential treatment.” This works in the opposite direction as well; affirmative action foes frame their opposition and their proposals to ban it as “civil rights” and “individual rights,” activating and potentially connecting with both egalitarian ideologies and meritocracy and individualism ideologies (Berrey 2015; Gamson 1992a).

However, it would be a mistake to interpret symbolic contests over social problems as merely a matter of offering (often poll-tested) messages that connect with frames that are more appealing. This is a surface-level approach that ignores the empirical underpinnings of social problem understandings, explanations, and suggested interventions. If interpretations, frames, and ideologies do not make sense of one’s lived experience, and to the extent that one continues to have empirical confrontations with the issue, symbolic explanations that generate cognitive dissonance will remain contested and impermanent, whereas those that resolve or lessen cognitive dissonance can help both the individual psyche as well as the collective good. Gender balance advocates used frames of good governance and the good ol’ boys network to persuade stakeholders to support the legislation. Ultimately this is effective because it has empirical validity. Catt Center E.D. Dianne Bystrom noted that some local officials are “very dedicated” to gender balance, but “they’ll tell you
that it’s just really hard to find people that want to serve on boards.” To recruit more women “they really have to try hard” and they do this by being “very transparent on their website, they go out of their way to try to recruit people outside of the circles they are familiar with that tend to be male dominated circles in most cases” (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018).

This understanding of ideological navigation firmly contrasts with Marxist interest theory. However, despite interest theory being overly reductionist and simplistic (and not withstanding its own empirical confrontations), Marx did have a theory of change. For Marx, social change occurs and false consciousness is able to be overcome through a dialectic process, i.e. conflict between dominant ideologies and lived experiences (Mason 1996). This has similarities to strain theory, where ideologies exist to make sense of our diverse lived experiences and the contradictions and strains therein (Geertz 1973). However, it also takes from interest theory the role that power and history and broad social context play in shaping our ideologies. It departs by extending the role of power to also include ‘less powerful’ agents who are also active participants in the social production of knowledge. Through social movement efforts, these advocates engage in symbolic contests to try to direct people’s navigation of this symbolic world, with the goal that they end up with an understanding of the world aligned with advocates’ own interpretive truth.

In Iowa, women’s rights advocates embraced progressive frames around gender balance and connected gender balance to egalitarian ideologies. This was in part because their positionality meant they had their own personal experiences with discrimination and underrepresentation. This “experiential commensurability” meant that they had a stronger commitment to these frames and ideologies because of their personal experiences with the problem (Snow and Benford 1991:141). This may also be a reason House Republican legislators with (especially only) daughters were more likely to support the bill compared to their counterparts.

For those who do not have “the problem… intruded into their everyday lives such that they
have experienced it directly,” empirical confrontations serve as a proxy for accomplishing this task (Snow and Benford 1991:141). Discussing the gender distribution of county boards and commissions in legislators’ particular districts was an attempt to tie them to the problem more directly. One-on-one meetings, forcing a conversation in committees and caucuses, and ultimately holding a vote on the issue also meant that this was an issue with which legislators had to reckon, whereas otherwise it may have remained an issue they did not consider or partake in much cognitive work around.

Iowa gender balance advocates were not universally successful. Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story)’s 1985 amendment for a state gender balance law failed in the House by a vote of over four to one. Attempts to expand gender balance to local jurisdictions failed prior to 2009, and the 2009 law has no enforcement mechanism. When Scott first began lobbying for the 2009 gender balance bill, she met with local government organizations to discuss the legislation. County supervisors association lobbyist Mike Wentzien sincerely felt that Scott’s efforts were an attack on county board supervisors’ integrity, implying they were discriminatory in their appointments rather than fair. Presenting the ICSW empirical study made both the supervisors association and the Iowa State Association of Counties more, not less, defensive. Traditional ideologies around meritocracy, individualism, and gender-devoidedness interacted with an interest in not conceptualizing oneself or colleagues one supports as people who are unfair, let alone sexist, leading stakeholders to reject gender imbalance as a problem that needed state correction. For those making appointments, meritocracy had “experiential commensurability,” because they felt they were being fair in making their appointments (Snow and Benford 1991:141).

Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn) described how this bill and study forced reckoning with the issue of gender imbalance, but also resulted for some in defensiveness due to how they interpreted the data and bill. She said,
It’s hard to have somebody who thinks they’ve been right challenged in that realm. So some of the guys didn’t appreciate the fact that they had to now think about it when they just assumed they’d always been doing the right thing, right? So they came through boards and they came through commissions, and they never felt like they were holding women back, so how dare you say they were, kind of a thing (R. Schulte, PC, 2018).

Interest theory does not offer a pathway forward for county board supervisors to support gender balance. Strain theory argues county supervisors would need to experience contradictions on this issue such that their belief in meritocracy was no longer functional. Some county supervisors did support gender balance. Indeed, Senator Johnie Hammond (D-Story) came to the legislature from being on her county board, and her experiences fit her support. However, most county board supervisors are not progressive women trained through social work and through the League of Women Voters who are entering public office with an already developed priority concern around the issue of representation.

Navigation theory, however, offers a pathway forward. It is not necessary for advocates to convince local government officials that they discriminate. Local government officials can hold both frames of nondiscrimination and egalitarianism simultaneously, which is an easier task for advocates to achieve than getting local officials to change their self-concept and believe they are personally sexist. Indeed, local government officials and gender balance advocates shared an investment in the nondiscrimination frame. Where they differed was in their interpretations and in how they made sense of the appointment process and the resulting gender distribution. Besides empirical confrontation, in this case through confronting local government officials with systemic data, there are two other strategies that moderate advocates’ success: offering an alternative resonant frame for interpreting the empirical data, and continued engagement.

Replacement frames.

In cognitive behavior therapy, people are given replacement behaviors. Those who engage in
cognitive reframing or cognitive restructuring are given replacement values or replacement frames. Teaching replacement behaviors is also a school discipline technique used in primary and secondary schools (Gatchel and Rollins 2012; Moreno and Bullock 2011). Since facts only matter for social persuasion if people interpret them as meaningful and supportive of advocates’ position, it is vital that advocates provide the tools for this to occur. Without an alternate explanation, unless someone already strongly believes that systemic inequality exists or is oriented strongly toward egalitarianism, it is cognitively too easy for facts to be dismissed or rationalized. When Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) E.D. Rachel Scott presented the ICSW study of gender distribution on county boards, she also provided a schematic explanation to help targets make sense of the data and to suggest change was needed and that change required outside intervention. To the extent targets are searching for an interpretation of the empirical facts before them, having a frame offered to them, should it resonate, is accessible and convenient. There were two primary replacement frames put forward: insular social networks and good governance.

The insular social networks frame was used as an advocacy message in Iowa from the beginning of concerted statewide efforts to increase women’s representation on boards and commissions. Governor Bob Ray (R)’s CSW recognized insular social networks as part of the problem. CSW member and Legislative Chair Ralph Brown explained it this way: “Public officials just aren’t acquainted with qualified women. They appoint men they see and work with” (Jensen 1970). In 2009, Scott used this frame to explain that appointers make appointments based on who they know. People often have homophilic social networks, so the people who get appointed are the people that are similar to the appointers, and in this case that usually meant men. Scott put it this way: “We were having conversations about, Well, people are getting appointed now just because, y’know, a county supervisor knows him…. You fill these boards right now with who you know. Well, who you know are the people like you. So it’s a lot of older white men” (R. Scott, PC, 2018a).
Insular social networks reproduce inequality by delineating opportunity and inclusion, thus reproducing men-dominated boards and commissions (Bourdieu 1984; Cornwall and Coelho 2007; Lin 2000). This frame gave an explanation of why appointment outcomes were imbalanced and provided an alternative to meritocracy that better fit the available evidence. It also questioned the current existence of meritocracy. While some opponents raised concerns about appointing somebody “just because you’re a woman,” one of the conversations Scott had was that “people are getting appointed now just because a county supervisor knows him” (R. Scott, PC, 2018a).

People with a strong commitment to meritocracy believe that everyone should have an opportunity to pursue success and that the most qualified persons should be rewarded for the skills they possess that result from their hard work. For those people who oppose gender balance because of this ideology, learning that the current system departs from simply being about having the best qualified people serving presents gender imbalance as a social problem that needs to be addressed. This thus necessitated some type of intervention or reform to the appointment system or process in order to ensure that appointments were being made in a manner that more closely matched their commitment to ensuring the most qualified people were the ones appointed. Those desiring a meritocratic system thus had to ensure that the mostly men county board supervisors were going outside of their own personal networks to recruit and ask women to serve.

Because this frame did not use an individualistic explanation, it also took the onus for the current imbalance off local government officials, who otherwise felt defensive and attacked in response to it (Johnson 2014a). Gender balance advocates presented the cause of gender imbalance as a systemic issue and as one that described local government officials’ practices and what they experienced. When issues are presented as having structural causes, people are less quick to blame themselves or others for the outcomes or for how they participate in this system (Hayward and Lukes 2008). While labeling gender imbalance a result of systemic sexism is also a structural cause,
that frame is most easily interpreted in individualistic societies through an individualistic lens, leading to feelings on individual culpability and thus defensiveness. Offering a structural cause of systemic sexism (“who you know”) lightens that responsibility by attributing outcomes to board supervisors being part of a gender segregated society.

Considering insular social networks in combination with informal appointment processes, the necessary next step is recruiting women and then appointing them. Pushback against the insular social network explanation was that it was difficult to find women or that there were not enough qualified or interested women. Advocates’ response to this was the frame, “Just ask.” From Governor Ray’s CSW expressing its concern that women were not “ever asked” to serve on state boards and commissions in 1970 to Representative Vicki Lensing (D-Johnson) repeatedly expressing this frame during the 2009 gender balance bill discussions, advocates argued that women were not serving because they were not being recruited (Governor’s 1970:B; Peterson 1970; V. Lensing, PC, 2018). Advocates noted that, because of their underrepresentation, women were less likely to self-identify and thus take initiative to apply for board and commission seats. However, women were approximately half of each community, and so there were more than enough women in a community to recruit and ask to serve.

Failure of appointees to ask women to serve in appointed office, along with appointees’ reliance on informal insular social networks, corresponds with another frame advocates used—good governance. Depending on the target, this had two iterations: good government and the good ol’ boys network. The good government frame was about using open, transparent, and advertised processes for vacancies and filling appointments, and moving from informal to formal application processes. Expanding recruitment efforts also had the potential to expand diversity on boards beyond gender balance and bring community members into the governing process that were not yet involved with their local government. Having the diversity of one’s community integrally included in
shared decision-making processes and growing new community leaders are key factors that contribute to a community’s civic health, its capacity to address its challenges and opportunities (Leavy et al. 2019). Moving to a more bureaucratic and transparent process also positioned and encouraged appointers to increase consideration of qualifications and merit over personal relationships. Good government is in contrast to just appointing who you know.

This replacement frame resonated with Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn), who combined this frame with ideas around men’s privilege (but not bad intentions). She said,

I don’t think that men were doing it on purpose. I don’t think that there was like a club that said, Hey, let’s not nominate women for boards and commissions, right?.... I don’t think that they all went out and said, Hey let’s make all these boards all men, but that’s just who they knew, that was their circle, whatever.... But nobody had ever asked the question. And sometimes it takes females to say, Hey, we’re not included for them to go, Oh! Yeah! Why haven’t we thought of that? Y’know? (R. Schulte, PC, 2018).

The other good governance frame used was the good ol’ boys network, which was the antithesis of good government. This frame painted local government officials as consisting of a multitude of old white men who appointed their friends and were unlikely to adopt good government practices unless required to do so. While former Waterloo Mayor Tim Hurley favors term limits and recognizes that he is now often perceived as part of the old guard, the good ol’ boys network is not a phrase government officials embrace to talk about themselves nor, except for in cases of blatant sexism (or corruption, or other substantive ethical breaches), to talk about their more immediate colleagues. However, it was and continues to be a common and powerful descriptor to communicate the idea of an exclusive out of touch network of older straight white cisgender men who make decisions based on how things have always been and engage in cronyism, backdoor deals, etc., and who oppose new voices, fresh perspectives, and diversity. Based on people’s continued use of the term during my interviews, this iteration of good governance had resonance.
In 1987, the empirical confrontation created a question about why the governor had made the gender imbalanced appointments he had. Advocates responded drawing on insular social networks and good governance frames, but especially focused on the good government aspect, which tied in with the policy goal of creating accountability and requiring Governor Terry Branstad (R) to comply with the gender balance law. Advocates put forward a narrative that Branstad wanted to reward his campaign fundraiser and friends with the appointments he was making. This explained why he was not compliant with gender balance and distanced him from appearing merit-oriented. This frame therefore resonated with those invested in meritocracy, who saw appointees like Branstad’s appointment of Marvin Pomerantz, a wealthy businessman who had just served as Branstad’s finance (fundraising) chair during his re-election, to the Iowa Board of Regents, as being less about merit and more about political rewards and cronyism.

Gender balance advocates certainly encountered ideologues that were committed to and continued to prioritize traditional meritocracy, individualism, gender-devoidedness, and gender ideologies, regardless of their advocacy. However, in the years legislation passed, there was enough support for the legislation, such that these were not the primary lenses through which a majority of legislators were viewing the bills. A legislator or stakeholder could support having a merit-based system, support gender-devoid processes and decision-making, support free markets with individualism and choice, and simultaneously support egalitarianism. If advocates convinced this person or group that in this case, women are being excluded from appointments due to insular social networks, the ‘good ol’ boys network,’ and that women are not getting a fair opportunity to serve on these bodies, then procedural equality is lacking. Similar to the Ban the Box advocacy efforts that frame removing criminal background records from initial applications as giving those with criminal backgrounds an “opportunity to compete,” gender balance invites women to the table and can move society forward toward gender equality and toward the point where a gender-devoid philosophy
could end up being a fair process. Advocates were able to diminish the saliency of the gender-devoid ideology because they demonstrated that the existing system already was gender-conscious, but that gender was a factor in terms of excluding, not including, women. Just like with roles for government and the issue of local mandates, actors’ held on to multiple ideologies simultaneously and navigated and exercised them with some flexibility.

*Sustained engagement.*

Presenting an empirical confrontation and offering a replacement frame may be effective in obtaining support among some stakeholders, but it may not be long-term, may not be transferable to similar issues, and may not be enough to convince some stakeholders. The Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) conducted a study and offered replacement frames on their one-page handout with what they perceived to be common questions and concerns and then responses. However, even with both of these components, there were many legislators who did not support the legislation right away or did not end up voting for it on the floor.

Senate Republicans and the majority of House Republicans voted against the legislation. All but one Democrat voted for the legislation. Eight out of nine House State Government Committee members voted for the legislation, constituting half of the Republican votes for the bill. All Republicans voted for Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama)’s amendment, with all Democrats except for one voting against it. It is understandable that positions and votes on gender balance were socially shared among groups, in this case especially by political party as well as its intersection with committee membership. When people evaluate and interpret social problems and proposed public policies, they are doing so as part of a larger social structure rather than in isolation. The groups they identify with may already have a particular established meaning or interpretation of the policy and may even delimit individual actors’ interpretive processes. For example, in Iowa, Democrats are
officially supportive of affirmative action while Republicans oppose it. Representative Dave Heaton (R-Henry) said that on an issue like this, Democrats support “a lot of structure” and being “prescriptive,” whereas Republicans are primarily concerned with having “the best people… rather than having certain genders or… trying to attain the balance of the board” (D. Heaton, PC, 2018).

In practice Democratic women and Democratic legislative leaders vocally supported gender balance and framed it as a matter of support or opposition to equality. Republican floor managers in the Senate and House opposed it, but in the House, given that this bill was not fiscal and was considered relatively low stakes, the vote was a considered a “free vote” for legislators, meaning there were not supposed to be consequences for legislators voting their conscience or district on the bill, even if their vote did not align with party position.

Most people interpret social phenomenon by conforming to the groups to which they belong. They do this for a variety of potential reasons: because their group offers an initial cue for them regarding how to interpret the issue; because of the pressure of social conformity; and/or because they consciously or subconsciously rationalize their agreement as a means to protect themselves from potential ostracization from the group (Kahan 2013, 2015). These processes occurred among gender balance advocates as well as among opponents. In this case, that meant Democrats supporting the bill and Republicans opposing it were their paths of least resistance, at least in the Capitol. Legislators belong to multiple groups, so for example their family or area local government officials or organizational memberships in groups like the League of Women Voters could reinforce or complicate how conformity would translate.

The strongest opponents of gender balance remain opposed to it to this day. For the 2009 bill, this includes the sole Democrat to vote no, Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story), who did not conform to his caucus or party’s position. However, Quirmbach had other salient and coercive affinity groups that were more personal to him and thus exercised a strong level of informal social
control because of the potential psychological loss that negative judgment could bring (Berger 1963). Quirmbach was a professor in the Economics Department at Iowa State University, where one of his colleagues was his partner Leigh Tesfatsion, who opposed the local gender balance bill because of her commitment to meritocratic ideology and because of her concerns about stigma and devaluing what she and other women could experience as a result of the law. Quirmbach was also chair of the Senate Local Government Committee and a former Ames City Councilman, where he had served starting in 1995 and until he became a state senator in 1993. Quirmbach’s term on city council overlapped with Ann Campbell, who had been on the city council for years prior to Quirmbach joining, and in 2009 was mayor of Ames, as well as a strong opponent of the local gender balance bill. Many legislators and stakeholders also noted Quirmbach’s unique personality, which may have insulated him from being more influenced by his fellow Democratic legislators or by women’s rights advocates, including those in his district.

However, even among those most opposed to gender balance in 2009, there was evidence of ideological cracks, of openness to areas of common ground between ideological opponents and the bill’s advocates. Just like with other legislators, these cases show that opponents were weighing competing frames that connected to different ideologies in various ways. Representative Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton), the only House State Government Committee member to oppose the bill and also the Republican floor manager for it, introduced her opposition to the bill to me as being about wanting “the most qualified person” to be appointed, regardless of gender. However, she was not against the idea of the policy—gender quotas, gender balance, or affirmative action. She said that she thinks gender balance is “good for the state.” Pettengill referenced the insular social networks frame, noting “It may be a little more difficult for them, but it also keeps you from just picking your friends.” Her concern was that it was too difficult in rural areas at the local level, and that you have
fewer qualified candidates to choose from than you do on the state level. Pettengill said that she would support local gender balance if there were “better exceptions” (D. Pettengill, PC, 2018).

Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama) felt that the bill was discriminatory, and he cared sincerely about discrimination. To that end, he acknowledged that gender imbalance could be problematic, and had hoped that his amendment’s requirement for a fair process, which he felt was his “effort at recognizing that [gender imbalance can be a problem].” Horbach felt that the proposed gender balance bill tackled the problem of a “good ol’ boy system,” but he also felt it was “fighting discrimination with discrimination.” Horbach said he would support a law that if a board or commission was gender imbalanced and there were two equally qualified candidates, the appointment should be given to the candidate who was underrepresented. Horbach said that, with his amendment, “My intent was to eliminate a good ol’ boy type system, partnering with friends for political advantage, all those types of things that the public disdains” (L. Horbach, PC, 2018).

Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux), a small government advocate and religious social conservative, shared that he thinks affirmative action was good policy, but that society has changed such that inequality has “passed, hopefully. You know, well, obviously there are vestiges of inequality and stuff like that, but hopefully we can work them out without creating laws” (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018). Feenstra’s opposition, then, follows Gamson’s (1992a) analysis of focus groups; it is a calculus based directly on his assessment of inequality. In Gamson’s study, while black and interracial focus groups believed black U.S.-Americans continued to face institutional disadvantage, half of the white groups felt racial discrimination was a thing of the past (Gamson 1992a). It also mirrors Bonilla-Silva’s (2018) minimization of racism frame. However, while institutionally sanctioned discourse on racism and sexism have changed over the past decades, inequality in these areas is still rampant and systemic (Berrey 2015; Gamson 1992a).
Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story) also engaged with the minimization frame. ICSW E.D. Rachel Scott said Quirmbach really felt women were doing well, in some cases having better outcomes than men (R. Scott, PC, 2018c). Quirmbach was also deeply invested in the meritocracy frame, which combined with his views on the status of gender equality such that he opposed intervention of this nature as substantially unnecessary. However, his support for (and limited to) reporting, and for moving toward balance through outreach and broadened networking, implies an acknowledgment that there is ample room for improvement, while also implying trust for appointers to make merit-based decisions of the applicants before them. This limited support combined with an assumption that could be subjected to scrutiny implies a certain level of potential openness, should the right engagements be fostered. Indeed, while Ames City Council may not have been much of a “good ol’ boys network” during his service on there or in 2009, he may have lacked other experiences or models of ‘less meritorious’ decision-making. Indeed, as of 2009, Ames advertised vacancies for boards and commissions on its website, shared descriptions of each board and commission, had an application that could be printed or submitted online, and had a full page on “Criteria for Appointment” (City of Ames 2009).

Regardless of potential openings, these strong opponents have not become supporters. While theories on consciousness-raising may be applicable for individuals and groups who oppose gender balance, these theories only have a mechanism for operationalization when there is required sustained active engagement or deliberation around the issue (Gaventa 1980). This issue has not been one with which opponents have had to regularly engage. Opposing it did not create tangible opportunity costs for them. One’s interpretation of reality is most likely to shift if that idea begins to make ones lived reality problematic (Berger and Luckmann 1966). These individuals have not had to engage with this issue beyond when it was in front of them for legislative consideration. While they may potentially be amenable to change, it would require sustained work over the long term. And if
they do not have to engage with this issue, if it is not felt as impacting their everyday lived experience, then change is unlikely. One could argue this issue does directly impact them and does so continuously, but if they do not interpret it that way, if it does not seem to them to objectively interfere with their lives, then arguing that it affects them is moot.

Symbolic shifts often require repeated instances of confronting an empirical reality that interferes with one’s overarching beliefs (Berger and Luckmann 1966). Ideological change “takes time” (Dijk 1998). Change requires repeated engagements that require reckoning with an issue. The most common shared relevant identity among Republicans who voted for gender balance in 2009 was their membership on the House State Government Committee; they spent more time than others engaged with the bill.

The idea that schematic change may require sustained engagement that interferes with one’s lived experience can be illustrated with a hypothetical example. Drivers typically interpret red lights as meaning they should and need to stop. They do not question this, and indeed if they began to challenge this, their empirical experience would bring them back to this view (through social sanctions such as tickets or through being in a traffic accident). However, if someone is driving and comes across a red traffic light, but there are no cars anywhere near the intersection other than theirs, and the light nevertheless stays red for 10 minutes prior to changing, they may reconsider whether or not red lights necessarily mean they should and need to stop. Their belief interfered with their ability to efficiently get from one place to another and caused frustration for them.

Now, if that driver never has a similar experience, they are likely to happily go back to their original functional belief of red lights meaning stop. Or, if they have repeated experiences but find that this is the only light where this happens, they may carve this light out as an exception to the rule, though in the future if they encounter a similar situation it may require less cognitive work for them to add that light to their exceptions list as well. However, if they repeatedly have this
experience in different contexts, believing a light means stop will become dysfunctional for them, because this belief has a sustained negative impact. This dissonance repeatedly interferes with their day to day experience and forces the driver to grapple with this belief.

The driver is not expected to simply reject their old belief system that red lights mean stop. Indeed, to do so would again get the driver in trouble. Instead, they may draw on beliefs and practices that others apply to these light situations. Perhaps the driver searches the internet for what to do when lights last 10 minutes with no cars around and finds out that many people look both ways for incoming traffic, look around for police or a traffic light camera, and then proceed through the intersection while the light is still red. This driver now has two contrasting belief systems. When the driver gets to an intersection, they evaluate the situation and make a decision as to which belief system applies. If most lights are not a 10 minute wait with no cars around, their first inclination will be to interpret the red light to mean stop. However, if they then evaluate that this is one of the other kinds of intersections, they activate their other belief system and proceed through the intersection.

An example of this can also be seen in relationship to gender balance. As previously noted, Representative Roger Thomas (D-Clayton) shifted his gender and racial ideologies through his interactions with women and with racial minorities. His cognitive shifts followed the type of process outlined here and was possible through sustained engagement. Thomas said his beliefs on gender changed through his interactions with women in college and then in the legislature. He said he supported gender balance in 2009 because in those environments, “I started to learn a lot more and actually I started to appreciate a female’s presence in making decisions’ (R. Thomas, PC, 2018). While Thomas underwent this cognitive shift through these institutional experiences, he recognized that his statement was dissonant with his lived experience. Indeed, he made sure to note that he does appreciate his wife’s presence in making decisions, and that the two of them indeed take care of all finances and make decisions as partners. Before that, he also had interactions with another
woman who made decisions—his mother, who was “strong. She was her own entrepreneur,”
basically running her own business. However, these were those initial exceptions rather than the
changes to his schematic beliefs. In college, Thomas felt he grew, “listening to females that could
challenge. I mean I sound kind of chauvinistic, but I think I’ve grown that way, too” (R. Thomas,
PC, 2018).

This continued in the legislature. Thomas said that, being in the legislature, his interactions
with women legislators influenced him, and coming from a rural, less diverse area to a very diverse
caucus, he also learned more about the plights groups of people face (such as women and racial
minorities), and that this increased his understanding of these issues. He said, “It’s about caring
really, and that’s the way legislation should be, is caring, not trying to oppress” (R. Thomas, PC,
2018).

Thomas’s experience with women in the legislature continued to shift his perceptions of
women’s roles, which again had begun with his experience with his women classmates in college.
Thomas began serving in the legislature in 1997, so for his first four years he served with then-
Representatives Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson) and Kay Chapman (D-Linn). Thomas said that
before coming into the legislature,

I never really got a chance to think about and watch how legislation and how the female input was
into it. And so I think it was a learning curve for me…. That, oh, they can talk global issues and work
issues and things and bring another perspective to any piece of legislation…. The legislators that
were close to me when I first went in really did influence me. Minnette Doderer was a real, at the
time, woman’s lib kind of person. Kay Chapman. Minnette and Kay were both… very smart…
Other than my wife I never really had too many females that went toe to toe with me on some issues,
but those ladies did (R. Thomas, PC, 2018).

Thomas said he learned about gender balance and began to understand it once he became a
legislator, after “being with, y’know, hours upon hours of being with your caucus members, talking
about poverty and the African-American plight. Y’know we had real strong women in our caucus,
the House Democratic caucus is… the most diverse caucus at the Capitol…. So you just started to
learn a lot about it. Some things just make sense” (R. Thomas, PC, 2018).

Thomas was initially recruited to run for the legislature by Representative Mary Mascher (D-
Johnson), who called him and made the ask. Thomas said that he “always got along really great with
Mary” and described her as “a pretty dominant kind of female.” Mascher was the type of person that
changed Thomas’s conceptions of women’s roles. However, if Thomas had not gone to college, or
had turned down Mascher’s ask and not run for the legislature, he may never have changed his
views, and if someone had asked him about gender balance may have had a very different
perspective.

While Thomas was influenced by these interactions and developed a more egalitarian
ideology, this was not the only influence that led him to support gender balance. Rogers also
supported the gender balance legislation because he felt it was good for economic development, that
it was pro-business and could help with Iowa being able to attract companies to the state. He said he
remembered hearing from companies like Principal Financial that “Iowa needs to be a much more
progressive, and much more receptive to all individuals… So I think this kinda sets an example for
companies. Okay, so if the state of Iowa wants to be gender balanced, that says a lot” (R. Thomas,
PC, 2018).

Women legislators in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s who discussed becoming feminist in the
legislature after receiving a multitude of letters from women discussing the issues they faced as
women is another example of this sustained engagement process. One letter or a rare letter were
unlikely to have this impact, but repeated forced engagement with the issue of women’s oppression
served as a mechanism for consciousness-raising. For example, Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson,
legislature, she did not “know that women had problems.” Doderer became a feminist after a
handful of years in the legislature, and she attributed it to that she kept hearing from women about their “troubles.” “The more I talked to women who had real problems, the more I became feminist.” It was the repeated and sustained engagement that led to her cognitive shift. Doderer said, “As you solve one problem, you get a story in the paper, and you hear about another problem. And I’m still hearing about problems” (Schenken 1991c:5,9,10). It might not be difficult for Doderer to get one letter or a letter a year, but continuing to get letters on women’s issues she does not know about and then discovering that the laws seemed to work against the women she hears from caused her to begin to radicalize.

League of Cities lobbyist Jessica Hyland’s opposition demonstrates the role that lack of continued engagement plays. Hyland initially lobbied against the gender balance bill, as well as for a variety of amendments, on behalf of the League. However, she also said she “personally didn’t agree with it [gender balance]” because she felt it was unnecessary (“Why are we doing this?”) and because she evaluated the legislation using the ideology of meritocracy (“It should be the most qualified person”) (J. Hyland, PC, 2018). However, Hyland also shared that, nine years later, in 2018, “It's funny, too, because I think—I don’t know what I would think now personally about it, cuz I think my thoughts about equality and women have changed up here, too. So I don’t know; it would be an interesting thing for me to work on it again now to see how I feel about it” (J. Hyland, PC, 2018). While Hyland may evaluate such legislation differently today because of changes in her perceptions of gender and egalitarianism, she is not yet a supporter. Prior to her interview with me, she had not had to consider this legislation or law for quite some time. Hyland shared, “It’s been so long since I’ve thought about it [the gender balance legislation]” (J. Hyland, PC, 2018). The issue was salient for her in her role as League of Cities lobbyist, and when it was before the legislature, but since then it has not been one she has had to grapple with or consider.
If advocates want to work to create cultural change among resistant individuals, they have to ensure the issue is one that these target individuals will have to continuously grapple with. This sustained work does not fit neatly into legislative campaigns or current social movement organizational funding, which is biased toward activation over persuasion, as funding is often directed toward short-term campaigns that are limited in scope and have particular outcomes in mind. Nevertheless, policy change can also lead to cultural change, and other societal changes may also change opponents’ views or how important they consider the issue. Additionally, this type of sustained work may be necessary in jurisdictions where ideological affirmative action opponents are a majority of lawmakers. In those areas where a policy win from a short-term campaign seems less plausible, advocates can robustly engage with opponents who believe gender imbalance on boards and commissions is problematic, or who support good government appointment processes, but otherwise have a limited conception of the problem and a limited scope of agreement. Social conscientization theories suggest the potential for this type of engaged work surrounding but not directly tackling the underlying issue can eventually lead to a confrontation with the source of the problem and thus help facilitate shifts in ideologies and/or their prioritization, or at least in how one conceptualizes facts on the ground and appropriate pathways to accomplish said ideologies (Gaventa 1980).

While less likely to impact strong ideologues, public deliberation is another method that has shown some promise for having an impact on changing the minds of people who have less reified views. Relevant deliberative democracy literature focuses on the role that dialogue, contact, and talk can play in altering people’s views and consciousness. Dialogue can encourage perspective-taking and facilitate understanding the other (Cornwall and Coelho 2007; Phillips 1995; Williams 1998). Encounters with other groups can shift people’s cultural perceptions of these groups (Young 1990). Still, deliberative spaces in and of themselves can ignore or reproduce institutional bias, institutional
inequality, power, and structure (Cornwall and Coelho 2007; Phillips 1995; Williams 1998).

Additionally, for social movements, deliberation both has the benefit of increasing perspective-taking and the drawback of moderating one’s position and passion about an issue, since the issue subsequently appears less cut and dry (Levine 2013).

Nevertheless, even robust and sustained efforts engaging in the issue of gender inequities in policymaking representation are unlikely to make support for gender balance universal. Throughout women’s rights advocacy and gender balance advocacy, many women advocates have gone out of their way to state that they are not seeking special rights or privileges, or even that they are not feminists. These defensive communications are in response to perceptions that their goals and policies are biased and promote special rights. As noted earlier, groups who more frequently interpret policies like affirmative action and nondiscrimination codes as special rights also more frequently feel their own lack of material and psychosocial inclusion and opportunity. Addressing this sense of isolation and economic depravity more universally is therefore also a part of broadening support.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION: THE PATH TO PRESENCE

In this conclusion I discuss the significance and contributions of my study as well as areas for further research, analysis, and writing.

GENDER BALANCE IN IOWA

Located in the Midwest region of the United States, Iowa is not a particularly small or large state in either land size or population (Fiscal 2009; U.S. Census 2009, 2010). Most of Iowa is rural, with several population centers spread throughout the state, and no city with over 400,000 residents (Fiscal 2009; M. Gronstal, PC, 2018). While reliably Republican for much of the 1900s, Iowa has been a swing state in the 21st century (E. Gayman, PC, 2018; Fiscal 2012; Hoffman and Larimer 2015).

While Iowa was the first U.S. state to have a woman mayor of a city with a population greater than 10,000 (Emma Harvat of Iowa City, elected in 1922), as of 2009, Iowa was one of the last two states (with Mississippi) that had never elected a woman Congressperson or governor (Emma 2019; Friends 2008a; ICSW 2018; R. Schulte, PC, 2018; Yanney 1991). Iowa finally elected a woman to these offices in 2014 and 2018 respectively (List 2018). In the 1970s, the women’s rights movement was robust and active, at its peak. The 1980s brought in a more conservative shift under President Ronald Reagan, and increasingly women’s rights issue became partisan. And yet, in the late 1980s, Iowa adopted a gender balance quota law for its boards and commissions, joining less than a dozen countries around the world that had some form of gender quota and pioneering such a policy for the United States. Indeed, while half of U.S. states have tried to adopt similar legislation, and gender quotas have become common around the world for elected office, Iowa is the only U.S. state with an outright gender balance requirement for appointed office.
While affirmative action was being rolled back across the country, Iowa extended its gender balance law to local jurisdictions. While this seems like a major accomplishment and a significant piece of gender rights legislation, outside of advocates who were passionate about the bill, and to some extent local government organizations, the legislation was no more conspicuous than many other pieces of legislation. Indeed, the issue barely made the Iowa newspapers in 2009 prior to becoming law. There was an article on February 6 in a number of local papers, making the front page of one paper, the Mason City Globe Gazette, and an article on March 19 in the Des Moines Register on page 7A, titled “House OKs two bills on gender equity for wages, filling boards” (Clayworth 2009b; Eby 2009a, 2009d). News that the legislation passed the Senate appeared in the Des Moines South Register in the form a legislative update column by Senator Dick Dearden (D-Polk), though this was only a community section of the newspaper that went out to one of eight areas of the state (Dearden 2009). The Ames Tribune also published a letter to the editor against Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story)’s competing legislation and in support of gender balance, an op-ed from Quirmbach on the issue, and a response op-ed from Representative Beth Wessel-Kroeschell (D-Story); this comparative flurry of community-generated news was due to Quirmbach’s opposition on the issue (Lex 2009; Quirmbach 2009; Wessel-Kroeschell 2009). Overall, gender balance was a commonplace proposal and the policy was simply business as usual for Iowa.

While Iowa is unique in its gender balance laws, the story of Iowa’s path to presence in many ways goes beyond Iowa and is also an international and national story of women’s rights. It is also a story of a handful of strong women legislators and advocates who prioritized and persisted, who dedicated themselves to women’s rights and representation, and who have helped shape Iowa’s historical legacy. Finally, gender balance is a story of politics and culture—from the Supreme Court actively engaging in politics to take a stand against mixing the judiciary and politics, and in doing so
endorsing gender balance for appointed and elected judicial nominating commissioners, to men lobbyists not knowing what to do with women legislators, to women legislators claiming power, holding a governor and local governments accountable, and ensuring women’s inclusion would not be forsaken.

A Historical Record

I made the decision to collect a nonfiction account rather than keep information confidential and obfuscate details or consistently use pseudonyms. While the specifics of the legislation in this case study would have made it difficult to obscure, as well as the main advocates’ roles, other records did not need to be particularly accurate and much of the data I collected could have been de-identified. However, I intentionally set out to create a public record. One goal of my research was to record the history of this particular case study.

There are a few sources that discuss gender balance in Iowa, a chapter or small article here or there, but there is not a comprehensive in-depth overview. I collected the bulk of my data from primary sources. Research participants shared a wealth of information with me and I uncovered fascinating stories and histories in the Iowa Women’s Archives at University of Iowa that are not easily accessible to everyone. Chapter Two in this dissertation is an initial contribution in this direction. However, it is a small portion of the narratives, stories, and analyses I have compiled on Iowa’s gender balance law. Generating a more robust report recording this history would help provide an accessible history for those interested in learning more about the history of gender balance in Iowa and/or women’s rights in Iowa and the United States.

This extended report would also enable me to provide a closer experience for the reader that I forsook in this paper for the sake of brevity. For example, images of the newspaper clippings from the Des Moines Register’s editorials with lists of qualified women for the Board of Regents would
make the story both more engaging and give the reader a more authentic experience of the history. Another example would be adding thick description. For example, when Joan Lipsky discussed her AAUW appointment project from the late 1950s in a 1989 oral history interview, she was asked if the group of women she engaged in her advocacy with were “outrageous,” and replied “No, not at all. We were very traditional women who came wearing hats and gloves…. We were just mothers and housewives and, you know, I was a professional person” (Schenken 1989b:7-10). This type of detail, while unnecessary for my sociological theorizing in this manuscript, helps transport the reader to a different time and place, helping them understand that the events taking place were in a context different from their own.

One contribution of this work is to provide an accurate history. The historical record presented in this paper is accurate to the best of my knowledge. I sought to resolve conflicting details and noted or omitted those that remained unsettled. For example, Iowa Commission on the Status of Women reports referred to a seemingly nonexistent Iowa City policy on gender balance and referred to the start of Iowa’s roster project as beginning in 1976 rather than 1970 (Christensen 1988; Document 1974; Durden 2003; Governor’s 1970; ICSW 1976, 1986a, 1987a, 1996b, 2001b; K. Fruehling, PC, 2018a, 2018b; Livermore 2004; Spencer 1989).

I also came across a larger discrepancy during my initial research—Kappie Spencer’s obituary says she “spearheaded” the gender balance project in Iowa (Lonabelle 2011), a comment on a national AAUW blog post by the 1982-1984 Iowa AAUW president said that Spencer “initiated” the 1987 gender balance law (Kathleen 2019; Laurila 2012), and an encyclopedia Women in the American Political System said Spencer was “actively involved in the 1988” Iowa amendment (Bystrom and Burrell 2018). A peer reviewed journal of popular scholarship had an online article on gender balance that I had found and had referred to me during my research, which also gave Spencer credit, referencing the excerpt that Laurila had written (Jaquet 2015). I, however, could not find any data on
Spencer’s involvement.

I was eventually able to resolve this through my archival research. In one of Spencer’s summaries about gender balance that in the archives, she wrote, “Because I had moved to Florida in 1984 and received only the Sunday papers since that time I did not know that Iowa had passed a bill in 1986 that set state policy to balance boards, commissions, councils and committee by gender. I first discovered it in the February 14, 1988 Des Moines Register” (Spencer 2004). While Spencer was not involved in Iowa’s legislative campaign for gender balance in the late 1980s, she nonetheless has an admirable record on women’s rights advocacy. Two examples include getting phone companies to include women in the phonebook and leading a massive National Gender Balance Campaign after the Iowa law had passed.

Recording this piece of Iowan political and gender history is a useful enterprise. The gender balance fight in the 1980s is passed down among women advocates in Iowa through “hand me down stories” (P. Peters, PC, 2018b). Representative Beth Wessel-Kroeschell (D-Story) said that the Des Moines Register’s response to the governor and his administration was “an amazing moment in our [Iowa’s] history” (B. Wessel-Kroeschell, PC, 2018). By bringing data out of the archives and compiling it together into a cohesive narrative, I am recording, preserving, and making this history readily available to Iowans and the broader public.

Political Process Model Evaluation

This manuscript focused on the adoption of gender balance laws in Iowa in relation to ideology. This is one component of how gender balance was adopted in Iowa. This case study has a broader story relevant to legislative studies and women and politics research. Social movements gain divergent levels of success based on multiple interacting factors, including opportunity contexts, resources, and schemas (Lee 2011). Based on my research and analysis, I would argue that gender
balance was adopted in Iowa in the late 1980s and in 2009 because a small group of women advocates, situated in (relative) positions of power, engaged in persistent and strategic leadership and action, mobilizing individual, group, organizational, institutional, and relational resources, capitalizing on contexts more favorable for the legislation and working to create their own friendly contexts when necessary, and committing to gender balance as an attainable and necessary law to catapult women’s rights forward.

While the political process model was developed to explain the factors that differentiate social movement success, it is not just an evaluation tool. It can also be used as a diagnostic tool for social movements to identify areas that are lacking and areas that are strengths. Through analyzing how gender balance became law in Iowa, I can contribute instructive insights into how advocates won political change, including but not limited to how they successfully navigated symbolic contests and social problem constructions. The Iowa gender balance case study can offer social movement organizations concrete and practical advice regarding strategies and tactics. The takeaways mentioned here that relate to ideology are elaborated upon later in this chapter.

In terms of contexts, this case study suggests the importance of being strategic, normatizing and institutionalizing (gender representation) practices, and the importance of prioritization and persistence. In terms of resources, this case study highlights the important role that individuals and groups play in outcomes and also suggests that busy policy environments that are focused on other areas may be ideal times to move this type of legislation forward. Finally, in terms of schemas, this case study suggests that advocates should lean into opponents’ sincere beliefs to explore how they may be able to be engaged, invested, and managed, that good governance and fairness are salient frames, and that it is vital to use systems frames, but to make those frames accessible.
DERADICALIZING GENDER BALANCE

Gender balance may conflict with ideologies such as neoliberalism, market fundamentalism, individualism, meritocracy, traditional gender ideology, individualism, and (depending on the group) affinity group deference. In some instances across the country, gender balance failed because these ideologies were activated and applied to the bill. For example, in 1993, Florida Governor Lawton Chiles (D) vetoed a gender balance bill requiring gender balance “where practical,” stating

A Noah’s ark approach to selecting those for governmental service is not a sound approach – a rich diversification of public servants is a matter that cannot be fixed by passing more laws…. A governor must be free to select the applicant he or she believes is best qualified for any particular positions (Sarasota 1993).

Florida adopted a gender balance law in 1994, but to avoid the governor’s veto, the language of “shall” was changed to “should,” gender imbalance was also allowed based on qualifications and recruitment challenges, and a 10 year sunset provision was included (Hanson 1994; Herald-Tribune 1994; Spencer 1997).

I found these ideologies present in Iowa as well. For example, Senator David Hartsuch (R-Scott, 2007-2010) opposed gender balance because he believed “state boards and commissions should have the most qualified candidates not merely the candidates with the right genitals.” He saw gender balance as part of Democrats “play[ing] demographic politics” (D. Hartsuch, PC, 2018). However, overall, these traditional ideologies did not dominate the discourse on gender balance in Iowa. Instead, the legislation was viewed as fair and as a relatively minor policy matter.

Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) said that when she got gender balance passed in 1986 through the state reorganization conference committee, she did not think it upset anyone afterwards, even the representatives who had voted against her gender balance amendment in 1985. Hammond said “It wasn’t that big a deal to them, I don’t think” (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). Likewise, for the 2009 bill, Representative Doris Kelley (D-Black Hawk), a more conservative Democrat who “had a
rapport with the old Republicans,” told me that the gender balance “bill was not that big of a deal. You’re studying it, but at that time it wasn’t that big of an issue” (D. Kelley, PC, 2018). Political scientist Kim Lanegran interviewed local government officials about the law once it went into effect. She found that, “People all over the state, and of all political persuasions,… say it makes absolute common sense that we do this.” Lanegran said they just felt that gender balance “seemed…. common-sensical and obvious.” They did not view it as “a feminist project. It was much more, It’s just common sense” (K. Lanegran, PC, 2018).

Traditional ideologies did not prevail on this issue in Iowa because the issue had been deradicalized. This occurred through disembedding gender segregation, which made women into feminists and men into allies, normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good government.

*The Social Construction of the Quota*

While the purpose of Iowa’s gender balance law was to build equity, quotas are oft-perceived as prohibiting the most qualified people from positions, such that opposition to quotas benefits those that already have positions or access to those positions. As noted prior, quota is an ideograph, functioning as a frame to connect the legislation to traditional ideologies that would steer stakeholders toward opposing the legislation. Quota is a discursive tool aimed to challenge support for gender balance. Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story, 2003-2019) labeled gender balance “a quota bill” in his op-ed (Quirmbach 2009). However, besides Quirmbach, Iowa actors did not apply the label of quota to gender balance. Since gender balance in Iowa is part of the state’s best practices for governing, it is generally not considered a quota. Objectively defined quotas are not always socially defined quotas.
A comparative case study approach could explore this topic further. A number of advocates for gender balance across the country denied that the policy for which they were advocating for was a quota. Further exploring the interpretive process they were using to affirm or reject the label connects with the cultural cognition literature on facts versus frames. There are cultural differences between the United States and other countries, with quotas seeming anti-American on their surface as they may prevent those who work hard from achieving the American Dream. However, quotas are also controversial and contested internationally, but are also a language that is used and in some cases reclaimed. There are discursive studies of quota outside the United States that could provide a useful point of comparison to the term’s deployment and reception in the United States.

Additionally, this research could explore why quota was a sticky ideograph in some states but overall not present in Iowa and presumably not salient in some other cases. My hypothesis about Iowa is that, while other states also have participated in disembedding gender segregation, these states did not have similar gendered and other representation practices like political party balance, usual amendments, support from the Supreme Court, and for the 2009 bill, a history of over 20 years of gender balance for state boards and commissions.

I would also explore the extent to which and manner in which good governance frames were employed in a comparative analysis. Good governance might neutralize the idea of a quota. In addition, to the extent that a quota is about the mandatory aspect of a set-aside policy, Iowa was able to create a strict requirement as part of good governance—in reaction to Governor Branstad’s imbalanced appointments after the passage of the 1986 law. However, advocates in some states with policies that state the governor “should” gender balance boards and commissions but do not outright mandate it have tried to use these policies as accountability leverage to increase women’s representation. Why are other states that encounter a lack of fidelity to the laws they have passed on gender balance unable to pass a stricter law?
Patriarchy in the Iowa Legislature

Recording this story of Iowa history is especially important for younger people who may take many contemporary rights for granted and may not be fully aware of how recently (Iowan and other U.S.) women faced issues like being excluded from phone books or marital rape not being illegal. Cultural expectations and dominant gender ideologies have certainly shifted. When Ola Miller was first elected as Iowa Secretary of State in 1932, she was listed on the ballot as “Mrs. Alex Miller” (whereas Alex Miller would simply have been listed as “Alex Miller” if he were a candidate) (Doderer 1942+; Iowa City 1932; IWPC 1988+). Fifty years later in 1982, Senator Beverly Hannon (D-Jones), hosting a local Democratic caucus at her home, could not get the local chairperson to list the party caucus as being at the home of “Bev Hannon,” as she requested, or even “Mrs. David Hannon.” Instead, it was listed under her Republican husband’s name as “Dave Hannon residence” (Hannon 1982). This explicit presentation of dismissiveness of women as not having their own worth and claims as their own person (in contrast to men) is now deviant in U.S. society. The knowledge from my interviews and archives detailing patriarchy as well as women’s rights advocates’ arduous efforts to create social, cultural, and political change are a good source of knowledge production and potential schema shifting.

Additionally, in interviewing people about gender balance and in looking through the archives of Iowa women politicos, I understandably encountered a multitude of examples of sexism. Men legislators’ biases about women and women’s value, qualifications, and roles not only delimited women legislators’ agency, it had crossover into their views on issues of women’s representation on boards and commissions. Gender ideology affected the women’s rights movement’s success, women’s power in the legislature, and reception to the idea of gender balance (Edelman 2001; Guetzkow 2010; Hayward 2000; Schneider and Ingram 1993, 2005).

Attitudes toward and treatment of women and women in political leadership changed throughout the 1970s and moving forward, in many ways becoming more equitable but in other ways staying the same. In 1979, Representative Sonja Egenes (R-Story), said the “contrast in attitude…. [was] a world of difference” between then and when she was first elected in 1970. Egenes said initially she was “stunned by comments about women” that she encountered, and that
that had “really eased,” though some men legislators still seemed to hold sexist perceptions that “women couldn’t possibly handle things like men would” (Cooke 1979). Accounts of sexism over time both provide a historical account of appalling and blatant sexism, but it is also unnerving how similar the themes remain even as time progresses. Further analyzing a typology of sexism and patriarchy among Iowa politicos, over time, could demonstrate how sexism is and is not changing.

Furthermore, in this study I identified evidence replicating sociologist Laurie Cooper Stoll’s extension of Eduardo Bonilla-Silva’s theory on new racism and its various components to “modern sexism,” in which egalitarianism is espoused but sexism beliefs and practices continue (Stoll 2013). Stoll argues that the same frames apply to modern sexism as new racism (with the substitute of gender for race): abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural sexism, and minimization of sexism. A useful direction for inquiry would be to explore how these frames map out onto historical and contemporary sexism in Iowa government. Identifying whether they are congruent, whether certain frames are not a terrific match, or whether other frames are missing could validate or extend the idea of how modern sexism operates, just how modern it is, and how it compared to new racism.

Further exploration of modern sexism could also be useful for understanding the role of gender ideology in public policies like gender balance. The participants in my study did not exhibit ‘traditional’ gender ideology such that they opposed women’s participation in civic and economic life. However, there was certainly role-typing by gender (i.e. cultural sexism) and beliefs about men and women’s different capabilities and orientations (i.e. naturalization). How should gender ideology be conceived? Is it a continuum from traditional to egalitarian gender ideologies? Or are there other dimensions to consider? What do these gender ideologies mean for public policies and for social movement actors seeking to help actors manage these ideologies?
Deradicalization also took place through normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices. Whether referred to as “layering,” “gradation,” “foot-in-the-door,” the “piecemeal” approach, or “creeping normality,” this refers to contextual changes made through directly related seemingly marginal or small changes, or other changes that are indirectly relevant. These changes can shift the status quo such that a proposal for gender balance seems like it is already legislative practice (Freedman and Fraser 1996:195; Schenken 1991c:22; Streeck and Thelen 2005:22-24). In this case study, these normatizing practices included political party balance, political party 50-50 rules, amendments to legislation that deal with one particular state or local board or commission that solely gender balances that board or commission, individual local governments moving toward gender balance, and for the 2009 bill, the over two decades of the state gender balance law being standard practice. These act as socialization agents and lend comprehensive gender balance legislation a familiar framework.

Minnette Doderer (D-Johnson, House 1963-1968, Senate 1969-1978, House 1981-2000) said the House State Government Committee women in the 1980s used the “usual amendment…. piecemeal” tactic because they were out of other options. It was not employed at that time as an intentional strategy to deradicalize gender balance. However, Doderer learned the utility of this strategy for deradicalizing policy proposals and used it elsewhere to get her targets “adjusted to change” (Schenken 1991c:22). The state board and commission gender balance law particularly socialized state senators who had to consider appointees that require Senate confirmation. Senator Steve Sodders (D-Marshall), Senate floor manager for the 2009 gender balance bill, said, “At every step we’re all supposed to be thinking about, y’know, not only political affiliation, [geographic] location, but also gender equality” (S. Sodders, PC, 2018). Senators were socialized into equating
diverse boards with gender balance as a good governance practice, priming them to also perceive
gender balance on local boards and commissions as a good government practice.

The state requirement thus created an opportunity for the local requirement. Jack Hatch (D-
Polk, House 1985-1992, Senate 2003-2014), who was in the legislature in the late 1980s and in 2009,
shared that after the state law, gender balance “was all pretty normal. I mean, once there was some
grumbling, but it folded in pretty nicely” (J. Hatch, PC, 2018). Iowa Commission on the Status of
Women E.D. Rachel Scott said that in 2009, “We had the history of the state requirement that
shows the sky didn’t fall because you had to have women on committees” (R. Scott, PC, 2018a).
Senator Jeff Danielson (D-Black Hawk, 2005-2019) said the state requirement “had been a tradition
anyway, so it was perhaps more difficult for them to turn back the clock rather than see over the
horizon” (J. Danielson, PC, 2018). These comments all speak to how the state requirement
transformed gender balance into usual, normative practice.

This theory finds support outside Iowa as well. In Belgium, gender quotas were “relatively
easily accepted as simply one more quota that fit into the general normative framework of a ‘politics
of presence’” because they “fit into the logic of the political system” (Sgier 2004:7). This is quite
similar to how Iowa had political party balance and so gender balance had that conceptual
framework to draw from. However, 16 states have adopted some form of gender balance resolution
or law, and this has not resulted in a more robust law being subsequently adopted. Indeed, some
social movement actors worry about compromising for much less than their objective because they
worry that policy makers or other decision-makers will then think they have done their due diligence
on that issue and can move on for a period of time. One key factor in Iowa was advocates’
persistence in pursuing gender balance. However, this strategy seems like it could use further inquiry
in order to further operationalize it and understand its dynamics and contingencies.
The Stickiness of Good Ol’ Boys

While I went into this study expecting to hear a lot more frames connecting gender balance to traditional ideologies, I instead heard references again and again to the “good ol’ boys” network. For supporters, gender balance was an antidote to the good ol’ boys network (D. Boone, PC, 2018; T. Taylor, PC, 2018). For opponents, opposition to the good ol’ boys network was something that had to be navigated in order to oppose gender balance while clearly delineating one’s own beliefs as in opposition to good ol’ boys systems (L. Horbach, PC, 2018; Quirmbach 2009). Further discursive analysis of both explicit mentions of good ol’ boys as well as references to its characteristics could be revealing. Also, looking through speech transcripts, legislative hearing transcripts, and newspaper articles to identify the ways this frame has been employed could unveil more of its scope and utility. For how salient this frame was in this case study, it seems both lacking in social movement literature and theorizing and lacking in intentional discursive employment within social persuasion and mobilization campaigns.

Pragmatism as Ideology

Scholarship on ideologies traditionally conceptualizes pragmatism and ideology as opposing forces (Heywood 2017). Pragmatists focus on being practical and reasonable and collaborating to find a pathway forward, whereas ideologues are committed to their belief structure and are inflexible, opposing anything that is not a perfect match. However, scholarship in education research focused on teachers has shown that commitment to pragmatism can actually be a cognitive belief structure in and of itself, in which actors consider themselves professional craftspersons and apolitical. The ideology of pragmatism tends to conform to institutional arrangements and norms, though creative policy making is encouraged (Moore 2004, 2005). However, this means that depending on the space, issue, and context, this ideology can have a progressive or conservative effect on outcomes.
My research extends this concept from the classroom to social movements and politics. An ideology of pragmatism in relation to gender balance manifests in a commitment to governing, to using one’s policy toolbox and engaging together to create effective policy that will move the state forward. Pragmatism both explains why the 1986 gender balance law for state boards and commissions was written with flexibility (e.g. for odd-numbered and technical licensing boards) as well as why subscribers to this ideology supported tightening the language in the following two years (to correct problems with the law as written that were making it less than optimally effective). Iowa’s law being a requirement is the key difference between Iowa and other state’s laws.

Iowa’s 2009 law, while it has a good faith effort clause, is also a requirement—local governments are only permitted to make gender imbalanced appointments if they have advertised an opening for three months and remain unable to find a qualified person of the needed gender. Ensuring this extension addressed concerns about potential negative impacts while remaining a requirement is also part of pragmatism. Gender balance and affirmative action laws more broadly that are optional have comparatively little to no impact. While allied local government officials may use the opportunity context of a gender balance resolution or law without a requirement to further gender balance locally, overall local governments may choose to simply not change their behavior if a state passes a law suggesting local governments make an effort to gender balance their boards and commissions, especially if the identified problem is that local governments have yet to do this on their own. Good public policy thus dictates that if a law is going to be adopted, it have the ability to contribute toward what it is trying to do.

Pragmatism is what motivated Johnie Hammond (D-Story, House 1987-1994, Senate 1995-2002) as a county council person to push for gender balanced county boards and commissions: she was drawing on a League of Women Voters’ county study. Pragmatism also shaped her fellow League of Women Voters’ member Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson, House 1979-1986, Senate 1987-
1994) approach to state reorganization. The ideology of pragmatism in 2009 manifested with the eight House Republican State Government Committee members who voted for gender balance. They decided to engage with the policy details of the bill, exploring its logistics. Whether or not they all cared about gender imbalance, these were able to invest themselves in a compromise and making what they felt was good policy that would benefit Iowa.

NAVIGATING IOWAN STAKEHOLDERS’ IDEOLOGIES ON GENDER BALANCE

In this section, I discuss navigation theory and its contributions to ideology and social movement literature, the operationalization of navigation theory for social movement actors, and directions for future research.

Reconceptualizing Ideology Theory: Proceeding Past Interest and Strain Theory

This case study provides an empirical challenge to two prominent theories of ideology—interest theory, in which the powerful impose ideology, and strain theory, in which people find ideology to cope with their experiences (Geertz 1973). My study suggests that, while power is invested in ideologies, individuals, groups, and institutions, traditional ideologies are not always the most powerful, and may not even represent the tradition. It suggests that stakeholders subscribe differential power to different actors, from local government officials to their party leaders to women members in the House Democratic caucus. While differential access to power is societally structured, it is also situationally divergent and complex. My study also suggests that, while people tend to believe in ideologies they view as functional for themselves, people simultaneously hold a multiplicity of ideologies and ideological perspectives, and that within particular situations different ideologies are activated, diffused, and prioritized, and then their application to the situation is filtered through how that person constructs and interprets the situation before them. The Iowa
gender balance case study thus suggests a different approach to understanding ideology: navigation theory. Advocates can present empirical confrontations and collective frame management to navigate stakeholders’ negotiations of these ideologies.

In 1973, Geertz argued that “the task of the scientific study of ideology—a task but barely begun…. [is] to forge a theoretical framework adequate to the analysis of such three-dimensional processes [sociological, psychological, and cultural]” (Geertz 1973:229). Geertz argued that studies of ideology, from both the interest and strain theory perspectives, suffered from bypassing the meaning-making and interpretive process. He wrote that there is a “virtual absence… of anything more than the most rudimentary conception of the processes of symbolic formulation. There is a good deal of talk about emotions ‘finding a symbolic outlet’ or ‘becoming attached to appropriate symbols’—but very little idea of how the trick is really done” (Geertz 1973:207). Rather than developing his own theory of ideology, Geertz presented interest and strain theories, and then critiqued them for being reductive and themselves ideological. Geertz critiqued strain theory as being composed of “unreflective” actors instead of actors engaged in interpretive processes (Geertz 1973:210). Geertz argued that the concept of ideology can only move forward through research that is more objective and that pays attention to the meaning-making process, to culture.

While departing from Geertz in other ways, this study addressed this challenge: I sought to conduct an objective study of ideology that is rooted in meaning-making, which therefore required ethnographic methods (Blumer 1969). In revisiting Geertz’s writing after my own analysis, I was struck by how navigation theory is truly building off of and fulfilling Geertz’s vision of what is needed in ideological theorizing. Specifically, Geertz criticized interest and strain theory for their failure of not “examining ideologies as systems of interacting symbols, as patterns of interworking meanings” (Geertz 1973:207). Navigation theory does just that.
Proceeding Past Systemic Inequality as the Moderator of Affirmative Action Support

In Gamson’s (1992a) study of why people support (race-based) affirmative action, he argued that the moderating determinant is whether or not they believe in (racial) systemic inequality. Gamson is right that acknowledging that structural discrimination exists is a key indicator differentiating whether people do or do not support affirmative action. People acknowledging inequality is useful for buy-in for affirmative action policies. I found this to also be true for gender balance. For example, Senator Swati Dandekar (D-Linn) believed gender inequality and women’s lack of representation was a substantial problem, and she therefore strongly supported gender balance legislation (S. Dandkear, PC, 2018). On the other hand, Senator Randy Feenstra (R-Sioux) believed that U.S. society has moved past systemic gender inequality, which contributed to his opposition to the legislation (R. Feenstra, PC, 2018).

However, in Iowa, support and opposition to gender balance was more complicated than whether or not someone believed there was systemic inequality. Gamson was studying people’s views in a focus group—their beliefs were either static or influenced by that particular social experience. While his study offered unique insights, it isolated issues like affirmative action as abstractions, and had people consider these policy issues in a contextual vacuum, divorced from other considerations that may interact with pathways to support or opposition. Indeed, Gamson (1992a) notes that this is a limitation of his study. My study therefore extends Gamson’s work, adding additional nuance and complexity to his findings on determinant(s) of affirmative action.

In Iowa, people who believed that gender imbalance is a systemic problem did not necessarily support gender balance. League of Cities E.D. Alan Kemp agreed with Ames mayor Ann Campbell that there was cultural change in the domestic sphere that had to happen before gender balance would be a practical policy (A. Kemp, PC, 2018). Representative Doris Kelley (D-Black Hawk) was a strong proponent of gender balance and women’s equity. She came to her interview
armed with information (e.g. brochures, statistics) about women’s underrepresentation in Iowa and in the legislature. She felt that “Iowa has just been so far behind” and was serving on the board of 50-50 in 2020, an organized dedicated to gender balance in the Iowa legislature and congressional delegation (D. Kelley, PC, 2018). However, as previously noted, Kelley would not support the initial version of the legislation because she was concerned about rural communities, where she felt women were not as “strong” or as civically involved (D. Kelley, PC, 2018). While Representative Donovan Olson (D-Boone) had concerns similar to Kelley’s, that led him to support the bill—in order to help foster cultural change. House Minority Leader Kraig Paulsen (R-Linn), as previously discussed, looking at the bill and the advocacy fact sheet on it in 2018, believed the policy was a “good idea” to tackle a real problem. However, as minority leader he had been more concerned with other issues: “There would have been talk about budgets, and targets getting released, and those sorts of matters,” he said (K. Paulsen, PC, 2018). Indeed, Paulsen did not remember the legislation, which I interpret as in 2009 it not overly activating ideologies that would lead him to feel passionately for or against the legislation. Paulsen instead prioritized affinity group deference, voting with his Republican floor manager (and therefore he ended up voting against the bill).

Just like there was variation in votes among people concerned about gender imbalance, people who believed that gender imbalance is not a systemic problem did not necessarily oppose the legislation. There were many additional considerations and factors that influenced people’s support or opposition to gender balance. There were people who felt gender imbalance was a systemic problem but their role and other ideologies they prioritized in this regard positioned them to be opposed to it, such as Waterloo mayor Tim Hurley, who was board president at the time for the League of Cities and thus based his position on opposition to local mandates.

There were people like Representative Doug Struyk (R-Pottawattamie) who said that, just like in 2009, in 2018 he was “still not convinced there was a problem because we had gender
imbalance on a county commission.” Struyk also believed in meritocracy, telling me he was still committed to “the best person for the job regardless of gender” and that he wanted to ensure the policy would ensure appointments were of “competent” people and not simply made for gender balance. With all this, Struyk still supported and voted for the bill, because he prioritized his ideology of pragmatism and the bill ultimately met his criteria for good public policy. Struyk said that he “hasn’t had a single person” complain to him about local gender balance’s feasibility, leading him to conclude that “it was a change for the good…. Looking back now, right thing to do, and lo and behold, the sky did not fall and it was not the string that would undo the fabric of the state, so it was a good policy” (D. Struyk, PC, 2018).

While Struyk iterated multiple times that he did not consider gender imbalance problematic, when I asked him about 10 minutes later about why this bill had come forward and passed in Iowa, in contrast to his earlier statements, he identified gender imbalance as a problem. He said that Iowa is “not [a] progressive” state, but it is a “common sense” state, “and here’s one where you had to paraphrase something Senator [Mike] Gronstal [(D-Pottawattamie)], the majority leader in the Senate, used to say. We have to get reasonable people working together to solve common problems. And we sat down and we did it” (D. Struyk, PC, 2018). While Struyk did not personally interpret gender balance as being a problem, because other legislators and stakeholders considered it a problem, his pragmatic ideology led him to define it as a “common problem,” one that he could engage with, put his policy toolbox orientation to use through a collaborative and deliberative process, and since the end product was legislation he thought was feasible to implement, he voted for it (D. Struyk, PC, 2018).

**Navigation Theory.**

Through an ethnographic inductive approach that captured both agential meaning-making and broad constraining social context, I was able to build on existing theories of ideological
determinants—interest theory and strain theory (Geertz 1973). By using ethnographic methods, I was able to explore additional determinants and decision-points made by actors in their dynamic process of decision-making. This enabled me to extend Gamson’s (1992a) study and others’ ideological studies that capture static cross-sectional linear pathways by which collective action frames and interpretations of social phenomena connect particular ideologies to particular decisional outcomes (Blumer 1969). Based on my findings and analyses, I argue for reconceptualizing ideology formation through navigation theory—actors simultaneously hold multiple complementary and competing ideologies and must negotiate how these ideologies are (de)activated, (de)prioritized, and interpreted and applied to the issue under consideration. In Iowa, advocates employed collective action frame management to facilitate and steer this navigation such that a majority of legislators voted for and the governor signed gender balance legislation.

We simultaneously hold a multiplicity of ideologies, many of which are open to contestation, interpretation, and varying levels of activation and prioritization. Government roles (neoliberalism and market fundamentalism, as well as local mandates), gender ideology (from traditional to egalitarian), belief in and evaluation of meritocracy, individualism, egalitarianism, social liberalism, good governance (good government, good ol’ boys network, and pragmatism), and partisanship and affinity group memberships all played varying roles for different stakeholders, working in concert or competition to moderate stakeholders’ outcomes. While some ideologies may be deeply anchored, they still may or may not be interpreted as applying to a particular situation. Other ideologies may only be partially formed. Ideologies can be flexible and adaptable. Depending on an empirical situation, they can manifest or dissipate, they can perform in various ways and be navigated within various arenas. Their effect is situational and affected by our ongoing experiences. Advocates can play a pivotal role in stakeholders’ decision-making processes through managing collective action
frames. For example, if stakeholders are weighing competing ideologies, removing roadblocks can lead them to prioritize one ideology and deprioritize another.

This refined theorizing has increased empirical validity and makes sense of the social world as it is, at least within the contexts of the legislative campaign for gender balance in Iowa. For example, Representative Mark Kuhn (D-Floyd), a former county board supervisor, voted for the gender balance legislation. He said, “Y’know, it’s tough, but we have to have gender equity” (B. Wessel-Kroeschell, PC, 2018). On the other hand, some legislators like Representative Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton), who had concerns about implementation and about the availability of qualified and interested women, thought it was too tough, prioritizing those beliefs and voting against the legislation.

The application of ideologies to a particular empirical situation is open to interpretation and may also be more nuanced, especially as it navigates with other ideologies and roles. For example, Pettengill supported the state gender balance legislation and committed herself to leading a number of women’s empowerment trainings across the state, but she opposed the local gender balance law because of her strong belief, informed by her interpretation of her experiences with and connections to local government, that rural small towns did not have enough qualified women to make local gender balance feasible. Catt Center Director Dianne Bystrom said that opposition to the 2009 legislation was focused on its potential burden to local governments and was generally not really about “gender balance” (D. Bystrom, PC, 2018).

Representative Mark Kuhn (D-Floyd) had served on the Floyd County Board of Supervisors from 1992 to 1998, and his recollection of that experience was that appointments “tended to be white elderly males—in large part, not exclusively.” Kuhn’s initial impression of the local gender balance bill then, was that even if would require work, it “sounded like it was needed.” Kuhn also drew on his county’s proud legacy of being the home to Carrie Chapman Catt, whose “picture and
story [are] on the walls of the courthouse.” This history served as a cultural resource that made addressing social problems of structural inequality a collectively shared goal. Kuhn also expressed pride at his county’s record on gender balance, and noted that it did take more work, especially for the county veterans affairs commission and the county veterans memorial hospital board of directors, given that there are more men than women veterans. However, his county accesses public records on veterans and reaches out to women to serve and “it’s worked out quite well” (Iowa Legislature 2018c; M. Kuhn, PC, 2018; Skipper 2018).

Other legislators like Representative Dave Heaton (R-Henry) initially shared Pettengill’s concerns about implementation, but through compromises—in the case of the 2009 legislation, the good faith effort provision—their concerns were sufficiently addressed. For Heaton, this altered the calculus as he weighed his concerns rooted in ideologies that in this case were initially in conflict. When I asked Heaton why he supported the bill, he drew on Iowa’s existing practices as making sense of the bill as a sensical practice, and he shared that he had been influenced by the environmental context at the time which was a focus on advancing women’s rights. Heaton said, “I thought it was fair. I guess if we were doing it for state level boards, I guess we could do it for local boards. At that time there was a real push on the gender thing and all of that, and so I just thought it was the right thing to do” (D. Heaton, PC, 2018).

However, Heaton also said that when this legislation was first under consideration, Democratic and Republican legislators received “local input” about the “difficulty” the bill “would have created.” Heaton said that his local mayor, Mount Pleasant mayor John Freeland, expressed concerns to him about the difficulty such a law would create. He had to weigh his desire to advance women’s equity with his desire to not create a difficult or untenable situation for his local government. However, with the good faith clause added in, “the bill ended up A-O better.” Freeland told Heaton he was okay with the bill “if it’s got some way we can get around some of this stuff if I
can’t find the right people,” and so with the “little bit of wiggle room” in place, Heaton voted for the legislation. While he shared that implementing the law is indeed challenging, Heaton also said that “I’d still support it today if it had the best effort clause. I don’t think I made a bad vote. I mean I don’t” (City 2008; D. Heaton, PC, 2018).

For Heaton, concerns connected to good governance, pragmatism, and local relationships with community leaders were initially salient. The good faith effort enabled him to deactivate these concerns and instead prioritize his commitment to fairness. Heaton said that the amendment was “one reason I voted for the bill” (D. Heaton, PC, 2018). Heaton also thought the bill had a good but not guaranteed chance of passing even if the good faith amendment had not been added, so being able to move forward with a compromise that “relax[ed]” the bill could even strengthen his relationship with his mayor and earn him political capital with his local government. The amendment fully de-activated Heaton’s concerns about local government relationships, and it reinterpreted his evaluation of the bill in connection with good governance. With his other concerns now adequately addressed, the good faith effort amendment enabled Heaton to prioritize his ideology of egalitarianism as he considered the legislation. Post-amendment, egalitarianism and good governance were now the foremost ideologies Heaton drew on in making sense of the policy and deciding how to vote.

Similarly, Republicans like Struyk with an ideology of pragmatism may have wanted to support the legislation but felt weighed down because they interpreted the bill as impractical (in part a reflection of being told repeatedly by secondary targets that the bill is impractical). The good faith effort amendment deprioritized those concerns, facilitated reciprocity, and enabled a focus on good governance and women’s opportunity and empowerment.

In the previous subsection I discussed House Minority Leader Kraig Paulsen (R-Linn) voting against gender balance in 2009 because he deferred to the Republican floor manager, who happened
to be Pettengill. However, even if an ideology is activated, that does not determine a particular outcome. Representative Jeff Kaufmann (R-Cedar) also valued affinity group deference. Kaufmann was an assistant minority leader (and is now state chair for the Republican party). He said that he, along with the other House Republicans on the State Government Committee, which included another assistant leader and an appropriations ranking member, had to consider this as part of their votes. Kaufmann said the committee vote of 20 to 1 and 16 Republicans voting for the final bill were “significant vote[s],” considering Pettengill was against the legislation. Kaufmann said that it “makes a statement because a lot of the leaders… defer to the floor manager and that did not happen,” but also because Pettengill had recently switched from the Democratic to Republican party and therefore they were trying to make sure she “feels at home within the Republican caucus” (J. Kaufmann, PC, 2018). Paulsen and Kaufmann therefore both considered affinity group deference, but Kaufmann ultimately deprioritized that ideology. A key difference between Paulsen and Kaufmann was that Kaufmann was on the House State Government Committee and so had engaged with the legislation, whereas Paulsen did not pay the legislation much attention.

All House Republicans, including those who supported gender balance, voted for Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama)’s amendment to replace the entire bill with language that would require gender-devoid appointments, the opposite of the policy called for in the original bill. Minority Leader Kraig Paulsen (R-Linn) said that while he did not remember the amendment, “There’s very few votes that take place that you don’t already know the outcome, so my guess is everyone just went, Oh, Representative Horbach, y’know, we’re all Republicans. We’ll just hang with him and the amendment will fail (K. Paulsen, PC, 2018). Representative Kevin Koester (R-Polk) confirmed this in his case. When I asked if he had a sense of why he voted for the Horbach amendment, Koester responded, “Um, cuz I sat next to him. [Laughs.] I’m just being honest. Yeah, that was probably as much of a reason as anything, and yeah, I believed in the integrity of the bill” (K. Koester, PC,
Because the vote seemed inconsequential, Koester deprioritized ideologies of pragmatism and egalitarianism, and instead prioritized the House Republican caucus, an affinity group, and his relationship with Horbach. Ideology can take the form of “expressions of group solidarity” (Geertz 1973:220). Considering that Koester’s vote on the gender balance bill as a whole was in support, which was already going against his party and the floor manager for the bill, he chose to humor the legislator he sat next to rather than vote against the amendment. Koester may view this as good governance, or even pragmatism, though interpreted differently. Given the lack of political or policy cost for voting in favor of the amendment, his vote is both reciprocation for voting against the overall legislation as well as generating political capital and goodwill with a colleague who he will need to work with in the future.

Those in the thick of social justice advocacy work may believe their work is being stymied by widespread extremist ideologies that are serving as a barrier against the progress they are trying to make. There are certainly ideologies that are more extreme, and there is also differentiation in how entrenched various ideologies are, how stuck they are and the degree to which they serve as a primary lens to which interpretations and frames make quick connections. A bill to increase the minimum wage may immediately make one legislator think of individualism and neoliberalism and thus believe there is no need for the bill, while it may immediately make another legislator think of social liberalism and class egalitarianism and thus immediately draw them to support the legislation. Another may have both or neither activated, and be more interested in policy analysis, constituent perspectives, or how the bill will affect a particular group (e.g. racial minorities, women, or businesses). Navigation theory conceptualizes ideology not as something static, but rather conceptualizes ideologies as part of an ongoing process through which actors must find their way as their empirical world shifts and as they encounter new and different issues and spaces.
Navigating Ideological Intersections

Navigation theory could be further developed through exploring the patterns of intersections for the various ideologies people hold and navigate. This is an underexplored area on ideology and cultural change. How specifically do these various ideologies intersect and complement each other during a legislative campaign? What happens at the intersection of individuals and groups allied in their support for policy outcomes but divergent in their ideologies? For example, what happens when the League of Cities, opposed due to implementation concerns and the local mandate issue, lobbies Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama), who is concerned about the bill being discriminatory? Who makes headway with whom and adopts whose frames in what contexts? Is this a political decision? Do people’s minds change? What is the relationship between stakeholders focused on implementation concerns and stakeholders focused on ideological concerns?

During my interview with Hanna De Groot, Public Policy Specialist for the Iowa State Association of Counties (ISAC), she initially focused on and circled back to ISAC’s “biggest thing,” which was local control and state mandates, but she also shared implementation concerns about it already being difficult for county governments to find people to appoint to boards and commissions without adding additional restrictions. De Groot said ISAC was therefore interested in encouraging rather than requiring balance. De Groot did not raise concerns about women’s qualifications or gender balance as discriminatory or a quota. Seventeen minutes into our interview, I brought up concerns that had been raised that went beyond the ability to implement, from being able to find enough women to noting Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story)’s position and competing legislation on the issue, that the most qualified person should be selected without considering gender. ISAC had supported Quirmbach’s competing legislation. I asked if there were also discussions about those issues. De Groot responded,

Absolutely. I mean, even within ISAC, absolutely, there were definitely—We didn’t want to
have to be kicking people off that were qualified, more qualified, just so that we could get a female on, I think was the thing that was said. You don’t want to lose qualified people on boards and commissions just so that you can balance it out. I mean, and that’s where we were on board with Herman…. We were on board with him because you want to have the most qualified people on these boards and commissions and not just make it a gender issue (H. De Groot, PC, 2018).

De Groot still focuses mainly on implementation and about losing good people, and not on the principle of whether it is wrong to consider gender. Even in the end, when she iterates the standard gender-devoid anti-affirmative action line, she qualifies it, noting that ISAC does not want to “just make it a gender issue” [emphasis added], indicating both an alliance with Quirmbach and a complementary framing and message, but not one that would actually exclude considering gender as one of the factors in making appointments, a departure from Quirmbach’s argument (H. De Groot, PC, 2018).

Unfortunately, my data does not contain many instances that reveal these types of intersections. A decade later, and without documented records of these exchanges, people’s memories on these types of details were fuzzy. Because gender balance was not perceived as a major and highly controversial issue in Iowa, outside of Governor Branstad’s appointments and the judiciary issue in the late 1980s, news coverage on gender balance did not provide this kind of depth. My current study is limited in this regard. An ethnographic study that explores a campaign as it unfolds, which can observe exchanges as they happen, may be able to shed additional insight into these processes.

Advocates Creating and Capitalizing on Dissonance

I captured one particular process through which gender balance advocates negotiated stakeholders’ ideologies. This process also helped make sense of stakeholders’ differential responsiveness to this technique. It is rooted in phenomenology, as advocates are attempting to change (or maintain, or
strengthen) people’s social conceptions of a policy issue (Berger and Luckmann 1966). Advocates created engaged experiences that challenged or strengthened conceptions of social phenomena in order to foster stakeholders’ navigation through dissonant ideologies.

Advocates’ first tactic was to create or present an empirical confrontation that created dissonance. In 1987, the empirical confrontation was the Des Moines Register newspaper presenting lists of qualified women for the Board of Regents, evidence that contradicted the governor and his press secretary’s excuse for making gender imbalanced appointments. In 2009, the empirical confrontation was presentation of data from the ICSW’s study of women’s representation on county boards and commissions. Having 18% women on county boards and commissions in 2009 contradicted meritocratic beliefs that the appointment system was fair and inclusive and focused solely on merit. It contradicted normative gender ideology in 2009 of women’s roles and expected status, and also ideologies around fairness and democracy that suggest “descriptive representation” should be the norm, meaning that community leadership should generally demographically and ideologically mirror the communities they serve (Phillips 1995; Tate 2003; Williams 2000).

Because interpretation of empirical phenomenon matters, rather than the phenomenon itself, providing an empirical confrontation begins a process but does not determine what will happen next (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Gamson 1992b). Advocates therefore need to be engaged in meaning-work and facilitating stakeholders’ cognitive paths. The second tactic used was to provide a replacement frame for making sense of the cognitive dissonance that had been created. The social psychological theory of cognitive consistency suggests that actors will want to resolve this conflict (Jowett and O’Donnell 2012). In 1987, replacement frames focused on accountability and good government. In 2009, replacement frames focused on insular social networks. Replacement frames can be customized for different groups; for example, Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson)’s framing to women family members of men legislators who were on the fence about the
legislation appealed to fairness and creating equal opportunities for women. However, in this case the framing may be more implicit: the message to legislators is that this legislation positively impacts an in-group member and this experience creates dissonance between ideologies opposing the legislation and affinity group deference for a group that exerts one of the most coercive forms of social control: the family (Berger 1963).

It should also be noted that advocates can use this same process for strengthening and mobilizing supporters. Rather than creating dissonance, these processes would further reify actors’ existing beliefs. Different frames may also be useful in these situations.

In some cases a single empirical confrontation may result in schematic change, especially if it has a substantive impact. However, creating cognitive change, especially at a group or institutional level, often requires repeated and sustained engagement. Some of the legislators who voted for gender balance in the late 1980s and in 2009 had repeated engagements with advocates and peer legislators, developing relationships that allowed for this sustained engagement. The layering process of normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices through usual amendments is an example of sustained engagement.

This process can be operationalized by social movement organization actors, though it will require customization based on resources, the issue, and the target(s) and/or social groups and institutions being targeted. Further studies of social movement actors using these techniques could help elaborate on the different components and the extent to which different tactics will be effective. In terms of gender balance, other states also produced studies of gender distributions on boards and commissions, and other states campaigns have also used similar language to Iowa. Their task is more difficult because they do not have Iowa’s history with gender balance. While persistence and political savviness certainly helped in Iowa, exploring what advocates did and did not do in these various cases could further explain what is more or less effective as well as more or less
possible for social movement actors in the short-term in various situations.

_Social Movement Organization Takeaway: Use Systems Frames but Make Them Accessible_

Considering navigation theory, as well as how gender balance was deradicalized in Iowa, has explicit consequences for social movements working to address policies that confront problematic ideological opposition. Support for public policies are based on understandings of social problems the policies seek to address. If someone believes a problem is individualistic, they will likely support an individualistic solution. Systemic understanding beget systemic solutions (Temko 2019).

Structural explanations can also diffuse individual-level defensiveness.

As noted in Chapter One, the FrameWorks institute suggests that policy advocates working on racial justice issues avoid using frames of structural racism (Davey 2009). However, their polling has a number of shortcomings. My study revealed that, at least for this case study, the key to using systems frames effectively was to make those frames accessible. In 2009, the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women (ICSW) told a structural story. The ICSW gave an explanation of gender imbalance that made sense of what was going on and that connected to gender balance as a sensible solution. The ICSW’s study revealed structural sexism; this sexism was explained through discussion of exclusive patriarchal social networks. However, the ICSW did not state that _Gender imbalance continues due to embedded segregation, insular social networks, and capital reproduction that functions within a social stratification system that keeps men dominant and women oppressed_ (in contrast to individual-level discrimination or women being unqualified). Instead, the ICSW used everyday language and down-to-earth communication to explain why gender balance had not occurred on its own. They told their structural story using ‘accessible sociology.’

The ICSW mirrored Anne Phillips’ negative discrimination argument, but with accessible language: “If local board and commission appointments were indeed based on qualifications of the
citizenry, it would be astounding that so few women are appointed” (ICSW 2009f). To explain insular social networks and the reproduction of inequality, Scott explained that for appointers like county board supervisors, “you fill these boards right now with who you know; well, who you know are the people like you. So it’s a lot of older white men (R. Scott, PC, 2018a). These arguments avoided academic or technical language. They did not assume people had already bought into the idea of structural inequality. They involved discussing the issue in a way people could relate to, that felt plausible and sensible to the point of almost seeming intuitive. They involved translating particular frames into concrete structural stories.

A recurring challenge to gender balance came from those who worried about whether there were enough qualified women for these appointed positions (J. Hammond, PC, 2018). The response went something like this: *Do you really believe that there are not three women in this town that are smart and competent enough to serve on the Planning Board? If we are not finding them, it is because we are not asking.* This strategy can also be worked into conversations about affirmative action more broadly, with a consistency frame that facilitates transference—explaining that affirmative action, just like gender balance, political party balance, and young adult requirements on boards and commissions, takes positive steps to build diverse inclusive communities and tackle the same types of underrepresentation problems as these other Iowa policies.

This discursive strategy can transfer beyond gender balance. In 2013, Illinois created a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Loan Program, with an initial $3 million for a revolving loan program, which disadvantaged (women, minority, or disabled-person owned) businesses can use for project financing costs for Department of Transportation construction contracts (Legislative 2013a, 2013b). One point of opposition among legislators to the bill was that the bill was diverting public funds to those who were not deserving of them or were high-risk for the state (State 2012, 2013a). As one legislator put it, "If the banks aren't willing to loan these people the money, why should
we?" [emphasis added] (State of Illinois 2012:29-30). An appropriate response would be something like this: *Do you really think there is not a black-owned or women-owned transportation company in Illinois that is capable of resurfacing that road?* Small, minority-owned businesses often lack sufficient start-up funding to allow them access to the capital from banks that larger corporations can access. *This revolving loan fund gives these small businesses the opportunity to compete for state construction contracts.* *Developing out an applied model for strategic cognitive frames that explain structural inequality would begin to address a current void in current communication organizations’ offerings. Developing, testing, and sharing structural stories that use accessible sociology on a handful of policy issues could move this conversation forward and provide a useful tool for progressive social movement organizations.*

*I Lean In to (and Begin to Navigate) Opponents’ Sincere Beliefs*

Sometimes advocates for or against gender balance ‘othered’ their political opponents, making them into enemies. For example, Representative Mascher (D-Johnson) called women’s advocacy against gender balance “ironic, y’know, that you would have women being the ones to do your battle, because it was the men who didn’t want it of course, but the women were willing to play into that” (M. Mascher, PC, 2018a). Hanna De Groot, Public Policy Specialist for the Iowa State Association of Counties, criticized Representative Donovan Olson (D-Boone) for chiding ISAC’s opposition to the gender balance bill. She questioned whether he was using his “county perspective or… party perspective.” De Groot said that some county officials go into the legislature and “work with us and are friends with the counties, whereas others, it seems like they get up there and drink the Kool-Aid and kind of forget what it was like at a county level, maybe just get in line with the caucus” (H. De Groot, PC, 2018). People tend to explain away their opponents’ positions, for example based on affinity identity membership such as their political party or being a state legislator.
In both these cases, questioning of opponents’ sincerity and motivations is one of the ways advocates seek to discredit their opposition (Knight and Greenberg 2011). Advocates tend to construct their political opponents into “others” (Landau 2018). Particular frames are imposed onto these “antagonists” regarding who they are, their motivations, what their values, morals, and character are, as well as what their competencies are (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994; Knight and Greenberg 2011). While this came across as cynical and as assuming the worst of intentions in others, this process is functional for the protagonist engaging in it. Turning these opponents into “villains” through “identity claims” both places “blame” on the opponents and also implicitly reflects back onto one’s own “protagonist” identity (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994). Protagonists, “for example,… unlike their ‘immoral opponents,’ are not willing to tolerate injustice, human suffering, and the like” (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994:198-199).

However, in interviewing people with varying perspectives on the gender balance bill, I was left with the distinct impression that those with whom I talked with were quite sincere and honest in their professed values and beliefs. Interpretations of empirical events steeped in particular ideologies “often appears bizarre to an outsider,” but “commonly the people putting forth these propositions are perfectly sincere” (Berger 1963). Indeed, our conceptions of our political opponents are usually exaggerated and subject to various cognitive distortions related to opponents’ out-group status (Landau 2018). Dismissing opponents’ perspectives as dense, necessarily strategic, or insincere can be a mistake, especially if the opponents’ perspective seems ideological.

Rather than dismiss and other opponents, advocates should lean in. One reason othering is problematic for advocates is because advocates base their strategies and tactics in part based off their perception of their opponents. “Antagonist identity constructions… guide SMO [social movement organization] actors’ deliberations about an opponent’s vulnerabilities and strengths and
are therefore key in planning strategies and tactics” (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994:199). If this social construction of the enemy is distorted, then one’s strategies and tactics will be misguided.

Representative Renee Schulte (R-Linn) commented that, in transitioning from a mental health advocate to a legislator with an expertise in mental health, she learned that legislators were passing laws that did not make sense because they did not know any better. They thought they were doing the right thing, but no one else around knew the issue and how it affected their home communities (R. Schulte, PC, 2018). Instead of othering opponents, advocates can lean in and engage in conversation or dialogue and explore the differences that do exist and where they come from. By leaning in, advocates can learn their opponents’ actual motivations and views, which could lead to being able to persuade them, whereas constructing them as the ill-intentioned enemy sets advocates up to focus instead simply on defeating them (which may or may not be possible) (Landau 2018). For example, Representative Dawn Pettengill (R-Benton)’s opposition seemed as rooted in her beliefs as it seemed rooted in her antagonistic relationship with advocates. Considering labeling theory, Pettengill may have ended up playing the role she was assigned.

Opponents also usually have more diversity of thought than they are credited with having by their opponents (Landau 2018). While those with more extreme and entrenched ideologies that oppose affirmative action are unlikely to be swayed, other stakeholders’ ideologies have the potential to be navigated. Advocates do not necessarily have to eliminate opposing ideologies, either. There is likely some common ground, at minimum when it comes to values. Additionally, advocates can explore what else might emerge. What else do opponents care about? Are there particular empirical confrontations advocates can create that will create helpful dissonance? Can collective action frames cause that to be activated or prioritized?

Potential opponents may not support or care about advocates’ primary frame (e.g. in this case women’s rights), but that does not mean they will not support the policy before them.
Representative Doug Struyk (D-Pottawattamie) voted for gender balance because, while he did not consider gender imbalance to be a problem, he thought the bill was fair and valued the give-and-take policy construction he had engaged in on the House State Government Committee. Similarly, as previously noted, Representative Kevin Koester (R-Polk), who was also on the House State Government Committee, also felt “there was no problem to be solved. It was just a view of what is most equitable and what’s best for representation” (K. Koester, PC, 2018). Advocates can choose to discount stakeholders like Struyk and Koester, both of whom did not identify women being less than 20% of county board and commission members as a problem. Or advocates can engage them, in this case through connecting with their ideology of pragmatism by engaging in collaborative policymaking, and together they can craft a policy that Struyk and Koester feel makes sense and is feasible and will be good for Iowa, and therefore that they can support. As Koester said, the legislation “started a little too strong and landed well” (K. Koester, PC, 2018). They were thus engaged, invested, and had some ownership in the legislation. Genuinely leaning in and working with these legislators meant being open to compromise, but it also meant bringing more people along.

EXTENDING MY THEORIZING THROUGH COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES
The theoretical constructs I developed in this study may extend beyond the particular institutional contexts and policy area of gender balance in Iowa. To that end, my theorizing would benefit from future studies using different cases, institutional contexts, and public policies to both test how transferable my findings are from this study and to further develop a theoretical understanding of how cultural power can be successfully navigated (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003).

One interesting finding in my study was that House Republicans who supported gender balance were actually from slightly more rural legislative districts, on average, than those who
opposed gender balance. However, the Republicans who voted in favor of gender balance were typically from municipalities and counties that were substantially more urban than their counterparts who voted against the legislation (Iowa Legislature 2018c). This potentially speaks to Republicans’ socialization experiences and its impact on legislative decision-making. Testing the urban-rural divide using district versus residence variables in other cases would reveal whether this is a social pattern or an anomaly.

This study focused on one particular case study: gender balance in Iowa. Exploring the similarities and differences between this case and others would be fruitful. What do the thematic and theoretical takeaways look like in a case study that deals with issues of financing? In states and jurisdictions with different histories and contexts? In affirmative action cases addressing minorities that are quantitative minorities and not just status minorities, or which have physical and not just embedded segregation?

My case study did include multiple pushes for racial representation on boards and commissions, at times for the local level as a combined legislative bill for gender and racial balance, including as part of the 1991 bill that passed the House. In 2008, Iowa adopted a law stating that, “Minority representation is expected on each board and commission, to the extent practicable” (Boal 2011). Some other states’ gender balance bills have also included language pertaining to racial minority representation. Comparing and contrasting advocacy, ideologies, and stakeholders’ navigation of these ideologies for racial representation in comparison to gendered representation could further my theorizing and tease apart what may be unique about gender and race in these contexts.

IMPLICATIONS OF GENDER BALANCE FOR GENDER EQUITY

Systemic gender inequality continues to exist in U.S. society, carving out a need for gender-based
affirmative action. While it may seem like U.S. society is going backwards in terms of affirmative action policies and that quotas are beyond discussion, recent state activity around corporate boards and editorials around gender quotas suggest otherwise, as does the continued international context of gender quotas being more standard than not. This study also suggests that these conversations and advocacy efforts do have the possibility to be successful. They can contribute to decreasing gender stigma, changing people’s beliefs about gender roles and qualifications, and increase women’s representation in appointed office.

Those who subscribe to a gender-devoid ideology critique gender balance and gender-based affirmative action as giving gender an outsized role in society, or bringing it into the public sphere when it should not be present. On the one hand, this argument is a nonstarter; it assumes that gender is not already an organizing principle in our society, present and powerful and stigmatizing within our public sphere (Lorber 1994). While our society has an opportunity to transcend gender, and seems to be moving in that direction, with states adding third gender options to driver’s licenses, or the increasing popularity of drag artistry, which reveals the performativity of gender and the disconnect between sex, gender identity, and gender expression, those who seem most insistent that they do not see gender are either living in egalitarian bubbles or are the people who are most cognizant of it, their implicit biases using gender as an evaluation criterion for assessing qualifications, their insular social networks exempt from a gendered analysis because they ‘do not see’ gender (Butler 1988, 1999).

Nevertheless, the gender-devoid argument has some overlap with queer and postmodern feminist theory, which would advocate degendering society and avoiding artificial categorizations (Butler 1988, 1999; Lorber 1994, 2005; Seidman 1997, 2001; Stein and Plummer 1994). According to philosopher Michel Foucault, the focus on gender balance contributes to the saliency of gender in our society and also reinforces the idea of gender as binary (Foucault 1978). However, this logic
would also mean that the attention to tackling gender imbalance and gender typing, to an egalitarian ideology, would also make the addressing of gender inequality prominent and salient. Regardless, outside of gender-devoid ideology, no archival materials I came across nor anyone I interviewed brought up concerns about gender balance reproducing or furthering problematic gender norms and conceptualizations, such as further institutionalizing the binary conceptualization of gender. The only other concern I heard, and it was not a dominant one, was about the potential impact that gender balance (like affirmative action) could have in terms of stigmatizing women.

There is a tension between identity politics and queer theory. Collective identity serves as a source for organizing and advocacy, and categorization is a prerequisite for analysis of inequalities as well as for policies addressing these “institutional sources of oppression” that target these identities (Gamson 1995:403). However, this has made group identities “politicized” (Stein 1992:36). Group identity and categorization simultaneously exclude some people and institutionalize the importance of identity (Duggan 1992; Flax 1987; Gamson 1995; Piontek 2006; Seidman 1997, 2001; Stein 1992). “Fixed identity categories are both the basis for oppression and the basis for political power” (Gamson 1995:390). Most who argue against a gender-devoid ideology do so out of recognition that gender-conscious strategies are necessary to tackle systemic sexism (Williams 1998). One cannot tackle inequality without recognizing gender and its consequences.

Going back to navigation theory, one can subscribe to both queer theory and identity politics, which seemingly contradict one another, and through these recognize and consider the costs and benefits of policies like gender balance. For gender balance advocates, the benefits of the legislation outweigh the potential costs. One primary pathway to making gender less salient is to decrease its relationship to power. Decreasing gender inequality inevitably leads to less essentializing of gender. Contemporary movements to degender society and move past gender are stymied by ongoing gender inequality. Additionally, addressing the concern about stigma, when women’s
representation reaches a critical mass and then reaches balance, women are much more often treated as a normal part of the body they are participating in and not viewed through the lens of gender being their master status (Thomas 1991). Additionally, gender imbalance is a result of a stigma process. If women, historically excluded from government, are less represented in it, do not observe leadership of women in government—symbolically communicating that it is not their domain, are not recruited for it, are not told it is their domain, too, and when they are in it are still assumed not to be in it, on the basis of their gender, they will not be equally represented. In contrast, if men think of government as men’s domain, which historically it was—and this was enforced by law, network with other men, think of men when they think of potential leaders, and profess that their men-dominated institution is meritorious, inclusive, with gender not being a factor in its processes and systems and structures, women will remain underrepresented. Gender balance forces a reckoning with these traditional ways of operating.

Gender balance proponents and opponents seemed unanimously committed to meritocracy. Proponents and opponents could join together in no longer supporting affirmative action policies like gender balance when the removal of it does not precipitate moving backwards toward substantial underrepresentation. Gender no longer needs to be a consideration in appointments when those appointments are more or less balanced, proportional to the population, without sustained patterned deviance. In the interim, gender balance supporters seem passionately committed to meritocracy, translated as an egalitarian ideology that means striving toward meritocracy, creating equal opportunities. The Scottish Engender organization uses this as a talking point, that “Quotas support real meritocracy” (Engender 2016:16). Gender balance advocates are fighting for the critical mass that allows men and women to be treated as individuals, for the proportional representation that symbolically translates to cultural power in which people can observe models of people who look like themselves across the human experience, where issues are
no longer associated with a particular gender and subsequently typed and valued or devalued.

In terms of how gender balance contributes to conceptions of gender, as well as how stakeholders’ conceptions of gender influenced their position on gender balance, I found that both social constructionists and gender essentialists were able to support or oppose the bill. The notion of gender was conceptualized in all kinds of ways by different Iowans: from more sophisticated to more reductionist, from more biological to more sociological, from more stereotypical to challenging stereotypes, from important to ignored. For the most part, outside of traditional gender ideologies and gender-devoid ideologies, how one thought of gender did not impact support or opposition to gender balance. Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) member Ralph Brown felt “men and women aren’t equal any more than oranges and apples are equal,” but he was committed to “working for a way for women to work in society as man's partner, not his slave” (Jensen 1970). People who viewed women and men as bringing something different to the table thought it was useful to have gendered perspectives. For example, Representative Dolores Mertz (D-Kossuth, 1989-2010) felt men and women have different “natural” perspectives they bring to policy making bodies, with women being more detail-oriented and organizational, though she felt this may be shifting with contemporary younger men (B. Sawyer, PC, 2018). These differences need not be natural. Senator Jean Lloyd-Jones noted many “differences in the way men and women behave,” but noted “Are they biological, cultural, or both? Who knows. Does it matter?” (Lloyd-Jones 1986b).

In 1984, Representative Johnie Hammond (D-Story) wrote a letter to the editor blasting U.S. Senator Roger Jepsen (R-IA)’s wife Dee Jepsen, who had worked as Special Assistant to the President as liaison to women’s organizations, for Jepsen’s “stereotyped” views that women are superior at relationships because they have more “sensitivity” and are “fixers” (Hamond 1984c). Hammond also observed, however, that in the legislature, women legislators “do their homework”
and “really work and prepare” on legislation “much better than men,” though they had to because they were judged differently (Schenken 1991a:52-53). Hammond obviously supported the gender balance legislation. If women were not naturally different from men, this was all the more reason there should not be discrimination against either women or gender typing of men and women into particular boards and commissions. Whether a gender essentialist felt boards needed diversity and different perspectives at the table or a constructionist felt boards needed to be inclusive since gender does not impact merit, both also were compatible with understanding the important role representation plays symbolically. Nevertheless, some gender views are less aligned with the types of cultural shifts advocates hope will result from this legislation.

While it did not come up in my data, the question of gender balance reproducing gender as binary did come up during presentations I gave on this case study. This could be in part due to my interviewees being older than presentation audience members. Gender balance, when operationalized as an equal number of men and women, does exclude nonbinary people, both from participation and symbolically from being counted in conceptions of gender. Engender, a feminist organization in Scotland, noted that “gender quotas…. are generally framed with a binary understanding of gender” (Engender 2016:14). However, this does not have to be the case. Engender calls for “gender neutral quotas” to be “inclusive of people with non-binary gender identities,” one version of which they note are “maximum quotas for men” that tackle overrepresentation (Engender 2016:9). Similarly, in 2017, the Law Society of Scotland evaluated a quota bill as using a “binary approach to the concept” and failing to “account for people who consider themselves to be genderqueer or a third gender” (Sinclair-Chin 2017). India’s supreme court recognized transgender people as a third gender in 2014 and ordered governments to institute transgender quotas for jobs, education, and services (Pandey 2014). In Japan, after groups advocating for a gender quota law decided it would be unconstitutional, they instead pushed for and
successfully got adopted a law that political parties should “as a basic principle” enact gender quotas for “gender parity.” The law specifically uses the (translated) terms “gender” and “gender proportionality,” and not “men” or “women” in order to ensure gender minorities are not excluded. Professor Mari Miura, who advised the parliamentary working group on women’s political participation and empowerment, said, “It might not be realistic yet, but eventually, a quota should be considered for anyone who transcends the gender identity of men or women” (Miura 2018). Across the world, where gender quotas are more common, countries are grappling with and considering how to proceed with gender quotas that are increasingly inclusive.

In Iowa, Democratic 50-50 rules created an empirical confrontation around the idea of gender as binary when a nonbinary Democrat sought to serve as a delegate. The 50-50 rule stimulated this conversation and contributed to the Iowa Democratic Party taking a stand on this issue and advocating for change at the Democratic National Committee level. For all that it seems gender balance is connected to the idea of a gender binary, the Iowa Democratic Party adjusted their gender balance rules with simplicity and ease to accommodate all gender identities and recast the policy in a way that no longer reproduces a gender binary. Indeed, in navigating how to keep the intentions of 50-50 rules intact while being inclusive across gender identities, the Iowa Democratic Party was able to draw from the state’s experience with gender balance: the Iowa gender balance law does not refer to men or women; it simply requires that no more than half of a board be made up of one gender. Iowa’s political party balance law similarly is not predicated on Iowans all being either Democrats or Republicans. Iowa’s gender balanced elected judicial nominating commissions, however, do explicitly refer to men and women.

Gender balance on boards and commissions is not going to transform society, but as advocates have said, it is one component that moves gender equity forward. From Hammond’s work to ensure a man was on the social welfare board to advocates’ pushback against the League of
Cities’ proposal in 2009 to have overall rather than board-specific gender balance at the local level, advocates have been committed to gender balance serving as a tool to decrease gender typing. The law does not just change whether women are better represented, or whether they are thought of as qualified, it contributes to understanding that gender does not differentiate capabilities across domains.

Some initial responses to this remain gendered. Former Iowa CSW Commissioner and Chair Phyllis Peters said that when she was giving a talk in 2012 and showing gendered distributions on different types of boards, she made the case for having “a variety of skill sets” on the variety of boards, and for gender balance encompassing both men and women dominated boards. For example, she said “the library board, just like a church board, would benefit with somebody who is a contractor or a builder or a welder.” Peters remembers a woman responding, saying her husband “would be great on the library board, because we’re trying to get that leaky roof fixed and he would know some solutions” (P. Peters, PC, 2018b). While people across gender identities may or may not be able to help with a leaky roof based on their human experience and competency in that area, hopefully participation in these boards and commissions across gender will also lead to a woman in the future saying her husband would be great on the library board because he can help with art programming and children’s programs like the summer reading program. In this case, if the man did join the library board and the roof no longer leaks, hopefully his engagement with the board will mean he will find other ways to contribute, and that he and the other board members and community members will be able to identify the diverse ways that people, regardless of gender identity, can contribute to their community’s governance.

The initial women to break glass floors are often privileged in other ways, and also often have to present themselves in a particular way, mimicking masculinity while preserving femininity, in order to be deemed acceptable. Senator Bev Hannon (D-Jones) said that in her first campaign in
1984, she wanted to include a photo of her family, “of whom I’m proud,” in her campaign literature. However, “experts convinced” her not to do so, arguing it would cause women to vote against her. Family photos were “a plus for men, a minus for women.” Hannon got asked on the campaign trail who would care for her children if she went to Des Moines, while at the same events men would be “holding their infants to the delight of the audience” (Hannon 1990a).

As women’s representation increases, this hurdle is lowered, enabling more diversity of representation. As women’s representation increases, women become part of a critical mass in politics and government that simultaneously enables them to be more authentic to themselves and that provides a diversity of models for what it looks like to be a woman in politics. Queer politics can contribute to this, broadening inclusion by “destabilizing… collective identity” and tackling “cultural sources of oppression” (Gamson 1995:403).

Women also have a lower hurdle in having to prove their qualifications and competency. The General Social Survey, conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, seeks a nationally representative sample from the U.S. adult population. A recurring question on the survey asks, “Tell me if you agree or disagree with this statement: Most men are better suited emotionally for politics than are most women.” Perceptions of women’s political acumen still has ample room for improvement, with 13% (weighted) of survey respondents in 2018 agreeing with the statement. However, that is a marked improvement from 1974, when 43.5% (weighted) of survey respondents agreed (Smith et al. 1972-2018).

Senator Jean Lloyd-Jones (D-Johnson) recalls learning in the legislature to let go of her initial attempts to act like a man to fit in there—that she instead wanted to act like herself, though perhaps a slightly braver version of herself. The Women’s Legislative Caucus helped her navigate this and be supported (Schenken 1989a). When Senator Janet Petersen (D-Polk, 2001-2019) first ran for office, she “was counseled to cut her blond hair and get glasses so she’d look more serious…. She ignored
the advice” (Fandel 2007). Melissa Gesing, E.D. of 50-50 in 2020, said that in the 2018 election, “women are campaigning as their authentic selves and no longer feel compelled to play by the old rules,” from discussing caregiving to “tossing aside the traditional expectations with how to dress, speak, and present themselves, and are instead re-writing the rules of the game” (Gesing 2018). Barbara Lee Family Foundation Research and Communications Director Amanda Hunter reflected that “women are really running unapologetically as themselves,” rejecting “an outdated template of what a candidate looks like” (Kurtzleben 2018). Gender balance facilitates women claiming their power while obfuscating gendered expectations.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CULTURAL CHANGE
Culturally shared belief systems that recognize and repudiate structural inequality can translate into cultural demands and in turn social progress, including social policies that reflect our government acting as a benevolent, power-balancing force in our society. However, given the multiplicity of various powerful beliefs, interests, and individual and collective actors that support and oppose such direction, this is not inevitable, even with hard work. Accomplishing policy objectives requires that decision-makers and stakeholders believe voting for a policy is worthwhile and feasible.

In Iowa, advocates won political change in part because they successfully managed collective action frames, contributing to how targets navigated their multiple ideological beliefs. Advocates fostered stakeholders’ encounters with empirical confrontations around gender inequality and women’s qualifications. They then capitalized on this created cognitive dissonance by offering replacement frames that assisted stakeholders with taking a favorable interpretive pathway. This led them through a navigational process toward a supportive outcome. Advocates used systems frames, but made these frames accessible through the use of everyday language and connected structural narratives.
Going into this study, I was hoping to uncover some strategy or tactic that could be operationalized to produce positive cultural change. I went to Iowa to study a positive deviance case on an issue that seemed embedded in a web of controversial ideologies. Given the vastness of suffering present in our world, I hoped to uncover operationalizable strategies to change people’s ideologies, that could cause people to support the actions necessary to restructure our society so that our fellow humans can at least be afforded foundational physical and psychosocial health.

In retrospect, that was a naïve hope. The social world is too complicated to offer simple and direct pathways to accomplishing social justice. And I found that, interestingly enough, due to advocates disembedding gender segregation, normatizing and institutionalizing gendered representation practices, and prioritizing an ideology of good governance, gender balance legislation in Iowa largely bypassed traditional dominant ideologies. This occurred without requiring advocates to do much to confront and persuade stakeholders to change their ideological conceptions on the issue. In 1986, 1987, 1988, and 2009, a majority of legislators voted for gender quotas, which they generally understood as the decent thing to do.

People may change their ideologies, but more often policy success, even on issues that seem to directly confront ideologies, is a result of people holding a multiplicity of overlapping ideologies, both complementary and conflicting, and their process of activating, navigating, prioritizing, and applying these ideologies to the empirical world. This process in and of itself may lead to ideological shifts, since most people shift their ideologies as a reaction to their lived experiences. Stakeholders’ negotiation processes and engagement with policy issues may have an impact on and shift one or more of their ideologies.

Overall, people with a shared culture share similar values, even if these values get applied in very different ways. People may seem quite inconsistent in how they apply their values and ideologies, but that is because their navigation includes a negotiation of a variety of lenses and filters
influencing their cognitive processes. I noted earlier in this chapter that Representative Doug Struyk (D-Pottawattamie) supported meritocracy, “the best person for the job regardless of gender,” and wanted to ensure boards and commissions were made up of competent people. Women’s rights advocates like Representatives Mary Mascher (D-Johnson) and Beth Wessel-Kroeschell (D-Story) also wanted boards and commissions to be made up of “the best person for the job regardless of gender” and of competent people (D. Struyk, PC, 2018). However, they interpreted the current appointments process as biased against women, preventing the best people for the job from getting appointed—because of their gender. In the release of their inaugural report on women’s representation on state boards and commissions in 1974, Iowa Women’s Political Caucus Chair Roxanne Conlin said Iowa “cannot afford to continue to overlook more than half of the experience, the wisdom, the talent and the intelligence in this state” (Gappa and Conlin 1974:2). Gender balance was a tool to bring competent people onto boards and commissions who were currently being overlooked in favor of people’s personal connections from their personal networks and their biased evaluations of who they thought of as best qualified and a good fit for these appointments. For advocates, this did not seem like a meritocratic system at all.

In this case study, certainly Senator Johnie Hammond (D-Story), Representative Mary Mascher (D-Johnson), and ICSW E.D.s Charlotte Nelson and Rachel Scott could be said to have supported fairness and opposed discrimination. However, Representative Lance Horbach (R-Tama) and Senator Herman Quirmbach (D-Story), ideological opponents of gender balance, also supported fairness and opposed discrimination. Given this, and given ideologies’ reticence to change, the question becomes not how to shift people’s ideologies, but how to manage collective action frames to tap into people’s ideologies in a way that connects to them and influences them, for example, deactivating neoliberalism and prioritizing egalitarianism to address social problems of structural inequality.
Just like the processes that deradicalized gender balance, this engagement may also engage directly with or lead to schematic and ideological changes. Ideologies are connected to one’s interpretation of an issue, to one’s perception of the cause of an issue, and to one’s support for various ways to address or handle the issue (Oliver and Johnston 2000). Convincing someone that gender imbalance is a systemic problem that is due to insular social networks may activate social liberalism and deactivate meritocratic ideologies. It may also change one’s gender ideology as they start to question whether women’s lower status is due to systemic issues like insular social networks rather than something inherent in men or women. When Iowa legislators encountered legislation in 2010, the year after local gender balance was adopted, to include at least one young person on state boards and commissions, their experiences, such as of government intervention operating as a successful tool and of understanding inequality as preventing appointments, may make them again prioritize social liberalism over meritocracy, even if without that engagement the year prior they would have prioritized meritocracy.

While ideological change is certainly necessary for belief structures that frame some humans as superior to others, like racism or sexism (e.g. Nazism is a problematic ideology), for other ideologies, receding into the background is not problematic. Women’s rights advocates for gender balance may still believe in meritocracy, but, coinciding with Gamson’s (1992a) analysis of affirmative action, believe there is a structural problem preventing equal opportunities and that thus requires remedial action. However, the goals of these advocates is ultimately to get to a place in which there are equal opportunities across gender, in which they can reactivate their meritocratic ideology and have it reflect and make sense of the empirical situation before them.

In this study, I found that false and critical consciousness are not always dichotomous categories in which people reside and/or move from one ideological position to another. There were certainly key instances of cultural change within this case study (e.g. some people moved toward an
egalitarian gender ideology, transitioning to a belief that women are equally qualified for public decision-making). However, there was also a lot more room within each actor for ambiguity, complexity, and contradiction. This may indeed be beneficial, that we already hold within us the belief structures that can lead to support of better policies. That they just need to be navigated, activated, prioritized, and managed to get to more optimal outcomes. That even with the weight of individualism, we still have ready capability for structural understanding. That given strategic advocates’ hard work, persistence, and time, and given a social problem that has an objective negative impact, coupled with human decency, eventually advocates (or their successors) seeking a world filled with more justice and loving-kindness can succeed in bringing us closer to that future.
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