GLOBAL SOJOURNERS: WOMEN'S POLITICAL EFFICACY AND POLITICAL

AMBITION IN THE FACE OF POLITICAL CYNICISM AND GENDER BARRIERS

By

Copyright 2016

Terri M. Easley-Giraldo

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Communication Studies and the Graduate

Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Chairperson – Dr. Mary Banwart

_____

Dr. Kelly H. Chong

_____

Dr. Angela Gist

_____

Dr. Beth Innocenti

_____

Dr. Alesia Woszidlo

Date Defended: April 22, 2016

The Dissertation Committee for Terri M. Easley-Giraldo

certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

GLOBAL SOJOURNERS: WOMEN'S POLITICAL EFFICACY AND POLITICAL

AMBITION IN THE FACE OF POLITICAL CYNICISM AND GENDER BARRIERS

_____

Chairperson – Dr. Mary Banwart

Date approved: April 29, 2016

Abstract

Despite progress that has been made worldwide regarding female political participation, the question of why more women do not enter the political arena remains. This study explored how women from MMIAPEZ (Mongolia, Morocco, India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt, and Zambia) discursively construct obstacles and barriers to their participation in politics, as well as their political interest and ability to participate in politics. Fifty-eight in-depth semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted with young women from seven different countries. Using a qualitative approach and thematic analysis, this study uncovered three themes. First, MMIAPEZ women revealed the multi-faceted gender barriers that exist for female political participation in their countries. Second, MMIAPEZ women demonstrated high levels of political cynicism which was articulated by apathy and an active avoidance of politics. Finally, MMIAPEZ women generally expressed lower levels of political ambition and political efficacy which was articulated by their skeptical outlook towards politics. This study also conducted a follow-up survey at the end of the leadership institute to examine potential discursive shifts about their political interest and political efficacy. This study suggests that while encouraging women to run for political office is still an important goal, in countries such as MMIAPEZ, encouraging participation in the civil sphere may be more advantageous for young women with low political efficacy.

Acknowledgements

Harvey Mackay once said, "None of us got to where we are alone. Whether the assistance we received was obvious or subtle, acknowledging someone's help is a big part of understanding the importance of saying thank you." I would not be where I am today without so many wonderful people that I am grateful to have in my life.

To my advisor, Dr. Mary Banwart – you have been a constant inspiration for me throughout my graduate program at KU. The political communication seminar I took from you my first semester at KU opened my eyes to my true research passion of gender and politics and you continued to help me hone my research agenda. While we both juggled many commitments, I could always count on you for support and encouragement when I needed it the most. I always left our meetings feeling fantastic, refreshed, reassured, and reoriented.

I would also like to thank the other members of my committee. Dr. Angela Gist helped me grow as a qualitative scholar and I will forever be grateful for the assistance she provided on this project. You went above and beyond in assisting me on this project and I will never be able to express how much I appreciate you and your time. I learned so much from our sessions and truly appreciate the mentorship, support, and words of wisdom you shared with me. To my committee members Dr. Alesia Woszidlo, thank you for your guidance, insightful comments, support, and advice; Dr. Beth Innocenti, your classes made me a stronger writer and I will forever be grateful for what I learned in those classes; and Dr. Kelly Chong, thank you for serving as my outside member – your insight and advice was extremely valuable.

Graduate school while maintaining a full-time faculty position at Johnson County Community College would not have been possible without so many supportive friends and colleagues. Thank you to my Symposium group who always provided words of wisdom and a

place to vent and recharge. I'd also like to thank my Dean, Dr. Larry Reynolds who I consider a great mentor, colleague, and friend. You have been supportive of me from my very first day at JCCC, and your encouragement and support helped me survive and navigate the PhD program. Scheduling was a luxury that helped facilitate my ability to take classes at KU and I appreciate my department's understanding and cooperation, as well as other administrators who made it possible.

I owe a huge part of this accomplishment to my husband, Mario. You are the most supportive, caring, thoughtful, and patient partner I could ever hope for. You've only known me as a crazy, stressed graduate student, so I'm pretty sure the rest of life will be a cake-walk! Words are not enough to express how thankful I am for you, how much I owe you, and how much I love you. I'm so lucky to do life with you amor!

I want to thank the amazing people in my life who have always been supportive and have helped me survive graduate school. You have all helped me in various ways whether it was listening to me complain, helping distract me from stresses, brainstorming ideas and titles, and most of all just being there. Thank you Kelly, Natalie, Dan, Alisa, and Brandie.

Finally, I would like to thank my family: Mom, Dad, Brandon and Grammie. My family has always been my #1 cheering squad, and while being away from them is difficult, there is not a day that passes that I don't think of them. My Mom and Dad have been great parents that have always encouraged me to follow my dreams and goals, and more importantly they are the greatest people that I know. Brandon, you have always joked that I'd never stop getting degrees, but this is finally it – I'm done!! Thank you all for believing in me, and always supporting me.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Scholars studying gender in politics have focused on a variety of topics over the decades, with one of the most studied questions– for those interested in women's political socialization – asking why women are not as involved or interested in politics as their male counterparts. Women in American politics have slowly made progress with incremental increases in representation in higher levels of political office, but yet the question still remains, why are more women not involved?

A variety of explanations and approaches exist to address the question of the lower levels of a female representation in politics. One such explanation is offered by role congruity theory. Specifically, Eagly and Karau (2002) explain that prejudicial biases exist towards female leaders due to an incongruity between societal expectations of gender roles for women with those of leadership roles. In other words, the roles considered "appropriate" for women are not roles in which leadership as a behavior or trait is generally required for success; and, when roles requiring leadership behaviors or traits are enacted by women, the women enacting those roles are often viewed less favorably. Additionally, role model theory developed by Campbell and Wolbrecht (2006) provides explanations for low levels of female representation by arguing the presence of female politicians and candidates is crucial to increasing political involvement of young women. Both of these theories provide a relevant framework for examining women's political participation domestically, and certain possibility for understanding it globally.

Indeed, researchers have examined the interactions of various predictors of political participation, such as knowledge, interest, cynicism, ambition, and gender socialization (Delli, Carpini, & Keeter, 1996; Dermody, Hanmer-Loyd, & Scullion, 2010; Eveland & Scheufle, 2000; Jennings, 1992; Kaid, McKinney & Tedesco, 2000; Kenski, 2001; Lawless & Fox, 2010; Paxton

& Hughes, 2013; Pinkleton et al, 1998). A foundational program of research has been established by scholars investigating the intersections of political knowledge, interest, cynicism, and ambition among the citizens impacted by American politics, notably finding differences on all constructs across young men and women. Yet, little research has tested these findings through a global application. This study seeks to expand this line of study to explore political knowledge, interest, cynicism, and ambition in young women from non-Western cultures.

The participants of this study are from seven different countries, and whenever I address these countries as a group I will use the acronym MMIAPEZ to represent the countries of Mongolia, Morocco, India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt, and Zambia. An acronym best captures and serves as a descriptive element when referencing the various countries the participants represent in this study. Further, the acronym used is value-free. For instance, the use of "developing countries" would infer the country lacked a certain element of industrialization and would suggest a value-laden comparison that is irrelevant to this study. Similarly, the phrase "international women" describes the female participants' country origins but places the United States as the center and all other countries as "international." Further, instead of "international" as a spatial descriptor, at times I will refer to Western and non-Western contexts when referencing previous research. Granted, the literature is heavily focused on American perspectives with a Western approach to studying female participation in politics, whereas this study focuses on understanding female participation in non-Western countries. While a dichotomy still exists in the use of "Western" and "non-Western," this descriptor is commonly used in research to distinguish the focus and methods of study; I propose this qualifier best encapsulates the research and aim of the study by providing operative and functional descriptions.

Mohanty (1991) encourages scholars to make a conscious effort not to homogenize research participants' experiences, arguing that we can only understand experiences that are different than our own through knowing. This study accesses the "knowing" Mohanty (1991) argues is essential through first-hand, personal accounts from the participants regarding political involvement and engagement. Ethnocentric evaluations – such as evaluations of legal, religious, societal, and familial structures – are not given in this study as the purpose is not to impose a Western standard on the MMIAPEZ women. Rather, this research seeks to understand how these women discursively construct their political knowledge and interest as well as their ability to participate in politics. As Mohanty (1991) argues, it is important to acknowledge that power relations within the government, family and other institutions vary for all women and there is not a homogenous function of powerlessness for women. For Mohanty (1991), "a cross-culturally singular, monolithic notion of patriarchy or male dominance leads to the construction of a similarly reductive and homogenous notion" (p.54). This homogenous notion is clarified as "the stable, ahistorical something that apparently oppresses most if not all the women in these countries" (Mohanty, 1991, p. 53-54). Therefore, the participants' personal experiences are shared in their own discursive strategies to prevent homogenization and universalization of their perspectives and experiences.

This project also explores and seeks to understand what obstacles and challenges these women believe to exist for their participation in politics. Additionally, this study seeks to understand how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct their political interest and knowledge, as well as their ability to participate in politics. Although evidence of the effects of role model theory have been supported by the study of women in the United States, is there evidence of similar effects with presence of female politicians impacting on young MMIAPEZ women? In

countries where quotas exist for female politicians, is the presence of female politicians recognized and if so, how is that discursively constructed by young women? Additionally, the predictors of political involvement have focused on women in the United States, but there are important consequences for women who face fewer rights in non-Western countries. This study seeks to explore how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct their perception of obstacles and barriers to female political participation, and in particular the role gender plays in those perceptions. Because the women involved in this study participate in a six-week intensive leadership institute focusing on adaptive leadership, this specific experience raises the question: Does involvement in an intensive leadership institute alter their perceived confidence and political efficacy to encourage women to be involved in civic processes they have not be engaged in before? This study conducts a follow-up survey that investigates potential discursive shifts in MMIAPEZ women's discussion of their ability to participate in politics after their involvement in an intensive leadership institute.

In order to address each of the topic areas in connection with previous research, Chapter Two begins by summarizing existing theory and research and concludes with the research questions for this study. Chapter Three describes the methods and participants used in the study, and Chapter Four presents the findings. Finally, Chapter Five discusses the major findings in connection with previous research and discusses the implications and conclusions of this study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Scholars studying gender in politics span an array of topics, but as Kirkpatrick (1974) claims, "the most important and interesting question about women's political behavior is why so few seek and wield power" (p. 23). This research project explores MMIAPEZ women's perspectives on political behaviors in their perspective countries. While understanding why women do not seek political office is an important question as Kirkpatrick (1974) argues, also investigating women's political interest and knowledge plays a foundational role in understanding why women do or do not seek political office. Research continues to demonstrate that American women tend to be more cynical, less interested, and less knowledgeable about politics than their male counterparts (Citrin & Muste, 1999; Lawless & Fox, 2012; Lizotte & Sidman, 2009;; Mondak &Anderson, 2004; Tian, 2011). However, little research exists that asks whether non-Western women share the same cynicism, lack of interest and knowledge as American women.

While an important body of work, the current literature within this topic area is predominately based on American perspectives of women's involvement and political attitudes and perceptions. This project seeks to investigate whether these concepts and phenomena are also discursively constructed and experienced by MMIAPEZ women. Additionally, the gender and cultural socialization through societal norms and regulations of the women involved in this project allows unique investigations of various perspectives of female political behaviors in differing cultural contexts.

Role Congruity Theory and Leadership

Women's participation in politics has slowly increased over time, but as Rhode (2003) notes, "women still remain dramatically underrepresented in formal leadership positions" (p. 3).

Rhode (2003) cautions that even though barriers have been lowered or removed, it is important to acknowledge that women still face inequalities in treatment and expectations as leaders. Progress has been achieved, but parity has not yet been reached with women underrepresented in top positions and overrepresented at the bottom in both the public and private sectors (Rhode, 2003). While a leadership ambition gap can explain that while women may be equally as professionally ambitious as men, data continues to reveal more men than women tend to proactively seek advancement into leadership positions (Sandberg, 2013). Further, over time research has demonstrated that, historically, within the corporate institutional climate women are not afforded the same opportunities to develop and enhance their leadership abilities as men and are still confronted with traditional gender stereotypes (Rhode, 2003). In an attempt to explain the lack of female representation in politics and leadership positions, Eagly and Karau (2002) proposed role congruity theory which is grounded in the context of gender roles and expectations for gendered behaviors. Role congruity theory extends beyond social role theory to explain prejudicial bias towards female leaders due to incongruity between societal expectations of gender roles and leadership roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women are associated with more communal characteristics such as being kind, sensitive and sympathetic, whereas men are associated with more agentic characteristics such as being assertive and confidence (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Female leadership behaviors violate traditional gender norms which activates stereotyping that leadership is a masculine concept that is biased towards women (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & Lopez-Zafra, 2006). Studies have shown that this prejudice does not exist only with males, confirming that females can be prejudiced against female leaders as well (Garcia-Retamero & Lopez-Zafra, 2006).

In their work Eagly and Carli (2007) challenge the glass ceiling concept and argue that prejudice and discrimination that hinders women's advancement has not evaporated completely, but further argue that the glass ceiling metaphor is actually quite inadequate to describe the situation. Instead of the glass ceiling, they propose a new metaphor – the 'labyrinth' – to capture "the varied challenges confronting women as they travel, often on indirect paths, sometimes through alien territory, on their way to leadership" (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 1). As Eagly and Carli (2007) claim, "with continuing change, the obstacles that women face have become more surmountable, at least by some women some of the time. Paths to the top exist, and some women find them. The successful routes can be difficult to discover, however, and therefore we label these circuitous paths a *labyrinth*" (p. 6).

Women's pursuit of leadership opportunities has been met with the tension of traditional gender stereotypes wherein women try to conform to male definitions of leadership (Lee & Shaw, 2010; Rhode, 2003; Sandberg, 2013; Wilson, 2004). One of the largest barriers women face in leadership is the fact that characteristics traditionally associated with women are at odds with traditional, socially-constructed concepts and distinctive traits of leadership that are masculine (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Lee & Shaw, 2010; Paxton & Hughes, 2013; Rhode, 2003). Further, some scholars even argue that the word "leadership" in and of itself, grounded within socially constructed connotations and associations, tends to invoke images and characteristics based on stereotypes that are traditionally considered masculine and thus fosters the belief that men are more appropriate and effective leaders (Garcia-Retamero & Lopez-Zafra, 2006; Lee & Shaw, 2010; Wilson, 2004).

A fundamental incongruity exists between the social expectations of women and leaders as leader behavior violates gender norms (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ritter & Yoder, 2004). While

both men and women are expected to conform to masculine leadership expectations, men have an easier time meeting this masculine expectations, whereas women must leave behind female qualities in order to blend in with masculine expectations of leadership (Lee & Shaw, 2010; Wilson, 2004). Deborah Gruenfeld, a professor of leadership and organizational behavior at Stanford argues that "our entrenched cultural ideas associate men with leadership qualities and women with nurturing qualities and put women in a double bind. We believe not only that women are nurturing but they should be nurturing above all else" and that behavior contrary to those expectations can give negative opinions and impressions of women (Sandberg, 2013, p. 43). Women in leadership positions must serve and balance their role as a leader and their gendered expectations as a woman, which can result in failing to perform the requirements of either the gender role or leader role (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Lee & Shaw, 2010; Paxton & Hughes, 2013). The result, then, is that American culture views leadership traditionally as men's work and when it is performed by a woman it is usually not acknowledged as leadership (Hoyt & Burnette, 2013; Wilson, 2004). As Eagly and Carli (2007) state, "the mere activation of the female stereotype can undermine women's interest in leadership" (p. 93).

Eagly and Carli (2007) explain the double-bind female leaders' face is the gendered expectation that women are communal, and the expectation for leadership roles is that "leaders be especially agentic" (p. 101). This double-bind for women is to bear the burden of having to be likable to be influential and acceptable as a leader, and are expected to clearly demonstrate their superiority in ability, whereas men are more fortunate in the leadership arena and do not have the same expectations of demonstrating likeability and superiority (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Success can alter likeability in different ways for female and male leaders though, as men who

are successful are liked by both men and women whereas when a woman is successful both genders view her as less likeable due to stereotyping (Sandberg, 2013).

Another impediment for female leaders is the perception of competence. Even though research finds women to perform as effectively as men in leadership roles, research also reveals that women struggle to establish credibility and capability among co-workers and colleagues (Bridge, 1997; Deaux & France, 1998; Ridgeway & Correl, 2000; Rhode, 2003). What this means, then, when these impediments are translated to the world of politics is that instead of portraying female candidates as "experts," female candidates are "painted with the brush of mediocrity" (Wilson, 2004, p. 40). In addition to external perceptions of lacking competence, stereotypical evaluations by others lead to internalization for women. This internalization causes a decrease in confidence and the ability to be viewed as a leader, which has serious implications for the recruitment and maintaining females in leadership positions (Rhode, 2003).

An obstacle for women seeking leadership positions is the difficulty in accessing mentors and network opportunities (Rhode, 2003). Mentorship offers critical and valuable support for women seeking and pursuing leadership positions by helping to prepare women and supporting them through challenges in the process (Rhode, 2003). Supportive networks can also be a valuable resource as women seek leadership positions, bringing women together around common interests which allows for coalition-building in addition to a supportive and encouraging environment (Rhode, 2003; Sandberg, 2013).

Challenging the traditional conceptions of leadership can be an avenue for greater acceptance of female leadership. Contemporary research has acknowledged a range of qualities, behaviors and processes that are advantageous for effective leadership (Rhode, 2003). Current theories of leadership have stressed the importance of feminine qualities of cooperation and

collaboration which are more commonly associated with women and challenge the traditional concept of leadership with concentrated power in the hands of a few (Hoyt & Burnette, 2013; Rhode, 2003; Wilson, 2004). Wilson (2004) suggests that we "need the "female advantage" – women's ability to communicate across lines of authority, sharing information in a team-spirited work ethic" (p. 108). A leadership style that values more communal approaches would be more congruent with gender expectations for female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ritter & Yoder, 2004). Moving beyond traditional conceptions of leadership can be advantageous for women and would create a much more inclusive environment for women seeking political office.

This study examines how role congruity and gendered expectations may influence young women's interest or involvement in politics. Additionally, this study explores if societal expectations and gender norms present potential obstacles for young women seeking political involvement and participation.

Role Model Theory

The role model theory developed by Campbell and Wolbrecht (2006) provides additional explanation for gender representation in political office. The role model theory contends that the presence of female politicians and candidates is essential to increasing political involvement of women and young girls. Studies have found overwhelming support for the hypothesis that visible and competitive female candidates increases women's political engagement (Atkeson, 2003; Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006; Hansen, 1997; Sapiro & Conover, 1997; Wolbrecht & Campbell, 2007). Women running for or holding political office function as role models by inspiring women to be politically active themselves (Wolbrecht & Campbell, 2007). Atkeson's (2003) contextual cue theory concludes that descriptive representation matters for women and insists that when a viable female candidate or politician is visible, cues are sent that politics is an

appropriate and acceptable place for women that can lead to mobilization. Additionally, increased female representation leads to increased female external efficacy where women's feelings towards government responsiveness increases (Atkeson & Carillo, 2007). The visibility of female candidates and politicians in higher offices is important to signal that women are viable and credible (Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006). While female candidates and politicians are still beneficial on the lower levels of political office, visibility and viability are both important elements of role model theory as media coverage plays an vital role in making the female candidates and politicians seen and recognized. Furthermore, it is not the sheer number of women running for political offices that matter, rather it is the attention drawn to women running and exercising leadership (Cambell & Wolbrecht, 2006).

Campbell and Wolbrecht (2006) found that visible female candidates led to increased likelihood of teen girls indicating their intention to be politically active. This study also maintained that visible female candidates leads to increased political discussion within families (Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006). Increased political discussion can have a positive effect on political involvement with political knowledge being one of the most powerful predictors of future political involvement (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996). The presence of more female members in political office leads to the greater likelihood that women would not only discuss politics more frequently but would also participate as an adult (Wolbrecht & Campbell, 2007). Verba et al. (1997) found that women in states with a female office holder had greater political knowledge and efficacy. Research has also found that women are more likely to approve of the governmental policies and have more faith in the political systems when they are represented by a female candidate (Lawless, 2004). Additionally the presence of female candidates and

politicians can enhance women's confidence in their own abilities to act politically (Hansen, 1997; Sapiro & Conover, 1997).

While general support for role model theory has been found across several research studies, some specific results are either inconclusive or mixed and warrant further investigation. Additionally, some studies have shown no relationship between descriptive representation and women's engagement, suggesting that the effects of a female's presence as a well-known political actor is more likely to be influential during campaigns and thus when she is widely covered as a political candidate (Karp & Banducci, 2008; Reingold & Harrell, 2010). Yet, Dolan (2006) ultimately found little support overall for role model theory and suggests that the influence of female candidates is dependent on the election year and contextual environment.

Burns et al. (2001) and Campbell and Wolbrecht (2006) both suggest that women are more likely to be politically knowledgeable and care about politics when they live in an environment where women seek and hold political office. Further, role model theory is currently most prominent and rooted in American political research with investigations of role model theory largely unexplored in non-Western contexts. Thus, opportunities for expanding either the application of or irrelevance of role model theory is worthy of analysis for those countries in which quotas for female representation exist and offer a unique study of the resulting perceptions of young MMIAPEZ women.

Predictors of Political Involvement

Domestically decades of both research and corresponding discussions continue to demonstrate that the political participation of young adults is far behind that of other segments of the American population (Andolina & Jenkins, 2002; Bennett, 1991; Delli Carpini, 2000; Keeter, Zuikin). Explanations for these low level of young adult participation indicate factors such as

low trust for the political system (Andolina & Jenkins, 2002; Delli Carpini, 2000; Keeter,

Zuikin), lack of political knowledge (McDevitt & Kiousis, 2007; Gans, 2004), and lack of

political ambition (Carroll, 1994; Lawless & Fox, 2010). Yet, while at the same time the

research undeniably demonstrates the importance of these variables and their association with

participation, gender socialization functions as a key factor in providing nuance and context to

effects of political knowledge and behavior in young people. This section outlines the various

predictors of political involvement for this study: political knowledge and interest, political

cynicism and efficacy, political ambition, and gender socialization.

Political knowledge and interest. Political knowledge and interest have been linked

throughout the literature of political participation. For instance, research suggests that individuals

who are politically interested tend to have higher levels of political knowledge (Delli, Carpini, &

Keeter, 1996; Eveland & Scheufele, 2000; Kenski, 2001). As Barabas (2014) argues, "political

knowledge is a central concept in the study of public opinion and political behavior" (p. 840).

An individual's perception of their comprehension of politics influences their level of political

interest (Bennett & Bennett, 1989). Political knowledge has been found to influence a variety of

actions from vote choice, to turnout, levels of tolerance, and one's own political beliefs (Barabas,

2014; Mondak, 1999). The most divisive question in this body of literature is what determines

who is informed. Some studies focus on formal education (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996),

cognitive abilities (Luskin, 1990), or partisan loyalties (Jerit & Barabas, 2012). Other studies

focus on the supply of information (Iyengar et al., 2009; Jerit, Barabas, & Bolsen, 2006) or

variations of the media influence (Curran et al., 2009). Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996)

recommend the five-item knowledge index which is often used by scholars (Hayes, 2008; Mutz,

2002; Nyhan & Reifler, 2010). The five-item knowledge index contains questions about: 1)

party control of the house, 2) veto override percent, 3) party ideological location, 4) judicial review, and 5) Quayle (identifying the Vice-President) (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996).

Political knowledge influences an individual's likelihood of political participation, but it also influences the individual's attitudes and ability to participate in politics (Bartels, 1996; Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996, 2000; Jennings, 1992; Ondercin & White, 2011, Sanbonmatsu, 2003;). Women have been found to have lower levels of political knowledge than men, and this lower level of political knowledge reduces their political participation (Ondercin & White, 2011).

A gender gap in political knowledge has also consistently emerged in research. Political knowledge surveys demonstrate that women tend to give fewer correct answers than men to a variety of questions testing political knowledge (Burns, Schlozman, & Verba, 2001; Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996, 2000). In studies of American politics on a national scale, women's self-reports demonstrate they are less likely than men to understand politics and are more likely to report they "don't know" (Bystrom, Banwart, Kaid, & Robertson, 2004; S. Bennett, 1997; Frazer and Macdonald, 2003; Kenski & Jamieson, 2000; Sidman, 2009; Mondak & Anderson, 2004). Even with a greater possession of information, well-informed women tend to distrust their ability to understand politics (S. Bennett, 1997).

Political knowledge is a foundational resource that individuals rely upon when making decisions to participate and engage in politics. Political information is necessary for individuals to participate in politics on a fundamental level to form participatory decisions (Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). The importance of political knowledge on political participation also highlights that women's likelihood to participate operates differently than men. As Ondercin and White (2011) argue, "women hold themselves to higher standards when deciding to run for elected office" (p. 676). Additionally, an individual's political knowledge can reflect

their psychological orientation to politics (Lizotee & Sidman, 2009; Mondak & Anderson, 2004; Frazer & Macdonald, 2003; Kenski & Jamieson, 2000). As Ondercin and White (2011) argue, "if an individual lacks a positive psychological orientation toward politics that in turn lowers his or her political knowledge, the individual will be less likely to participate in politics" (p. 676).

Ondercin and White (2011) argue that voting is a distinct act of political participation compared to other forms of political participation as "voting is the most common and, some would argue, easiest form of political participation and is generally less visible" (p. 682). Other forms of political participation range from influencing others to vote, going to political meetings and rallies, working for a political campaign, wearing a campaign button or shirt and making campaign contributions (Ondercin & White, 2011). As one of the most obvious predictors of political involvement, this study explores how women from MMIAPEZ discursively construct their political interest and knowledge. Additionally, this study explores the women's constructions of political participation as well as their ability to participate in politics.

Political cynicism and political efficacy. In addition to a lack of knowledge, political cynicism can negatively impact young voters' future participatory behaviors (Banwart, 2007). Political cynicism results from an erosion of trust in government and politicians (Dermody, Hanmer-Loyd, & Scullion, 2010). Cynicism is identified as the "feeling that the government in general and the political leaders in particular do not care about the public's opinions and are not acting in the best interest of the people" (Kaid, McKinney, & Tedesco, 2000, p. 198). In addition to a lack of trust in the government and political officials, political cynicism involves a feeling of powerlessness over the processes involved in managing and guiding the country (Lariscy et al., 2011). Starobin (1995) argues that cynical attitudes toward government focuses on the integrity, purpose, and effectiveness of the government and its political officials.

Adriannsen (2010) contends that "we regard political trust and cynicism as opposites on a continuum that runs from very positive to very negative attitudes" (p. 435). Young citizens in particular have declining levels of trust in politicians and their governments (Dermondy, Hanmer-Loyd, & Scullion, 2010). Relatedly, cynicism is argued to have direct associations with efficacy by lowering the perception that an individual can have an impact on the political system (Verba et al., 1997). Campbell et al. (1954) define political efficacy as "the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have an impact on the political process" (p. 187). Carr et al. (2014) argue that the "downward spiral of political trust spawns political cynicism and alienates citizens from the political processes" (p. 456). Efficacy, then, is developed through successful experiences that promote confidence and expertise, while negative experiences can decrease efficacy (Bandura, 1986). Indeed, political efficacy is important to our understandings of political behavior and engagement (Campbell et al., 19854; Westholm & Niemi, 1986). As Pinkleton et al. (1998) observed, "citizens are likely to participate in the political process to the extent that they feel their participation can make a difference" (p. 35). Young citizens in particular have been caught in a cycle where cynicism lowers their perceived efficacy, which in turn increases their cynicism and disengagement further (Muglan & Wilkinson, 1997; Park, 1999; Pinkleton et al., 1998; White et al., 2000).

Cappella and Jamieson (1997) describe the cynic as "tend[ing] to hold that the political system is corrupt; its players are Machiavellian partisans uninterested in the public good, [and] its process driven by a concern with winning, not governing" (p. 19). The underlying root of cynicism is lack of trust (Stroud, 2011). Money and corruption within political systems has created a climate of cynicism in the youth in particular (Strama, 1998). As young citizens lose faith and confidence in the political system, detrimental consequences to democracy such as

declining interest and participation occur (Belanger & Nadeau, 2005; Patterson, 2002; Strama, 1998; Stroud, 2011). Research suggests that cynicism at a young age has more negative consequences such as lack of participation or typically complete withdrawal than cynicism in older individuals (Belanger & Nadeau, 2005; Patterson, 2002; Strama, 1998; Stroud, 2011). Negative perceptions of the government clouded by perceptions of political scandals and crime greatly contribute to citizen's distrust in their government (Chanley et al., 2000). Pattyn et al. (2012) concluded that political cynics feel estranged from the political system and that they are powerless to elicit change, and this political cynicism may be quite resistant to change.

Some studies have found that the youth are more cynical than older American populations (Pinkleton, Austin, & Fortman, 1998), while others report that age cohorts are similarly cynical about the government overall (Zukin et al., 2006). Research has confirmed that trust and confidence in the government has been on the decline for several decades (Moy & Pfau, 2000; Prior, 2007; Putnam, 1996). These declines, which predict political cynicism are particularly relevant to political study and evaluations of democracy. Political cynicism can have a damaging effect with civic engagement and voting behavior and has been found to correlate negatively with voting efficacy (de Vreese, 2005; Hoffman & Young, 2011; Yoon, Pinkleton & Austin, 2001; Pinkleton & Ko, 2005).

This study explores the political cynicism of MMIAPEZ women's perspectives by understanding how they discursively construct their trust in their government and political efficacy. While many factors may influence political knowledge, interest, and engagement, political ambition is a more complex predictor of political involvement.

Political ambition. Recruiting politically ambitious women to run for office is important to the overall representation of women (Carroll, 1994). A gender gap in political ambition was

documented in Lawless and Fox's (2010) research on eligible candidates which revealed a sixteen point percentage gap in 2001, and in 2008 the gap had slightly shrunk to fourteen points. While research in the field has heavily focused on stereotypes and gender biases that exist in the electorate, investigating, and understanding the role gender plays in the decision to run for office is a prerequisite to achieving gender parity in political office. Prior to Lawless and Fox's first research study in 2001, which investigated motivations for potential candidates to run or not run for political office, political ambition research had largely ignored the issue of gender (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Research investigating the gender element of political ambition was typically focused on candidates that were already in office, and took place in the 1970s and 1980s when female candidates were much scarcer and less accepted than today (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Identifying the reasons men and women chose to run or not are difficult because as Palmer and Simon (2008) note, it is difficult to identify the people who considered running but decided not to run, and much easier to identify people that declared and actually ran for office. Lawless and Fox's (2010) study examined "the factors that lead people to make the move from politically minded citizens to candidates for public office" (p. 4) and discovered that gender played a crucial role in the candidate emergence process. Women are less likely than men: to consider running for office, to run for office, and to express interest in running for office in the future (Lawless & Fox, 2010).

The decision to run for political office is a different and complicated process for men and women. Highly credentialed women's stories such as Condoleezza Rice and Elizabeth Roberts, demonstrate that women may be more hesitant than men to jump into particular candidacies (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Even though men and women may have similar levels of political participation and interests, women are less politically ambitious than their male counter-parts

(Lawless & Fox, 2010). When a woman considers running for political office, she considers her qualifications, impact on her family, and her chances of winning, whereas a man only considers whether or not he wants to run (Bledsoe & Herring, 1990; Palmer & Simon, 2008; Sapiro, 1983).

Lawless and Fox (2010) articulate a two-stage process of political ambition. The first stage involves considering a candidacy where the idea permeates within the candidate and the second stage is deciding to enter the first race (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Examining the role of gender in the two-stage process of ambition demonstrated how the progression can be different for men and women, thus challenging the assumption that men and women are equally likely to run for office (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Men were significantly more likely than women to state the idea of running for office "crossed their mind," which illustrates a gender gap in stage one of considering a candidacy (Lawless & Fox, 2010, p. 53; Palmer & Simon, 2008).

The model of political ambition developed by Lawless and Fox (2010) tests the levels of education, political interest, political knowledge, and participation to find as the levels of these variables increase, so does the inclination to run for office, but yet women are less likely than men to consider running. These forms of political participation do not yield differences based on gender, yet women are more likely to report they never thought about running for office (Palmer & Simon, 2008). Thus, it is clear that the gender gap still exists when examining stage two of deciding to enter a political race with men more likely to run, but with gender operating in a more subtle way (Lawless & Fox, 2010).

Related to the issues surrounding women's political ambition, gender differences also exist as candidates' examine their qualifications and viability. Women are more likely to dismiss their qualifications and doubt they are capable of running for political office, whereas men are more likely than women to express confidence in skills they do not possess, and over-confidence

in skills they do possess (Kling et al., 1999; Lawless & Fox, 2010; Wigfield, Eccles, & Pintrich, 1996). Men are also more likely to overestimate their intelligence, while women tend underestimate theirs (Kling et al., 1999; Lawless & Fox, 2010; Wigfield, Eccles, & Pintrich, 1996). Ambition for men is a virtue and norm, whereas for women it can bring a host of issues and barriers (Wilson, 2004). Professional ambition for men is expected, whereas for women it can be viewed negatively as aggressiveness is a trait that violates acceptable norms for female behavior (Sandberg, 2013). Women's tendency to underestimate their experiences and skills in everyday experiences transcends into the political arena as a barrier to potential candidacy (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Men are also more likely than women to seek out and enter competitive environments such as politics (Lawless & Fox; 2010; Niederle & Vesterlund, 2007). Potential candidates have often cited that they would rather service the public in other capacities rather than political office, and lacked confidence in their abilities (Carroll, 1994).

Men are more likely than women to report receiving encouragement to run for political office from party leaders, current politicians, and activists regardless of party affiliation of the potential candidate (Lawless & Fox, 2010; Sanbonmatsu, 2014). Encouragement towards women to run for political office plays an important role in women actually running for office (Sanbonmatsu, 2014).

Ambition is a simple explanation for why women do not run for political office, but is important to consider and worthy of study. As Schlesigner (1966) explains, "a political system unable to kindle ambitions for office is as much in danger of breaking down as one unable to restrain ambitions" (p.2). Kindling political ambitions for women is a vital part of encouraging more women to run for office. This study explores how MMIAPEZ women discursively

construct their political ambitions. Ambition highlights an important facet of political involvement to be the role and societal expectations of gender.

Gender socialization. In addition to the variety of factors examined above, particularly political ambition, women's political exclusion and inclusion can also be attributed to assumptions about capabilities or beliefs about a woman's proper place in society (Paxton & Hughes, 2013; Paxton & Kunovich, 2003). Societal structures and opinions greatly influence and determine a woman's ability or inability to run for political office (Burn, 2010; Paxton & Hughes, 2013). Cultural expectations have formed a dominant image of women as wives/mothers which makes the transition from the private sphere to the public sphere difficult as it does not align with gender conformity and expectations (Burn, 2010).

Lawless and Fox (2010) argue that "deeply embedded patterns of traditional gender socialization pervade U.S. society and continue to make politics a much less likely path for women than men" (p. 175). Even though cultural expectations have shifted over time, the socialization of gender in American society, as well as the expectations for gender roles within the family, present obstacles and challenges for women running for political office.

The gendered nature of politics sets the stage so that involvement in politics is a natural and reasonable career path for men, but as Lawless and Fox (2010) find, "does not even appear on the radar screen for many women" (p. 12). Socialization of women does not tend to be as strongly oriented towards achievement outside of the home, whereas socialization for men almost exclusively focuses on achievements outside the home (Carroll, 1994). Women are socialized to believe that politics is a "nasty business," as well as "men's business" and not a proper place for women (Rinehart, 1992, p. 128). In *Lean In*, Sandberg (2013) explains that in addition to external societal barriers, women are also hindered by internal barriers. These

internal barriers that women grapple with are as Sandberg (2013) points out, rarely discussed and explored, but they are obstacles that women can more easily control within themselves than the external barriers. Fear and self-doubt are the origins of many of the barriers that women face as they navigate society and careers (Sandberg, 2013). Women are more likely to "pull back" by doubting themselves and underestimating themselves "when we should be leaning in" (Sandberg, 2013, p. 8).

In addition to socializing behaviors of women, scholars often argue there are not enough women in the political pipeline. The pipeline explanation is one that is most often used to describe the process that when more women are positioned in careers that lead to political candidacies that more women will then acquire the qualifications and experience to pursue political positions (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Occupations such as business, law, and education provide a path to political office, and having more women in these occupations fuels the pipeline (Lee & Shaw, 2010). Clark (1994) explains that "women are not found in the professions from which politicians inordinately are chosen – the law and other broker-type businesses. Therefore, they do not achieve the higher socioeconomic status that forms the eligibility pool for elective office" (p. 106). This is slowly changing over time with more women entering business and law careers, but they do not elevate to leadership positions in those careers as often as men (Lawless & Fox, 2010). Men are more likely to be in the political and leadership pipelines in larger numbers than women (Sandberg, 2013). One explanation for the lack of women in the leadership pipeline is that career progression requires taking risks and self-advocating, which are traits that women are arguably discouraged from displaying (Sandberg, 2013). Scholars defend that the lack of women in the political pipeline is a serious issue to getting women elected to

higher offices and that attention should be given to putting more women in the pipeline (Lawless & Fox, 2010; Rhode, 2003; Wilson, 2004).

The participants of this study are women from MMIAPEZ. The U.S. State Department has deemed their homes as "at risk" places for women's and children's issues which provides a unique opportunity to explore the role of gender socialization on young women's political participation and interest. The "at risk" designation indicates that women's and children's issues are not a primary concern and that gender discrimination is present. MMIAPEZ offers a unique opportunity to examine how gender socialization may be discursively constructed by young MMIAPEZ women.

Research Questions

In light of this research, this project seeks to understand the political behavior and perceptions of MMIAPEZ women toward issues surrounding women and politics. Few studies have investigated non-Western perspectives in relation to political participation, knowledge and interest, and even more specifically none exist that examine these variables among the young female cohort. Granted, Ross (1986) measured overall female participation in various countries, but this quantitatively-based research is almost thirty years old. Ross (1986) argued that two significant forms of female participation existed; involvement in decision making and participating in organizations controlled by or reserved for women. Additionally, Attar-Schwarwtz and Ben-Arieh (2011) have investigated the political knowledge of Palestinian and Jewish Youth, but this was a quantitative study of both young boys and girls and discovered significant gender gaps in political participation for young girls as well as a potential role of living in conflict zones on political engagement and approaches for youth. Bullough et al. (2011) found in their global institutional analysis that the institutional development of a country's

political freedoms was positively related to women's political leadership participation. This particular study eludes that political freedoms are related to women's political involvement, but yet does not explain why or how that relationship may exist. Therefore, an important gap in the literature exists. In order to understand how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct their political knowledge, interest, and ability to participate in politics, this study explores how gender socialization and political cynicism potentially present unique challenges and obstacles for political participation and interest.

Overall, much of the research on factors related to political socialization and involvement has been heavily focused on quantitative approaches to understanding relationships between the variables that predict political behaviors. And yet, Dermody, Hanmer-Loyd, and Scullion (2010) conclude that "the relationships between trust, cynicism and efficacy and their effects on voting behavior are complex" (p. 431); therefore the ways in which research approaches the study of these variables must be varied in order to address their dynamic and complex nature as well. Rather than study the quantitative relationships between trust, cynicism, and efficacy, this research project explores perspectives and perceptions from young women in MMIAPEZ through qualitative inquiry. Specifically, this study explores how young women from MMIAPEZ perceive politics and political participation in their countries. This study also seeks to understand if MMIAPEZ women share the same cynicism, lack of interest and knowledge of American women.

Additionally, gender socialization is an important and valuable area to investigate in MMIAPEZ. These perspectives can shed light on the social structures of MMIAPEZ and how the women perceive cultural expectations and limitations in relation to political behavior.

This research project seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How do young women from MMIAPEZ discursively frame the barriers that exist for political participation in their country?

RQ2: How do women from MMIAPEZ discursively construct their ability to participate in politics?

RQ3: How do women from MMIAPEZ discursively construct their perceptions of political participation and interest after involvement in an intensive leadership institute?

Chapter 3: Method

The goal of this research project is threefold: a) to understand what obstacles and challenges MMIAPEZ women perceive to exist for their participation in politics b) to understand how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct their ability to participate in politics, and c) to understand how these women discursively construct their experiences at an intensive leadership institute. This chapter outlines the specific methods of data collection that I used for this research project. Specifically, I explain the rationale behind the case study methodology, techniques and procedures used collect data, and analysis used to reveal findings that foster a better understanding of the perspectives of MMIAPEZ women.

Qualitative Research

While most American research on gender components of political knowledge, interest and participation focus on quantitative data analysis, I am most interested in understanding and exploring MMIAPEZ women's perspectives from their personal experiences and descriptions. Qualitative research seeks to better understand "the complex interrelationships among all that exists" as opposed to quantitative research that seeks for "explanation and control" (Stake, 1995, p. 37). This deeper understanding "attempts to understand the world from the subjects' points of view, to unfold the meaning of their experiences, to uncover their lived world" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Attempts to understand particular behaviors and motivations can be explored through qualitative practices (Silverman, 2000). A qualitative approach for this study best provides the opportunity to explore and understand the various discursive strategies of political participation for MMIAPEZ women.

Case study research "focuses attention on one or a few instances of some social phenomenon" (Babbie, 2004, p. 293). Stake (1995) explains that instrumental case studies can

be used as "a need for general understanding, and feel that we may get insight into the question by studying a particular case" (p.3). In instrumental case study research, focusing on the issues is of the highest importance rather than intrinsic case study that places emphasis on the case over the issues (Stake, 1995). This research project utilizes case study research by focusing on the Kansas Women's Leadership Institute (KWLI) participants as the research site over a three-year period. While the leadership institute is an important element of the participants' experiences, this project seeks to understand their unique perspectives on political participation and engagement in their home countries. This study utilized interviews as the primary method of data collection and also conducted follow-up surveys at the end of the institute.

Interviews can provide witness information that is valuable to understanding experiences, gathering information about things and processes while also inquiring about the past (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). It is sometimes easier to access information through interviews when the researcher cannot observe participants and situations for long periods of time (Berger, 2000; Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). By talking to individuals, researchers seek to "know how they describe their experiences or articulate their reasons for action" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Interviews provide the opportunity to investigate "people's ideas, their thoughts, their opinions, their attitudes, and what motivates them by talking to them" (Berger, 2000, p. 113). In addition to a deeper understanding from the respondent, interviewers not only seek answers to their research questions, but also represent the worldview of the respondents through analysis and description of the findings (Hesse-Biber & Leavey, 2006).

One of the unique attributes about qualitative research and interviews in particular is that there is no one right way to do it (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). This flexibility is argued by

Silverman (2000) to allow for innovation by researchers without a fixed structure to fully investigate and explore their research questions.

To develop a deeper understanding and explore MMIAPEZ women's perspectives on politics and political participation, interviews are an effective method to gather first-hand information and detailed explanations. Because English is not the native language of the women in this study, interviews allow the flexibility for the researcher to reword or explain questions that a survey would not allow for to account for a potential language barrier.

Context for Instrumental Case

Stake (1995) explains that the first selection criterion for a research case study is to "maximize what we can learn. Given our purposes, which cases are likely to lead us to understandings, assertions, perhaps even to modifying of generalizations?" (p. 4). The Kansas Women's Leadership Institute (KWLI), provides a unique opportunity to understand young women's perceptions of their political interest and participation. A researcher attempting to gather data from non-Western perspectives could be an extremely daunting task due to travel, financial expense, time constraints, and language barriers; however, the geographic location of the leadership institute provides an exclusive opportunity to explore young women's political perspectives from a number of different international countries. Additionally, this instrumental case study provides an opportunity understand how young women from MMIAPEZ countries whom are ambitious in leadership opportunities discursively construct their political participation, ability, and interest after an intensive leadership institute.

Participants were recruited for the KWLI from the U.S. State Department sponsored leadership institute, where selection is handled directly by the U.S. embassies through a combination of writing samples, letters of recommendation, and multiple rounds of interviews.

The State Department requires all leadership institute participants to be proficient in English, as well as the institutes to be conducted in English. The self-selection aspect of women applying for a leadership institute is an important element of this study as the act of applying for a leadership institute in the United States indicates a desire to learn and/or develop one's leadership abilities. The interplay between participant's views of leadership and politics is an important component of this study. Women participating in the Kansas Women's Leadership Institute (KWLI) are from MMIAPEZ and generally face societal and cultural restrictions that provide a unique opportunity for understanding how potential barriers may or may not influence the political interest and participation of young women.

The KWLI is a six-week academically intensive program focused on leadership development through an experiential learning pedagogy. The six-week program includes a conference in Washington, D.C., a trip to St. Louis and Chicago, and four weeks of residence at the University of Kansas. The leadership institute provides a combination of cultural and classroom events for the participants (See Appendix A). While at the University of Kansas, the primary focus of the daily routine is curriculum and work on their Leadership for Change Project (LCP). The participants select their own LCP based on their interest and issues in their countries and the culmination of their work is presented in their final presentations at the conclusion of the institute.

The KWLI curriculum teaches and focuses on a particular type of leadership style – adaptive leadership. Heifetz, Grashow and Linsky (2009) define adaptive leadership as the "process of mobilizing people to tackle tough challenges and thrive" (p. 14). A core aspect that distinguishes adaptive leadership from traditional concepts of leadership is the distinction between leadership and authority (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz, 1994).

Traditional concepts of leadership view authority as power for change, but in adaptive leadership authority is not a prerequisite for engaging in the process of leadership (Parks, 2005). By not relying on authority, one has the power to frame issues and pace the work through activity and interventions (Heifetz, 1994; O'Malley, 2009). Adaptive leadership focuses on distinguishing between technical and adaptive challenges. Technical problems have known and prescribed solutions that when applied to an adaptive challenge only provide short-term fixes to the underlying problem. Adaptive challenges are ones where the situation requires a change in priorities, habits, beliefs or loyalties (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). Piansi (2013) identifies a huge error of treating adaptive challenges as technical problems which does little to fix the underlying issues. Engaging in adaptive leadership requires the ability to embrace disequilibrium as part of the process of leadership (Heifetz, 1994). While uncomfortable for many, experiencing disequilibrium is a necessary component for change (Heifetz, 1994). Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky (2009) outline adaptive leadership as a three-step process to tackle adaptive challenges: observation, interpretation, and intervention.

The lack of dependence on authority is an empowering feature of adaptive leadership that is beneficial for participants of the KWLI. The KWLI women do not have as many freedoms when compared to those American women typically enjoy (e.g. some of the women are unable to walk in public without a male family member escort, some are not allowed to drive, some are not allowed to engage with male students and colleagues), but through engaging in adaptive leadership they can ideally make progress on their adaptive challenges in their countries without reliance on authority which would be difficult for them to obtain give social situations in their home countries. Adaptive leadership allows progress to be made in situations where deeply held values and beliefs are the challenge (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). When mindsets are the core of the

challenge, it is important to recognize it cannot be treated as a technical problem, rather engaging in adaptive leadership provides a process that addresses the foundational issues of the situation. For many of the KWLI women, societal and cultural beliefs are the core of many adaptive challenges. Additionally, this type of leadership style encourages unusual voices to participate in the process which allows more voices, such as the KWLI women to be included in the process of adaptive challenges in their home countries (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009).

Participants

Research participants were all students of the Kansas Women's Leadership Institute (KWLI). This study is a longitudinal case study within three separate institutes that took place during the summers of 2013-2015. This case study was longitudinal within the specific year's institute as the interviews were conducted at the beginning of the institute and a follow-up survey was conducted at the conclusion of the institute. Recruitment was based on a snowball, convenience sample as I focused solely on participants enrolled and participating at the KWLI each particular year of study. Each year at the institute I introduced myself to the women at the end of a class session and explained that I was conducting a research project and would like to interview them about their interest and perceptions of politics. Out of the fifty-nine institute attendees, fifty-eight volunteered and participated in the interviews. All fifty-eight participants were women; with an age range from 18-25. This study specifically focuses on young women's political involved as research has demonstrated that political interest and knowledge influence's a young person's likelihood of political participation and influences the individual's attitudes and ability to participate in politics (Bartels, 1996; Delli Carpini and Keeter, 1996, 2000; Jennings, 1992; Ondercin & White, 2011, Sanbonmatsu, 2003)Role model theory contends that the presence of females in politics is key to increasing young women's political engagement

(Atkeson, 2003; Wolbrecht & Campbell, 2007; Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006; Hansen, 1997; Sapiro & Conover, 1997).   Understanding these young women's political interest and knowledge, as well as ability to participate in politics has direct implications for their potential future participation in politics.

MMIAPEZ participants represented seven countries: Afghanistan (n=10), Egypt (n=3), India (n=11), Pakistan (n=9), Morocco (n=14), Mongolia (n=7), and Zambia (n=4). All participants were current college students in their home countries with a variety of majors. Participants represented the following majors: economics and business (n=22), engineering (n=9), English (n=4), English literature (n=5), law (n=2), medicine (n=7), political science (n=2), psychology (n=3), and sociology/social work (n=4). To preserve the identities of the participants, names were removed and each participant was assigned a number (see Appendix B).

At the time of participation, all of the participants werecurrent college students, which is a requirement of the U.S. State Department for these leadership programs. This acknowledges they have access to education that many women in their countries are not afforded. They are chosen by the U.S. Embassy in their home country which also acknowledges a level of privilege as being selected out of a pool of applicants.

Research Context: Nationality and Female Representation

The following section will give a broad contextualization for MMPIAPZ for female political participation. As Paxton and Hughes (2013) argue, "though it is important to understand the big picture, one must also recognize that there is substantial regional variation in both the nature of the obstacles faced by women and the avenues open to women to pursue political inclusion" (p. 217). The participants are quick to point out in the interviews that the

situation depends on what areas you are in within their country as regional differences are vast and extremely influential on the culture and society. The regional and cultural differences of the MMIAPEZ "are diverse, and one should resist overgeneralizing about the region and its women" (Paxton & Hughes, 2013). This section will provide a broad overview for each country in MMIAPEZ that includes female political participation and the Gender Gap Index rankings.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union collects data each year from 190 countries and ranks the countries by "descending order of the percentage of women in the lower or single house" (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2015). This allows for a more comparative approach since several countries do not have female representation in the upper house of government, so data based on lower levels of female participation allows for a more comparable assessment across countries. For comparative purposes, the data for each participating country in this study is based on the December 2015 report. In the 2015 rankings, the United States was ranked 75th with 19.3% of women in the lower house and 20% in the upper house (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2015). Some countries have established quotas for female participation in their political systems, and this information was gathered from a global database. The Quota Project is an online global database that provides information on the quotas that exist and is an updated tool that is based on verified information through the collaborative efforts of International IDEA, Inter-Parliamentary Union, and Stockholm University (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015).

Women in the workforce percentages provide a comparative and contextual data to understand how many women are working outside the home in a particular country. While these numbers are from 2005, they still provide a framework for understanding the cultural context for women working outside of the homes in particular countries (Seager, 2009). The Gender Gap Index (GGI) developed by the World Economic Forum is a measure of the comparative equality

of men and women regarding access to resources (Seager, 2009). The Global Gender Gap Index is defined by three basic concepts: "First, it focuses on measuring gaps rather than levels. Second, it captures gaps in outcome variables rather than gaps in input variables. Third, it ranks countries according to gender equality rather than women's empowerment" (World Economic Forum, 2014). Additionally the report from the World Economic Forum (2014) reports each country's response to the survey question "In your country, to what extent do businesses provide women the same opportunities as men to rise to positions of leadership? (1 = not at all, 7 = extensive – women have equal opportunities)." The middle of the spectrum for women's empowerment ranking with this particular scale is a score of 4. Anything below a 4 would be considered low rankings and scores above a 4 would indicate a higher opportunity for women to rise to leadership positions.

Women in the MMIAPEZ are in countries that continue to "struggle for the most basic social and political rights" (Paxton & Hughes, 2013). Of the seven countries in MMIAPEZ, only Mongolia and Zambia are countries where restrictions on women in areas of travel, dress and other social restrictions do not generally exist (Seager, 2009). In Morocco, India, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Egypt, state laws or cultural norms may restrict a woman's dress, mobility and societal functions (Seager, 2009). A cultural preference for sons over daughters is present in the Egypt, India, Pakistan, and Morocco, which has been viewed and linked to a lower economic value through systems of marriage, dowry and inheritance practices (Seager, 2009). Additionally, four of the MMIAPEZ countries (India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt) are considered to be in crisis zones with wars, ethnic conflicts, economic collapses, and general violence (Seager, 2009). Even though Islam is the dominant religion of the MMIAPEZ, it is important to recognize that it is not a "singular cultural force" and many complexities, as well as

regional differences are involved (Paxton & Hughes, 2013). MMIAPEZ countries are deemed

by the U.S. State Department to be at-risk countries on women's issues, which is a considerable

element in the selection of countries for participation in the U.S. State Department women's

leadership institutes. Instead of trying to identify social and gender barriers for each country

individually or homogenizing women's issues and barriers, this study will allow the participants'

interviews to provide first-hand accounts of barriers and issues they face in their countries

regarding political participation and involvement. The following information based on data

collection allows for a comparative and contextual framework for understanding female political

involvement in MMIAPEZ (Table 1).

Table 1 Nationality and Female Participation Data

Country	IPU World Ranking of Women in Politics	Percentage of Women Working	Gender Gap Index (GGI)	Ability to Rise to Leadership Score
Mongolia	95th	50-60%	42nd	5.5
Morocco	85th	Under 30%	133rd	4.5
India	109th	30-39%	114th	3.9
Afghanistan	42nd	--	--	--
Pakistan	68th	30-39%	141	3.5
Egypt	136th	Under 30%	129th	4.5
Zambia	105th	Over 60%	119th	5.3

Mongolia. Mongolia is ranked 95th by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (2015) based on

their percentage of female participation in politics with 14.9% of women in the lower house.

Mongolia has seventy-six members of parliament and in 2012 instituted a national quota that

requires political parties to present at least 20% women on their unified party lists (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). Mongolia also has a local quota for council elections that requires political parties to present a list that contains at least 30% of female candidates (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). Women in Mongolia gained the right to vote in 1924 (World Economic Forum, 2014).

The women in the workforce data shows that Mongolia is one of the highest percentages in the MMIAPEZ with 50-60% of women working (Seager, 2009). In the *2014 Global Gender Gap Report*, Mongolia was ranked 42nd out of 142 countries, which is the highest ranking for MMIAPEZ countries (World Economic Forum, 2014). Mongolia's average score on the question of women's ability to rise in leadership positions was a 5.5 demonstrating a leaning towards equality in opportunities for leadership positions (World Economic Forum, 2014).

Morocco. Morocco is ranked 85th by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (2015) based on their percentage of female participation in politics with 17.2% of women in the lower house and they also have 2.2% of women in the upper house. Morocco has a quota system for the national lower house and local levels of government, but not for the upper house of government. A national quota was first introduced in 2002 and then was updated with an increased number of female seats in 2011 (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). In Morocco, 305 of the 395 seats are elected through a representational quota with sixty seats being reserved for women and thirty seats are reserved for young men under the age of forty (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). At the local level, one-third of the seats at regional council elected positions are reserved for women (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). Women in Morocco gained the right to vote in 1959 (World Economic Forum, 2014).

The women in the workforce data shows that Morocco is on the lower end of the MMIAPEZ with under 30% of women working (Seager, 2009). In the *2014 Global Gender Gap Report*, Morocco was ranked 133rd out of 142 countries (World Economic Forum, 2014). Morocco's average score on the question of women's ability to rise in leadership positions was a 4.5 which is slightly above the middle of the spectrum score demonstrating a slight leaning towards some equality in opportunities for leadership positions (World Economic Forum, 2014).

India. India is ranked 109th by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (2015) based on their percentage of female participation in politics with 11.4% of women in the lower house and 12.8% of women in the upper house. India does not have a quota for the national level of government, but does have a local level quota in their constitution. The constitution requires that 33% of elected seats at the local/village level be reserved for women (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). While 33% is the country required minimum, some states in India have higher quotas up to 50% for female representation (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). Women in India gained the right to vote in 1950 (World Economic Forum, 2014).

The women in the workforce data shows that India has about 30-39% of women working (Seager, 2009). In the *2014 Global Gender Gap Report*, India was ranked 114th out of 142 countries (World Economic Forum, 2014). India's average score on the question of women's ability to rise in leadership positions was a 3.9 which is slightly above the middle of the spectrum score demonstrating a slight leaning towards some equality in opportunities for leadership positions (World Economic Forum, 2014).

Afghanistan. Afghanistan is ranked 42nd by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (2015) based on their percentage of female participation in politics with 27.7% of women in the lower house and 27.5% of women in the upper house. Afghanistan has quotas in their 2004 constitution at

the upper national, lower national, and local levels. In the upper house, two-thirds of members are indirectly elected and one-third is appointed by the President, with 50% of the President-appointed members required to be women (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). The lower level quota requires that 68 of the 249 seats are reserved with women, and the local level quota requires that 20% of council positions are reserved for women with the most votes (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015).

The women in the workforce data did not have data for Afghanistan to show the percentage of women working (Seager, 2009). The *2014 Global Gender Gap Report* did not include Afghanistan.

Pakistan. Pakistan is ranked 68th by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (2015) based on their percentage of female participation in politics with 20.7% of women in the lower house and 16.3% of women in the upper house. Pakistan has quotas in place for both the lower and upper levels of national government in their constitution. In the lower level, 60 of the 242 seats are reserved for women, and in the upper level of government out of the 104 senate seats, 17 are reserved for women (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015).   At the local level, the presence and percentage level of quotas varies according to the provinces (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). Women gained the right to vote in Pakistan in 1956 (World Economic Forum, 2014).

The women in the workforce data shows that Pakistan has about 30-39% of women working (Seager, 2009). In the *2014 Global Gender Gap Report*, Pakistan was ranked 141 out of 142 countries (World Economic Forum, 2014). Pakistan's average score on the question of women's ability to rise in leadership positions was a 3.5 which falls in the middle of the

spectrum score which does not favor a strong stance on equality or inequality in opportunities for leadership positions (World Economic Forum, 2014).

Egypt. Egypt was not included in the 2013-2015 rankings by the Inter-Parliamentary Union. In the 2012 rankings by the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Egypt was ranked 136th with 2% of women in the lower house and 2.8% of women in the upper house (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2012). In 2014, Egypt adopted a new constitution that changed previous quotas for the national level positions, but required a quarter of seats in local council positions to be reserved for women (Global Database of Quotas for Women, 2015). Women gained the right to vote in Egypt in 1956 (World Economic Forum, 2014).

The women in the workforce data shows that Egypt is on the lower end of the MMIAPEZ with less than 30% of women working (Seager, 2009). In the *2014 Global Gender Gap Report*, Egypt was ranked 129th out of 142 countries (World Economic Forum, 2014). Egypt's average score on the question of women's ability to rise in leadership positions was a 4.5 which is slightly above the middle of the spectrum score demonstrating a slight leaning towards some equality in opportunities for leadership positions (World Economic Forum, 2014).

Zambia. Zambia is ranked 105th by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (2015) based on their percentage of female participation in politics with 10.8% of women in the lower house. Zambia does not have a quota system for female representation in politics. Women gained the right to vote in 1962 in Zambia (World Economic Forum, 2014).

The women in the workforce data shows that Zambia is the highest ranking in the MMIAPEZ with over 60% of women working (Seager, 2009). In the *2014 Global Gender Gap Report*, Zambia was ranked 119th out of 142 countries (World Economic Forum, 2014). Zambia's average score on the question of women's ability to rise in leadership positions was a

5.3, which is a relatively high score demonstrating a leaning towards equality in leadership

positions (World Economic Forum, 2014).

While not exhaustive, this information based on data collection allows for a comparative

and contextual framework for understanding female political involvement in MMIAPEZ. It is

important to acknowledge that the participants in this study are not wholly representative of their

respective countries. The purpose of this study is to allow the participants narratives to

personally speak for their experiences and perspectives on political participation. The

participants' narratives speak to variety of barriers and experiences within their countries, which

will allow for a deeper and personal understanding of their societies and cultures.

Data Collection Procedures

Interviews. Interviews were the primary method of data collection for this study as they

provide the opportunity to record the discursive constructions of political participation of

MMIAPEZ women. Additionally, interviews were determined to be the best method of data

collections due to participants not being primary English speakers, which allowed the researcher

to clarify and explain questions when needed. Semi-structured interviews were conducted based

on a predetermined interview protocol that included predominately open-ended questions (Baxter

& Babbie, 2004). By utilizing semi-structured interviews, I was able to paraphrase or reword

questions for participants as well as probe areas of relevancy and deviate from the interview

protocol as they emerged in the data collection process (Baxter & Babbie, 2004). Interviews

were conducted in English because the leadership institute is also conducted in English. Since

English is not the native language of the participants, the flexibility of semi-structured interviews

worked best for this context and purpose. Semi-structured interviews allow a researcher to

maintain the "casual quality found in unstructured interviews" while still relying upon a list of

questions (Berger, 2000, p. 112). Although interviews are comparable to survey questionnaires, the flexibility of interviews can provide deeper understanding and retrieval of more detailed descriptions (Babbie, 2004).

Building and establishing rapport with the participants is an important component of the interview process (Baxter & Babbie, 2004; Geertz, 1973; Jorgenson, 1995). To build initial rapport I was involved in the KWLI each year through various events and experiences. Although my level of involvement with the institute varied each year-in 2013 and 2014 I was in the classroom daily as part of the support staff; in year 2014 and 2015 I delivered a workshop on public speaking - I was visible to participants, part of the support staff for the program, therefore not simply a researcher who showed up to collect data and then leave. It is therefore assumed that establishing a level of trust and familiarity with the participants through my role as support staff allowed them to feel more comfortable with me, and which ideally allowed them to feel more open to sharing information in the interviews. Additionally, Jorgenson (1995) recommends that one way to establish a relational understanding and to diffuse the rigid roles of interviewer and informant is to let the participant decide on the time and setting of the interview. I made myself available throughout the beginning of the institute and allowed participants to determine when the best time was for them to conduct the interview. In certain instances the times varied, for example some participants were on their way to lunch and wanted to meet with me over lunch, so I joined them. Some participants wanted to be in more open settings such as lobbies or hallways whereas other participants asked to go to more secluded areas as they felt more comfortable in a private setting while disclosing information.

I conducted individual interviews with each participant, lasting on average 18 minutes, with a few as long as 30-38 minutes, the shortest lasting 10 minutes, and specifically taking place

within the first week the participants were on campus for the institute. I obtained an ethics approval from University of Kansas Institutional Review Board (IRB) in June of 2013 for the first round of interviews. In 2014 and 2015, I applied for and was granted a continuing review to conduct additional rounds of interviews at the institutes in 2014 and 2015. Prior to the beginning of the interview, the participants were given an informed consent form that explained the purpose and procedures of the study, with an additional copy given to them for their personal records (see Appendix I). Participants were told they could terminate the interview or choose to decline to answer questions at any point during the interview without any consequences. In essence, interview participation was completely voluntary.

I followed an identical interview schedule for each participant within each year of study (see Appendixes C-E). Interview protocols changed slightly from one year to the next over the three years of the study with the majority of the questions remaining consistent over the three years. The 2013 interview protocol was the longest protocol in terms of the number of questions. Following the first round of data-collection, protocol was re-evaluated prior to the 2014 institute to eliminate and rephrase questions that had been confusing to participants in the first round of data collection. In 2013, the interview protocol included several introductory questions that focused on establishing their perceptions of the role of gender in their country. Additionally, the first part of the interview asked participants about the influence of politics on the career they plan to have, as well as asking if they plan to have a career after/if they married. These specific set of questions were removed from the future interview protocols for 2014 and 2015 as they were repetitive and therefore confusing because this information was best captured in other questions during the interview. In 2015, a reexamination of the literature on role model theory warranted the inclusion of two questions to investigate closer perceptions of female representation in

politics. The two questions are as follows: "If there are more women in the government – do you think it is more responsive to women's issues" and "Do you know any women that hold political office in your country?" These questions sought to understand the perceptions of the women on visibility of female representation in their country.

Across all three data collection periods, participants were asked questions that engaged discussions of gender and political participation, knowledge, and interest within their countries. In order to investigate participants' political participation, a series of questions first asked about participants' level of interest in politics (eg. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being no interest at all and 10 being extremely interested, how would your rank your level of interest in politics in your country and why?; What do you find to be interesting and not interesting about politics?). Also within this section on participation, a set of questions investigated participants' political knowledge, specifically asking how they "gain and seek knowledge on politics" as well as asking who they talk to in their family about politics (eg. How do you personally gain and seek knowledge on politics?; Do you think there are barriers to becoming knowledgeable about politics in your country?). The final portion of this section investigated political participation, asking participants to define political participation and to rank their level of involvement in politics in their country.

The middle portion of the interview asked participants about their perceptions on gender and perceived equality within their country, as well as within the American political system (e.g. Do you think there are barriers to political participation in your country for women?; If so, what are the barriers?; What is your perception of women in the American political system?). Participants were also asked to make comparisons and contrasts to female participation in the United States and their country (e.g. What do you think are the main differences and similarities

for women in the United States and your country in their political systems?). The final portion of the interview asked participants to rank their level of cynicism and efficacy, as well as their perceived ability to run for office or participate actively in their country's political system based on statements (e.g. I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics; I think political officials care about what people like me think.; The average person can influence the political system.).

In addition to collecting data via interviews the first week the participants were on campus, follow-up surveys were conducted at the end of the institute. In 2013, the follow-up survey was emailed to the participants a few weeks after the participants returned home from the institute and they were asked to email their responses. The follow up survey asked open ended questions to gauge the influence and perceptions of the institute on their perceptions of politics and involvement (see Appendix F). The follow up responses were copied into a single word document to remove personal identifiers, but were labeled with the corresponding participant number from their first interview. In 2014 and 2015 the follow-up surveys were conducted in person at the institute on a paper survey that was handed to the participants at the same time on the last class day of the institute. The follow-up surveys conducted in 2014 and 2015 were identical and contained the same five open-ended questions asked in the 2013 survey and added seven additional questions (see Appendixes G-H). The seven added questions were identical questions from final portion of the initial interview exploring their perceptions of politics and their ability to participate in politics after their participation in the leadership institute.

In total I conducted fifty-eight interviews totaling approximately 18 hours of audio-recorded conversations. The duration of the interviews lasted from 10-38 minutes, with an average length of 18.2 minutes.

Data management. All fifty-eight interviews were digitally recorded to preserve the interviews and secure the accuracy of information provided (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Before the interview started, I informed participants that I was going to be recording our conversation and they could opt out of recording whenever they wanted or felt uncomfortable. Interviews were stored on my personal password-protected computer as audio-files and transcribed personally by myself. Each interview was transcribed into a single-spaced Microsoft® Word document. After transcription I listened to each interview and reconciled the transcript against the original audio file.

The purpose of my research project did not rely upon a detailed transcript that identified vocalized pauses, distractions, and other mannerisms. My primary focus is on the content of the participant's answers rather than the other verbal and non-verbal components. In total, transcription resulted in 234 four pages of single-spaced text.

Data analysis. As Berger (2000) points out, there is no absolute rule or protocol for how coding is done. Coding is a "cyclical act" that requires several cycles of coding to refine categories and themes (Saldaña, 2013). The first round of coding conducted was open coding, which is defined by Strauss and Corbin (1990) as "the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorizing data" (p. 61). This "initial unrestricted coding of data" generated a list of codes that were used to begin the process (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 28). Codes were data driven as I generated them through the reading of the transcripts added as needed throughout the coding process (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). For example, "corruption," "optimism," "role of politics," and "dismissing women's rights." Saldaña (2013) articulates that there is not an ideal, magic number of codes, categories, and themes a researcher should

generate, rather it will vary on many contextual factors such as the data and the coding process. In total, my analysis generated 58 codes.

After establishing broad categories with open coding, I began a second cycle of coding utilizing axial coding (Baxter & Babbie, 2004; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002; Saldaña 2013). During axial coding I refined the codes and put in perspective with other codes into categories (Saldaña, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In axial coding, the main purpose is to integrate codes into categories to investigate the interconnections between causes, contexts, conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences (Baxter & Babbie, 2004). For example, I merged the categories of "corruption," "cynicism," "smokescreen," and "politicians self-interest" and examined the layers of cynicism as an emerging theme. To examine the role of gender, I examined the relationships of "gender barriers" among the codes of "traditional gender roles," "gender bias," "capability," and "security" to analyze the role of gender for female political participation. As Stake (1995) argues, case study research is focused discovering patterns, and axial coding allows for refining broad categories to provide clearer and more meaningful analysis.

Saldaña (2013) argues that "themes are a good thing to emerge from analysis" and rather than coding for themes, the cyclical process of coding and categorization generates the themes (p. 14). Bernard (2011) explains that analysis is the "search for patterns in data and for ideas that help explain why those patterns are there in the first place" (p. 338). After generating codes and categories, persistent themes emerged. Themes, defined by DeSantis and Ugarriza (2000), are "an abstract entity that brings meaning and identity to a recurrent [patterned] experience and its variant manifestations. As such, a theme captures and unified the nature or basis of the experience into a meaningful whole" (p. 362).

In addition to axial coding, categorization was used to capture participant's rankings of political participation, interest, cynicism and efficacy. As Brinkman and Kvale (2015) explain, categorization allows the closer investigation of phenomenon through occurrences or nonoccurrence. Saldaña (2013) refers to this mixed method study as magnitude coding, which allows for the application of numbers to data to represent values on a scale. Scale questions were asked in participants' interviews, as well as follow-up surveys, which are analyzed both through broad categories of presence, as well as performing descriptive statistics to provide means and frequencies of participants' evaluations. Saldaña (2013) argues that numeric representation can be a valuable methodology and supplemental heuristic for qualitative analysis.

To analyze the data, I used NVivo®, a qualitative analysis software, which allows researchers to store, manage, and analyze qualitative data. This software allows for a quick retrieval and analysis of codes, as well as the option to recode data easily and combine codes. Qualitative software, "unlike the human mind, can maintain and permit you to organize evolving and potentially complex coding systems" (Saldaña, 2013, p. 31).

Throughout the coding process, I wrote analytic memos to document the coding process and coding choices, as well as emergent patterns and themes (Saldaña, 2013). Stake (1995) argues that "good research is not about good methods as much as it is about good thinking" (p. 19). Memos allow an opportunity not to summarize the data, but rather to reflect and expound on data during the analysis process and to interrogate thinking and refine analysis (Saldaña, 2013).

Qualitative coding can be a solitary act as a "lone ethnographer intimately at work with her data" (Galman, 2007; Saldaña, 2013, p. 35). As a reflexive exercise, I met several times with my adviser and committee members to go over transcripts and discuss emerging themes. In

these meetings, we discussed participants' quotations and relationships between emerging themes. The cyclical and iterative process of qualitative data analysis required going back and forth between the raw data and the data analysis process (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Ultimately, this process facilitates a systematic and rigorous interrogation of the data.

   Trustworthiness. While much debate exists on how qualitative researchers should address issues of reliability and validity, there is, as Creswell and Miller (2000) argue, "a general consensus" that researchers "demonstrate their studies are credible" (p. 124). Baxter and Babbie (2004) argue that trustworthiness is evaluated through four criteria: dependability, confirmability, credibility and transferability. Dependability is met by providing a trackable account of the process such as audio-recordings and transcripts of the interviews as well as reflexive notes about the process (Baxter & Babbie, 2004). Throughout the coding process, I kept detailed notes as I refined the codes and process. Additionally, as the interview protocol and follow-up surveys were altered slightly over the three years, I kept notes detailing the changes and justifications for the changes. Confirmability is attained by obtaining "richly detailed data from a sufficient number of informants" (Baxter & Babbie, 2004, p. 344). Over a three-year span my intention was to interview as many participants as possible to have a variety of countries and experiences represented. Additionally, a clear audit-trail of audio recordings and transcripts also provides confirmability. Credibility focuses on whether the conclusions "ring true" to the participant (Baxter & Babbie, 2004). Member checking allows the participant to verify the conclusions and requires the researcher to take the data and interpretations back to the participants of the study (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Research participants confirm the credibility of the data by verifying the overall account to be realistic and accurate (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that member checks are "the most crucial

technique for establishing credibility" (p. 314.).   The completed results section was sent to six of the interview participants – two from each year, and one from 6 of the 7 countries in this study to review for accuracy. Transferability is concerned with demonstrating that the findings have applicability in other contexts even though generalizability may be limited (Baxter & Babbie, 2004; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A way to achieve transferability is to provide "thick, rich descriptions" which allows the readers the ability to feel that they experienced or could experience the accounts described in the study (Creswell & Miller, 2000). During writing, the purpose of thick description is to use as much detail as possible which aids the readers to understand the account is credible while also allowing readers to evaluate the extent to which the drawn conclusions are applicable to other situations and settings (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Throughout the results section, participants' responses are situated in context as well as presented to preserve the participants' stories without deleting too much contextual information.

Summary

The purpose of this longitudinal case study is to understand and discover the perceptions of politics and political participation for young women in MMIAPEZ. As I proceed to discuss my findings in the next chapter, I will explore how my participants perceive politics and political participation, their interest and ability to participate in politics, the role of gender in politics, and their perceptions and experiences after involvement in an intensive leadership institute.

Chapter 4: Findings

In this chapter I present the discourses of the 58 MMIAPEZ women to investigate their perceptions of barriers to political participation, as well as their perceived ability to participate in politics. During my analysis, three dominant themes emerged: 1) Losing Wife-Life: Gendered Barriers to Political Participation, 2) Diplomacy and Sugar Coating: Constructions of Political Cynicism, and 3) My Choice, My Life, My Future: Political Ambition and Political Efficacy. Additionally, this chapter presents the analysis of the follow-up survey responses of participants in the final section. This chapter will explore each theme and the multi-faceted discourses within each major theme. Chapter five will discuss how each research question is answered through the themes presented in chapter four.

Theme 1 - Losing Wife-Life: Gendered Barriers to Political Participation

MMIAPEZ women discursively construct gender as a barrier for women's political participation. NVivo analysis demonstrates that 48 out of 58 participants made remarks coded as "gender barriers" with a total of 126 references to "gender barriers." This theme illustrates the multi-faceted and intersecting gender barriers that women may encounter in political participation. Within this theme, five sub-themes emerged to reveal the macro-level and micro-level barriers for women in politics. These sub-themes include: 1) traditional gender roles, 2) gender bias and inequality, 3) capability, credibility, and confidence, 4) safety and security, and 5) optimism for change.

Traditional gender roles. Traditional gender roles were the most prominent way gender barriers were explained by participants to articulate barriers that exist to female political participation. Participants identified societal and familial expectations that women should not work outside of the home. Instead of being encouraged to find jobs outside of the home, women

are encouraged and sometimes forced to stay home to tend to the house, husband, and children. This sentiment is expressed in the claims of inability of women to run for political office because they are perceived as individuals who cannot and should not balance the demands of both politics and family.

Gendered societal expectations were described by a large majority of participants as a frequent barrier for female participation in politics. Rather than viewing the gender barrier as a personal obstacle, it was constructed as a societal gender expectation that prevents women from participating in politics. And while expectations about gender roles are a barrier, Participant 28, a 21-year-old International Business and Marketing major from Pakistan, articulates that many obstacles are intertwined for women's participation in politics,

> Social pressures – people do think that politics is not for women. When a woman gets popular, people try to relate everything bad to that woman because she is popular so you have to say something about her. It is easy to say negative things than saying positive things – we have a female Prime Minister who got murdered. She was the only female Prime Minister we had and was murdered during a political campaign. Family sometimes – family doesn't allow women in politics. Women themselves cannot join the different puzzles to get enough courage to get into politics. Plus when they get married, the family pressure doubles from husbands and parents. It's considered that politics is not something for women which is a perception. This mindset doesn't allow women to come into politics. I think it has taken a lot of time to include in law women to also have an equal right to participate in elections, so I think regarding that we are progressing, but when we compare to the mindset of people it is not getting changed.

For Participant 28, there are several "social pressures" that serve as barriers to female participation in politics: "security," "family obligations," and societal mindsets. In additional to societal barriers, she articulates that women lack confidence and courage to get involved in the political arena. She also provides a cautionary tale about what can potentially happen to women in politics by sharing that Pakistan's first female Prime Minister was murdered. "Different puzzles" are mentioned, which seem to reflect the multitude of obligations and expectations a

women face in her country. While she does not provide any further explanation about the

murder, her sharing of this event alludes to security as a concern and barrier for women's

political participation. Politics is described by Participant 28 as a complicated system and not

one that is particularly inclusive or opening for women, which is evidenced by the female

politician's murder.

Some participants were blunter in their articulations of gender barriers in their country.

They articulated a very clear gender barrier that is present in societal expectations for female

gender roles and the belief that women should not work outside of the home. Participant 3, a 23-

year-old Business Administration major from Afghanistan says,

> Well in Afghanistan the gender situation is getting worse day by day. The women rights
> are being ignored for years and now it continues to be so. Especially in terms of women
> working outside or in terms of women being in politics. I live in capital and now it is
> believed that whenever a woman goes to an office to work she is not a good woman who
> cannot take care of her children and cannot be at home, which is why she is going out and
> working outside. If any woman tries to say something it is because she is educated.
> They just blame education.

According to this participant, women who work outside the home are viewed by the society as

not being a "good" woman as the underlying assumption is that a woman's place is in the home.

This participant reveals a socially constructed double-bind: women desire to work outside of the

home, but society expects to her stay at home to tend to her familial responsibilities. Education,

which is a privilege in many of the MMIAPEZ countries for women, is described as the culprit

for women being outside of the home and speaking up. Participants in this study are in a

precarious situation as they are all pursuing college degrees, but their societies have strong

gendered expectations for women.

Many participants also describe a more directly and personally influential gender barrier

for political participation in their countries: their families. Many participants describe that their

families and societies do not understand why women would need to be involved in politics

because they have roles to perform as wives and mothers and should stay home instead of being

outside the home. Participant 10, an 18-year-old English major from Mongolia explains,

> Sometimes my friends, like men say – why do you need politics, you are a woman, you just need to cook and be in the kitchen and look after babies. Why would you do politics? Barriers are that some people say you are a woman and that's it.

She articulates this assumption society has, which she highlights as men in particular as not

understanding why a woman would want to be involved in politics because she has duties such

as cooking and taking care of children. Instead of being involved in activities outside of the

home, like politics, women are expected to fulfill their traditional responsibilities in the home.

Participant 11, a 19-year-old Geographical Information Systems major from Mongolia had a

similar explanation,

> Women are not so interested in political career because you have so many things to do. You have to do much thing and have to be very active in social life, which means you have to close your lives for your home. You can't do your children's homework with them and you can't cook – it means you are losing wife-life. Most women don't like life like that, so that's why participation is low.

For Participant 11, instead of it being a societal expectation, she articulates the barrier as a

decision that women make to stay home. Rather than the family as the impetus for a woman to

stay at home, she explains that women themselves make the conscious decision to fulfill their

gendered duties at home. This shift in discourse from a family's pressure to stay at home to a

woman's active choice suggests that she possibly has bought into the societal expectations

herself. She explains that if a woman is more involved in politics, then she is not able to do her

responsibilities at home, which is why women do not participate in politics. Participant 7, a 20-

year-old Economics major from India, also echoes this decision for women to stay at home with,

"Indian women are not actively participating in politics. They are only homemakers." This also

discursively constructs that a woman's job is solely to work at home, and any activity outside of the home would distract from what society has constructed as her primary responsibilities.

In addition to societal expectations, a woman's family may be discouraging of her desire to enter or participate in politics. Participants revealed that families may argue traditional gender roles are important to maintain and that there is no need for a woman to work outside of the home. Participant 3 narrates,

> When I started my career I thought everyone in my family except my father and mother and brother and thought everyone else worked outside to have a career. They all said study as much as you want but why would you need to work outside? We had people in our family who studied to be doctors but they never practiced because they told them they just need to stay at home. We have difficulty and obstacles to starting our careers.

Even though women may be encouraged to get an education, they may also be encouraged to stay at home and not pursue a career. This encouragement to stay at home can translate into the lack of desirability for women to be involved in activities outside of the home. Additionally, families and society are sending conflicting messages about women's education and their gender roles. While women may be encouraged to pursue education, they are not encouraged to pursue careers or activities outside of the home. Participant 9, a 23-year-old Sociology major from Pakistan, expressed a desire to be involved in politics, but explained that her family is discouraging her from being involved. She narrates,

> There are a lot of cultural barriers. I will give you an example of my own self. I wanted to be a political leader and be part of a political party, but my family even though they are very open-minded, back in 2010 what they told me was that it is a very dirty business, so you better stay away from it. And even now when I think about it, because it requires a lot of time, a lot of hard work, and if I want to be a politician I would want to give it my 100%, but our culture and traditions are such that they do not accept women as figures of authority. They just don't do that.

Participant 9 acknowledges that her family is very open-minded, but yet they did not want her to be involved in politics and were very direct in their pleas for her not to participate. Her family

viewed politics as a dirty business and did not want her to be involved, and she acknowledges

that society struggles with viewing women as figures of authority. This reveals social

constructions of women as pure and innocent and thus should be protected from "dirty business."

Because women are socially constructed to be pure and innocent, they should avoid things, such

as politics, that would destroy or corrupt this innocence.

Traditional gender roles are the most obvious and articulated gender barrier for women's

participation in politics. Societal and cultural expectations for MMIAPEZ women are to take

care of the home and their families, and outside work is viewed as distracting from those primary

responsibilities.

Gender bias and inequality. The most obvious gender barrier articulated is traditional

gender roles, but societal attitudes and behaviors towards women reveal society plays another

important role in composing barriers for women's political participation. Participants articulate

gender bias is manifested in several ways: patriarchal systems, fear and stigma of educated

women, lack of education, persistent gendered inequality, security, and religion. This section

explores these manifestations of gender bias and inequality MMIAPEZ women face.

Patriarchy and second-hand creatures. When asked if barriers exist for women's

participation in politics, Participant 41, a 23-year-old Medical student from Afghanistan answers,

> A lot – there are. Women are not considered – they are always considered second-hand
> creatures and are always treated second when it comes to rank. The security situation,
> the economical situation, access to knowledge, and access to media – these are all reasons
> that holds [sic] women back in Afghanistan. Especially the security situation and
> sometimes religion – extremists – when people are so extreme about women being in
> politics – they think it's terrible.

The characterization of women as "second-hand creatures" highlights the patriarchal systems

MMIAPEZ women navigate. This gender bias exists not only in politics, but in multiple facets

of society; for example, she mentions security, economics, education, and media as a few areas that where women are held back. Participant 2, a 19-year-old Political Science major from India, had a similar description of her society, "Society is predominately patriarchal. Family structures are patriarchal and you still have a very gendered divide. This is also true in workplace and family structures." As Participant 2 notes, patriarchy is present in the multiple areas of women's lives – both workplace and family structures, which means that the women cannot escape these gendered barriers because they permeate every facet of their lives.   In patriarchal systems men are preferred to hold power and women struggle for gaining positions that have power due to gendered expectations for women and gender bias against women. Participant 38, a 23-year-old Business major from Afghanistan narrates this power struggle,

> If you want to participate in Afghanistan – as a woman it is very hard to participate because of men dominating. Women do not have power and men don't want them to have the power. If women participate in politics – and you can see some Afghan women, but you can see they do not have enough voice. They are always being controlled and this is not good. This is because of religion and because of secrecy. They cannot have the voice they want. I think participation for women still takes a long time to be the real one.

The power struggle Participant 38 describes is inherent to a patriarchal system, which makes female involvement and participation in politics difficult. She explains that because of this power imbalance, women do not have "enough voice" to adequately participate or be involved. This restriction of women's voice has serious implications for political participation as it directly prohibits the inclusion and valuation of women in politics. This patriarchal control operates on two levels: it can prevent women's participation completely, or it can mitigate their participation if they do hold political office. She articulates religion and secrecy as impetuses for the control women are subjected to in order to prevent them from gaining power.

In addition to patriarchal restraints, women face difficulties when running for office, such as a lack of support from fellow women and also attacks on their personal appearance. When a female candidate is running against a male opponent, participants express that society tends to choose the male candidate as he is viewed as more capable than the female candidate. Participant 23, a 25-year-old Law student from Zambia describes,

> In Zambia, women are the largest amount of voters, but the situation there – a female stands against a male you will find that women do not support each other, so they tend to be discouraged to stand for these positions because they will probably fail.

Instead of standing in solidarity with fellow women, Participant 23 describes that female citizens are more likely to vote for the male candidate, which is discouraging for women who may run for political office. This hegemonic behavior is a reflection of patriarchal systems and highlights that even women themselves participate in the aggressions against other women.

Change is occurring slowly in MMIAPEZ, and participants reveal a slow trajectory of positive change that slightly increases women's participation. Even though gender bias still exists, participants provide descriptions that slow progress is occurring. Participant 17, a 23-year-old Economic and Business Management major from Morocco says,

> Actually women in my country do not have the same equality. 'Cause [sic] Morocco is mainly male dominated, so the fact that there is a woman handling a political or economics position it something a little bit awkward. But recently, like 3 years ago – they started to give more chances to women to prove themselves that they are equal and can do what men can do too.

Participant 17 points out that women in politics are "awkward," which speaks to the preferences of men in leadership positions and desirability for men over women in general for higher career positions. Additionally, her description of "awkward" to describe women handling politics suggests that she is possibly buying into the patriarchal ideology herself and views men as the

normative standard as politicians and economists. Participant 8 echoes this slow transition of acceptance,

> Actually India is still based on traditions. The acceptance is a bit of a problem – men are still dominant in participation, but women are rising. We are having a transition from traditional to modern beliefs and structure.

She highlights that many phenomena intersect as gender barriers for women. Historical context is the foremost catalyst for gender bias as she articulates India is still focused on "traditions." Social acceptance is another constructed barrier that prevents women's participation because society does not generally accept women in power positions. She argues that "a transition" from the traditional beliefs is occurring, which illustrates some level of social change is occurring and possible ideological shifts.

Participant 8, a 19-year-old English Literature major from India describes this slow historical progress,

> Well in India it has been from ancient times that women are in submission to males. There have been different transitions on this – there is a time, first where women were upheld in society and given more free reign on who they want to marry and change of education and the women were the mothers of the society. They produced children in order to increase society. After the transition of time, women had an opposite influence on society. Male child was preferred and a girl child was considered a burden on the family because India has a dowry system and family of a female have to pay a huge amount of price to the male family. Because of the dowry system, the women were put down and also child infanticide. Every time a girl was born, they would be killed or used as sacrificial offerings. Right now I would say that there is a slow and gradual process of importance given to women liberation, but due to traditional beliefs men are still dominant in job opportunities in salaries, and even in society. If there is to be a leader, it is expected for a man to stand up. If a women does – ok we respect you standing up, but still there is an apprehension of men to have a female leader.

In India, Participant 8 describes that women used to have more freedoms than they currently have, but those were taken away and now are slowly progressing again. The preference of having boys over girls, which is in part due to the dowry system also demonstrates the

historically persistent ideological views regarding gender preference – placing more value on males than females. Being a woman isn't just about an ideological preference, but more so the female body is devalued and the dowry system places a price to pay for the reproduction of women's bodies. This economic punishment for having women is manifested in perceptions about the possibility and capability of female leaders, where more value is placed on a male leader and preference is given to males for leadership roles. However, participants express a sense of optimism and hope for change. Participant 46, a 20-year-old English major from India explains,

> I being a woman, I want my gender to be the face of empowerment. I see that there is too much gender bias in my country. So I want some educated and some good faces because most of the politicians back home in my country are not well educated. What is not interesting is the gender bias. Because I myself am working for an organization that works for students and their rights and I face many challenges just because I am a woman, a female. You get into many conflicting situations with men and they don't find you as capable or worthy of that job.

She acknowledges that gender bias exists and has personally encountered it through her involvement in an organization, but also claims she wants to use her gender as "empowerment." This passage demonstrates tension with the gender bias that exists in her country, yet her quest for making progress and using her gender as a positive symbol in spite of the gender bias. She is trying to negotiate gender bias through her own "empowerment" as she cites her own personal experience with gender bias, but she believes change is possible.

     Gender discrimination and education. Patriarchal systems are an obvious explanation for gender discrimination and bias, but gender discrimination is also motivated by education and lack of education. Participants explain that people tend to fear or view educated women poorly and this is typically present in the population of uneducated citizens. Educated women are feared and viewed poorly because they have not stayed within the traditional gender confines of

the home, and they have defied these traditional gender expectations which society views

negatively. Participant 4, a 20-year-old English Literature major from Pakistan describes,

> In our country, gender discrimination happens. Women face gender discrimination. In our society, if you are an educated woman you must be a bad woman. All of the people that are uneducated believe this. Men can do everything and whatever they want to do and females cannot – they are not allowed to fulfill their dreams and wishes.

Women are discriminated against because of their education, by people who tend to not have an

education which also confirms the societal expectations for traditional gender roles. Women

who are educated and want to work outside the home are stigmatized as people who should not

be trusted and are perceived as "bad" through societal standards because they have defied

traditional gender roles and expectations. Traditional gender roles magnify gender bias by

providing expectations for women to follow, and when women disregard those societal

expectations, they are viewed negatively.

The lack of education is also constructed as a gender barrier for female political

participation. Participants blame the lack of education and high illiteracy rates of women and

their country's overall population for the lack of female involvement. Participant 5, a 24-year-

old English Studies major from Morocco argues that "Illiteracy is high, so women just don't

know about politics. They don't even know how to write, how to read, so how can they think

politically?" Lack of education is a gender barrier as women are not as privileged as men in

some countries to obtain education, thus the high female illiteracy rates. According to the United

Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), in the 1990s the literacy

rate in Morocco was around 41.6%, and then in the 2000s climbed to 52.3% with 2015 projects

of 56.1% (UNESCO, 2012). Although progress has been made in the past few decades with

literacy rates, Mouttaki (2015) argues that there "remains a startling division in literacy rates

between Morocco's urban and rural populations – with an even more significant gap between men and women." This confirms Participant 5's argument that women lack the knowledge about politics largely due to illiteracy in her country.

Security. Education is constructed as a prominent area for gender discrimination, and participants also articulate security as another threatening issue for women in politics. Participant 56, a 21-year-old Medical student from Afghanistan identifies several gender barriers and explains,

> Yeah the most common barrier is security. The women working in politics are not safe, they don't feel safe. Many women that don't become optimistic for involving in the politics – the reason is that they are not sure about the security and they do not want to take risks. There can be many situations and problems related to security that can happen to them. Education problems also. Our literacy rates for women is so low and education problems have prevented women from being in politics. As you know if a person is not educated, they cannot be in politics.

Security is articulated as the most common barrier by Participant 56, but she also contributes the lack of female participation to the lack of education and high illiteracy rates among women. Literacy rates in Afghanistan are the lowest in the world, with the average literacy rate of 31% (UNESCO, 2016). The female literacy average is lower than the country's average with an average of 17%, and geographical divisions exist with Kabul at 34.7% for female literacy and some regions as low as 1.6% for female literacy (UNESCO, 2016). She also invokes the assumption that a person must be educated to be in politics, thus this is a barrier for female participation.

Religious motivations. While not universal, religion was invoked by some participants as a gender barrier for women's political participation. Religion is described as a reason for gender inequality. Participant 30, a 21-year-old Sociology major from Pakistan explains,

> Pakistan is a country that was founded on the basis of Islam and the culture we got is a mixture of Indian-Hindu culture, as well as Islamic, so there are some things that hinder women from getting out, getting power, dominating men. So women are often not appreciated if they become a political leader. For example, we had a woman, the only woman from Pakistan running for elections and she was shot dead. So it's really difficult for women to participate in politics on a high level.

Religion, for Participant 30, is the guiding factor for women's ability to get out of the house and also to possess positions of power. This cautionary tale of the female Prime Minister that was murdered was previously mentioned by Participant 28. Here, participant 30 is implicitly linking religion and women's safety in politics by claiming that religion can "hinder women" and then she provides the story of the female politician's murder which illustrates a lack of safety associated with religious assumptions.

Participant 35, a 25-year-old Social Science and Politics major from Afghanistan acknowledges that religion is a societal barrier:

> Our religion barriers that may not allow women to talk with men. The biggest one is religion. And as our religion has said about this – we are not allowed to be part of the politics, but the mindsets are something we cannot change. They have set the idea in their mindset because such a thing is not allowed in our religion. But our religion has all freedoms for women, but people cannot realize it yet.

She identifies religion as the biggest barrier for women's ability to participate in politics, but she also criticizes the common explanation that religion is the sole reason why women cannot participate. In her statement, Participant 35 argues that her "religion has freedom for all women," but society has not realized it yet which highlights tension between her articulations of religion as a barrier and her personal opinion. Religion is used as excuse and scapegoat for women to not be involved or allowed in politics, but as she argues, her religion does provide freedoms for women that "people cannot realize yet."

Gender bias is very much present in MMIAPEZ, and participants articulate many manifestations of gender bias and inequality. Patriarchy is a driving force and reason that women struggle to be in leadership positions and politics, in particular due to systematic prejudices and biases women face. Gender discrimination is manifested in both an examination of educated women and un-educated women which places women in an impossible position as they are discriminated against for being educated, or lacking education. Security and religion are also manifestations of gender bias that can prevent women's political participation.

The multi-faceted intersections of these manifestations of gender discrimination and bias demonstrate that societal discrimination is a complex issue women face in MMIAPEZ. These multiple layers of gender bias and discrimination make it difficult if not impossible for a woman to navigate and to enter politics and leadership. Participants' revealed that at times these multiple facets of gender bias are present which can magnify the discrimination a woman encounters. Gender discrimination and bias uniquely present obstacles for women's political participation, and that societal discrimination can also manifest in perceptions of a woman's capability.

Capability, credibility, and confidence. With gender bias prevalent in MMIAPEZ, perceptions of women's capabilities are also articulated as a barrier to political participation. Women are not viewed as equal or capable of being in leadership positions. Society places much more trust in confidence in male leaders. Due to these perceptions, a woman can work as hard as a man, however, it will likely take her longer to achieve the same positions, recognitions, or accomplishments. In addition to societal views of capability, a woman may lack the confidence themselves to run or be involved in leadership positions.

Lack of trust surfaced as a common theme across participants. They collectively describe this lack of trust as exclusive to women. Participant 33, a 23-year-old Finance and Management major from Zambia explains,

> There are times when we have female candidates – sometimes we may not trust them and say that they cannot hold such a position. And this common belief, say to being President requires people not to sleep at night and work so many hours and all that – it's so demanding. Therefore people believe that a woman cannot do that. She can't take care of her home and do this for someone to be President.

Political candidates specifically are viewed as untrustworthy if they are a woman. Additionally, she articulates that women are scrutinized for their inability to perform a demanding position, such as a President because it would be taking away from her other responsibilities in the home and family. Additionally, she affirms the previous sentiment that a woman would lose her "wife-life" if she was involved in politics and would be neglected her primary responsibilities to her family and home. Participant 16, a 21-year-old Medical student from Egypt echoes this sentiment of lack of trust, with "Nowadays I think they are equal, but in authority – people used to trust men more than women. This is still true I think."

As mentioned in Chapter 3, quotas exist for female representation in politics in almost all of the MMIAPEZ, but the quotas typically require political parties to have one or more female candidates on the ballot. The ultimate decision rests with the citizens who vote for their politicians. As participants point out, this lack of trust directed towards female candidates results in women not getting elected. Participant 44, a 19-year-old English Literature major from Morocco argues,

> People do not trust women to be in politics. When it is time to vote for representatives, people do not vote for women. It's the quota that gets them involved, not the people's votes and I think we need to change that, but it will take some time.

Even though quotas are in place primarily to generate more female participation in politics, the election reflects this lack of trust citizens have in a women's ability to participate. This lack of trust hinders a female's perception as a qualified candidate for politician.

Additionally, women may face different scrutiny than men when they run for political office such as attacks and comments on their appearance rather than ability. Participant 34, a 20-year-old Banking and Finance major from Zambia mentions,

> The barriers like I mentioned earlier – women are looked at for their appearance. It's like, um, women are not really seen as people that contribute to society and it is the same thing that if a woman is in a position or something like that, the first thing they will start doing is attack her on her personality, maybe the things she's done in the past.

Instead of being viewed as capable and contributing to society, female politicians are readily criticized for their appearance, personality, and previous actions. Criticism on a female's appearance, which is irrelevant to their professional performance and capability, is an obstacle to political participation. Female candidates and politicians uniquely face a snowball of criticism that is irrelevant to her ability to hold political office.

Society may view women as lacking the capability to participate in politics, but women themselves harbor feelings of inadequacy. When asked if women face barriers to political participation, Participant 46 answers,

> At some point yes, you have to struggle a lot. If a man takes 3 years to reach a place, a woman would take 5 years or more. Then you have to undergo many questions and struggles. There is always a question mark about your character too.

While women may be able to accomplish the same things as men, it possibly can take them much longer, double the time as Participant 46 points out. The gender bias that exists presents a burden to women where they are not viewed as capable leaders, thus they must overcome these obstacles by working harder or longer to be viewed as competent and qualified. In addition to

taking more time to accomplish the same things, women face scrutiny as well when trying to participate in politics. While societal scrutiny exists, personal scrutiny also exists for women. Participant 45, an 18-year-old Psychology major from India believes the loss of femininity to be a disincentive for political participation. She explains,

> Yeah of course they are afraid to lose feminine nature when they go into politics. They have to go through situations that involve losing femininity so they are afraid of it and that society will talk bad about them.

The loss of femininity is a punishment for being involved in politics as women are expected to demonstrate more masculine traits and behaviors. This stigma of losing femininity for women in politics may make it less desirable for women to be involved in politics. Capability has manifested as losing their feminine nature and being more masculinized when involved in politics, which may make it less desirable for women to want to be involved. Lack of confidence is also personally constructed by women. Instead of societal restrictions or barriers, Participant 58, a 21-year-old International Business major from Mongolia believes that women lack confidence to participate in politics. She argues,

> The fact is that there is [sic] few women politicians in our country, but I do not think there is this certain discrimination towards women. It's just about the fact that women are not really confident enough to participate in politics even though they are educated and talented.

Instead of focusing on the larger systematic barriers women face in politics, Participant 58 places the burden on women themselves. While the majority of participants from Mongolia acknowledge discrimination and barriers for women in politics, Participant 58 does not acknowledge that discrimination exists or that barriers are present for women in politics. This lack of confidence in their personality ability to participate in politics can hinder a woman's desire to enter and participate in politics.

It is important to acknowledge that societal and cultural expectations vary region to region in a country and are not homogenous or universal. Barriers may shift based on spatial locations for participants. Participants were quick to point this out and many voiced that while their perceptions of how it is in their region is not necessarily the same truth for another area of the country. Participant 14, a 21-year-old Law student from India explains,

> It varies when you go from region to region. The region I come from – we do not have a lot of gender bias. Everybody is open to the idea that women can work at ideologies are prevalent that women might just be good at homework, but in other areas there is a lot of gender bias – women are not even allowed to go out of the house. It's a very diverse culture, practices differ from place to place.

The transient nature of gender bias and discrimination has serious implications for women's progress as it limits women's ability to navigate and negotiate these regional differences. For women seeking political positions that span these regional differences, it places an additional barrier for her pursuit of political office as she is required to navigate these complicated regional differences. Participant 9 expressed a similar view,

> It is actually quite divided, if you come towards the urban areas you will see a lot of equality, not too much equality, but women have the right to vote and to choose and even reproductive rights. They have a right to property, they have a right to own a car or anything at all that they want to, they have the right to go out of the house. That is only for the urban areas though, they have a right to education as well, and they actually report domestic violence if there is any as well. But if you move towards the rural areas, because we are so entrenched in our tribal traditions and customs, women do not have the right to vote, they do not have the right to property, to the extent that I was just telling one of my colleagues here that the fathers and brothers do not want to give property to the wife or daughter or sister. What they do is marry her off to the Holy Book – the Koran, that way they don't have to give her any property at all because she is technically still at home at the end of the day. Another is that woman [sic] cannot own anything. Whatever gold they may have, that is the husband's, not the wives'. Similarly that is the father – before marriage it is the father and after marriage it is the husband.

Participant 9 explains the distinctions that may exist for her country in terms of gendered rights and inequality. While gender barriers may exist for women in some regions, it is important to

remember that not all regions have the same cultural and societal views on gender and that it varies based on geographical areas. This shifting benchmark regarding women's rights reveals the variety and nuances about these women's daily lived experience.

Societal and personal constructions of a woman's capability to participate in politics and leadership positions can present a barrier to participation. When placing more trust and confidence in male leaders, societal perceptions can hinder a woman's personal reflection of her capabilities and desire to participate in politics.

Safety and security. For women of Afghanistan, security was always cited as a primary barrier for women's political participation. While security might vaguely be referenced in other participant's comments, Afghanistan participants answered the question of what barriers exist for women with security foremost. Participant 13, a 21-year-old Medical student from Afghanistan says,

> In Kabul, women vote, but in the other cities, most of the men don't want their wives to go out and vote because of security. Because in other cities we had situations like the Taliban attack the people with the color on their hands. Like it shows we vote because they cut their finger off. Also sometimes in some areas they experience bomb-blasts. This is why people don't feel secure and they don't get out on Election Day.

When citizens vote in Afghanistan their finger is imprinted with ink to identify those that voted so they cannot vote twice. The Taliban, as Participant 13 explained have cut off fingers of people who have voted. This fear of security also prevents women from doing or saying what they would like. Participant 35 explains,

> In Afghanistan they have fear in their hearts and they couldn't say the thing that their heart wants. Because they are scared of some people – maybe the Taliban or some other people. They are scared of themselves – that maybe they will be killed, so this is why they are not using their voices and rising their voices.

The "fear in their hearts" are a barrier to female participation in politics because they do not feel free to say what they want, while also fearing their safety. Participant 56, echoes this sentiment:

> The most common barrier is security. The women working in politics are not safe, they don't feel safe. Many women don't become optimistic for involving in the politics – the reason is that they are not sure about the security and they do not want to take risks. There can be many situations and problems related to security that can happen to them.

For women in Afghanistan, security is a primary concern and barrier for female political participation. Participant 50, a 23-year-old Medical student from Afghanistan reiterates this barrier and says, "Yeah there are barriers because the security situation is not that good in Afghanistan, so women can't really get a chance to go to politics." Security is the dominant barrier for women's political participation in Afghanistan, but is not solely confined to Afghanistan. Participant 28 from Pakistan previously made a reference to Pakistan's first female Prime Minister that was murdered. This murder of a female politician demonstrates that security for women is a concern that extends beyond Afghanistan.

When asked what barriers exist for women to participant in politics, Participant 29, a 24-year-old Economics major from Afghanistan made a comparative statement to American women and explains,

> Security – we are not safe. United States women are safe – they have safety and we don't have [sic]. As I said before, in my country we have every kind of freedom – we can go to school, we can go to university, we can have a job, we can work through the media – we can do anything –writing. But the one thing we don't have is safety for women. That is why women are afraid to go to school, women are afraid to go to jobs, somehow they are afraid of their family, somehow they are afraid the Taliban. There has always been a threat for women in my country.

She argues that women in Afghanistan do have freedoms, but the major freedom women lack is safety. While specific articulations of safety are not provided by Participant 29, she explains that the threat women face in Afghanistan is a paramount concern. Contrary to previous articulations

from participant's that construct gender barriers of societal expectations, security is a real physical threat to women's political participation.

Optimism for change. Participants universally identified gender as a barrier and articulated the multi-faceted roles that gender manifests into barriers in their societies, but also voiced hope and optimism for change. Many participants identify a gender barrier and then made positive, optimistic claims immediately afterwards. This combination of gender barriers alongside optimistic claims reveals participants' perceptions of societal progress. Participant 18, a 22-year-old Medical student from Morocco says,

> There is always that family barrier – that I have to take care of my family, of my children and don't have enough time. But now that is changing. The governor, she is female. Things are changing.

While acknowledging that familial responsibilities may prevent women from being involved in politics, she also voices hope by expressing that things are changing. This tension between familial responsibilities and not having enough time to perform gendered duties echoes the gender barriers from previous participants and reveals society views the ability to participate in activities outside the home as mutually exclusive for women. Participant 40, a 21-year-old Economics major from Pakistan acknowledges the current barriers that exist, but also claims that traditional mindsets are changing:

> Well there are definitely barriers and it's a struggle for women to get up to some of the higher position, be it politics or any higher position, there are a lot of barriers and it's a struggle to get somewhere. So because the main reason is that society is male-dominated and the old mindset is that women shouldn't be in the work – be working women. So that mindset is declining rapidly, but it still exists, so that makes it difficult.

Even though her positive comment about the mindset changing quickly is sandwiched between more negative comments about the gender barrier, she acknowledges a positive shift: that while gender barriers exist, the mindset behind them is quickly changing.

Summary

Gender functions as a multi-faceted barrier for female political participation for MMIAPEZ women as demonstrated through the five sub-themes. Participants recite the dominant barrier to be the societal expectation for traditional gender roles and the belief that women should not lose their "wife-life." If a woman was involved in politics, she would be neglecting her familial responsibilities. Additionally, gender bias is still very prevalent in MMIAPEZ and women are not viewed as equally capable as men in leadership positions. Gender bias and discrimination manifests itself in many facets through patriarchal structures, biased perceptions of women and education, security concerns, and religion, which illustrates the complicated and complex system women must navigate to pursue leadership and political positions. The final gender barrier the participants constructed was the security threat women uniquely face in Afghanistan which prevents and hinders female political participation. While many gender barriers were articulated, MMIAPEZ women also expressed an optimistic hope for change in these gendered societal assumptions and beliefs.

Theme 2 – Diplomacy and Sugar Coating: Constructions of Political Cynicism

Cynicism is the most frequently mentioned theme throughout the participant interviews. NVivo analysis demonstrates that 56 of the 58 participants made remarks that were coded as "cynicism" with a total of 236 references to "cynicism." Within this theme, four sub-themes emerged, which are: 1) corruption, dishonesty, distrust, 2) broken promises, 3) lack of transparency, and 4) tensions with optimism.

During the interview participants were asked various scale-questions to measure their levels of cynicism and political efficacy. For instance, one scale-question asked participants to what extent they agree with the statement "I have trust in the political system." The mean was

3.78 with a standard deviation of 1.20. A vast majority, 70.7% (n=41) of participants indicated

low levels of trust in their political systems (Table 2).

Table 2 Levels of Political Trust

Responses to "I have trust in the political system"

Scale Indicator	Frequency	Percent
1 – Strongly agree	4	6.9
2 – Agree	6	10.3
3 – Neutral	7	12.1
4 – Disagree	23	39.7
5 – Strongly disagree	18	31.0

Another scale-question asked participants to what extent they agreed with the statement "I think

political officials care about what people like me think." The mean was 3.88 with a standard

deviation of 1.01. Again, a rather strong percentage, 74.2% (n=43) expressed that they did not

think politicians cared about what women thought (Table 3).

Table 3 Politicians Care About Citizens

Responses to "I think political officials care about what people like me think."

Scale Indicator	Frequency	Percent
1 – Strongly agree	2	3.4
2 – Agree	4	6.9
3 – Neutral	9	15.5
4 – Disagree	27	46.6

5 – Strongly disagree	16	27.6

A third scale-question asked participants to respond to the question, "Sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on." The mean was 2.26 with a standard deviation of 1.12. The majority of participants, 67.3%, agreed with the statement that politics is complicated and sometimes they cannot understand what is going on (Table 4).

Table 4 Politics is Complicated

Responses to "Sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on."

Scale Indicator	Frequency	Percent
1 – Strongly agree	16	27.6
2 – Agree	23	39.7
3 – Neutral	9	15.5
4 – Disagree	8	13.8
5 – Strongly disagree	2	3.4

Overall, the majority of participants express high levels of cynicism towards the government and low levels of trust in politics. This section will examine the multi-faceted articulations of political cynicism participants expressed.

Corruption, dishonesty, distrust. The most articulated motivation by participants in their cynicism is the existence of corruption, dishonest politicians, and a lack of trust for the political system. Corruption overwhelms participants' responses and motivates cynicism as they

view their political system as broken and one that is very hard to rid of corruption. Participant 32, a 19-year-old Business Administration major from India, was asked if barriers exist to be knowledgeable about politics, and she answered:

> Yes. The first thing is when you say politics, in my city, what they say is politics is corrupted. When you say politics, the word that comes to mind is corruption. They don't say politics is a group of people working to make a better life for the public – they don't say that. And the other thing is that it is becoming more complicated day by day. So people are just not interested. They keep saying we have this problem – we have that issue and need you to resolve that issue, but most of the time there are no actions taken unless you are in the election period. So people are just fed up with what is going on because it is the same thing going on over and over again, it's like a vicious cycle. They provide us things and the election goes on, and then they don't do it again.

For Participant 32, "corruption" is the defining term used to describe politics in India which highlights the cynical views association with government. This cynicism is also highlighted by the remark that "so people are just fed up with what is going on" which describes the coping mechanism of disengaging from politics as a result of cynicism. The assumption that politicians are supposed to help the public is not present in the association with politics because as she points out people do not describe politics as "people working to make a better life for the public," instead they think corruption. Action seems to only happen during "election period" as politicians are trying to gain votes and so action only occurs during this crucial time. She also expresses frustration and cynicism that politics is "becoming more complicated day by day" which results in disinterested citizens.

Politics is also constructed as "dirty" game that can be comprised of personal attacks, messy drama, and corruption. Participant 34 explains why politics is not interesting to her personally:

> In my country, there is a level of dirty politics where they don't attack people based on issues that are happening, but make personal attacks. And if it is women who are in politics you find that the media will only put them on the front page if there is a picture of

them doing something that is inappropriate or something like that, so it's a dirty kind of politics.

For Participant 34, "dirty politics" is constructed as personal attacks on a person. These personal attacks are also furthered by the attention women receive by the media, which is a picture of "them doing something that is inappropriate," which is the only way they are featured on the front page. These personal attacks and focus on negative portrayals of women are "dirty politics." Participant 41 also agrees that politics is "dirty" and describes,

> I have no trust in the political system. Politics is very dirty I think. I've always noticed the people in politics are not the right people – the ones that should be there. The ones I thought were right for the position end up being the bad politicians again, so I don't think the political system is right, especially in my country. It's a messed up system. Politics is inherited and not based on qualifications and knowledge.

"Dirty" for Participant 41 is the fact that the "right people" are not the ones in political office and only "bad" politicians flood the system. This lack of trust is the first claim that she makes, but declaratively stating "I have no trust in the political system." At the end of her statement, she points out that rather than being based on "qualifications and knowledge" political office is "inherited."

Many political systems in MMIAPEZ have political families that are powerful and are the main source of politicians for the country. If one is not part of a political family, it is difficult for one to be part of the political process. Participant 42, a 20-year-old Computer Science and Engineering major from India mentions,

> Every time, at least what I see, women and youth in general when they try to get involved doesn't do anything – because the system is so rigid and it's basically the political families that run the entire system. It's really hard to get into the system and make significant change. You will basically be the person holding their flags for them and I'm a very ambitious person so I don't want to waste my time in something I don't think will really create a difference. I think I can do my share for my country in other ways – politics is not one of them.

Cynicism for Participant 42 is rooted in her discursive construction that the system is "so rigid" and it is very hard to accomplish anything positive in the political system. She explains that political families run the political system and that if one is not in one of those families, then one has little to no power. Being involved in politics would be "a waste of time" and she believes that she would not "really create a difference," thus does not desire to be involved in politics. This cynicism has resulted in apathy as Participant 42 does not believe her involvement in politics would "create a difference." She also explains that she believes she can serve her country in ways that do not involve politics, which demonstrates her apathy results in disengagement from the political system and a shift to focus elsewhere.

This desire to create change is articulated as a reason participants would not want to be in politics because they do not view the opportunity to make change within their political systems due to corruption. Participant 39, a 22-year-old Psychology major from Pakistan expresses,

> I would want to be in political office if I was part of change or political project that can really make a change and make a difference in my country and help out people suffering from all this political drama. And I wouldn't want to be in political office just because of all the drama they already created – I hate it, seriously.

Participant 41 and Participant 42 both share that they want to create change, but their cynicism is expressed through statements that it is difficult or almost impossible to create change in their political systems. The participants largely manage cynicism by disengagement and disassociation from politics. Instead of participation in politics, MMIAPEZ women express their desire to work in public or civil service or through non-governmental organizations (NGOs). For MMIAPEZ women, change is best facilitated through social activism and community organizations. Politics is also undesirable for involvement due to the "drama" that is present in the political system, which she declaratively says, "I hate it."

Cynicism is also manifested through constructions of distrust where participants describe politics as a loss of "loyalty" and a loss of "faith." Participant 49, a 20-year-old Finance Management major from Mongolia expresses her distrust as:

> I think the political is just a mess. The people have no loyalty and I don't know why they just – maybe I just don't know about other countries. In Mongolia, most of the Parliament members are just for making money and just for the authority, they are not there for the country.

For her, politics is a "mess" which again constructs politics as an undesirable thing that should be avoided. While not explicitly saying she does not want to be involved or engaged in politics, the description of "mess" implies that she would not want to be involved in politics. She also describes politicians as having "no loyalty" which she explains as the politicians only focusing on their personal self-interests and not the overall good of the country and citizens. An implicit expectation for politicians is a loyalty to their country and citizens, and this lack of loyalty is constructed as an impetus for cynicism. This distrust is defined for Participant 49 by the self-motivations that drive politicians and the lack of caring for citizens and lack of action to improve the country.

This symbolic construction of "loss" is explained by Participant 54, a 21-year-old Marketing major from Morocco:

> I think I just lost faith. Not only about this political government but all the ones in the past and the government that will come. I may sound very negative about it all, but this is how I feel. I think that better work will come not from the government, but from people and organizations.

Not only has Participant 54 "lost faith" in her current government but she expresses that it happened both in past and future political structures. Her description of complete loss of "faith" identifies her cynicism towards the government and also a complete withdrawal from politics. The solution for improvement of her country is explained by her to come "not from the

government," but from the citizens themselves and various "organizations." Cynicism has

completely overtaken her views that the government cannot accomplish much and the work must

come from outside of the government.

Participants frequently expressed frustration with the perception of lying and dishonesty

present in their political systems. Participant 34 argues that:

> To me, politics is mostly about lying what you think you can do. I always think of lying.
> I wouldn't say I will do something that in reality I know can't be done. Most politicians
> have specialized in doing that. The moment they get into power – they go the other
> route.

She describes politics as being a process of lying to citizens and making promises that they

cannot or do not keep. Participant 34 also directly refers to her efficacy by acknowledging that

she would not be able to make promises that she knows "can't be done," but that politicians have

a knack for making promises they do not carry out. Elections are invoked here again as the time

where politicians make promises, but as Participant 34 points out, as soon as they get into office,

they "go the other route" and do not carry out the promises they made. Participant 22, a 22-year-

old Business major from Afghanistan, echoes the sentiments that politics is ripe of dishonesty.

When asked what is interesting and not interesting about politics, she answered:

> What is not interesting for me is that now the politics has gained another meaning. It has
> gained a status quo definition which is to front and to deceive the people, which is to lie,
> which is to take the money of the people and use the people, but not serving them.

Later in the interview, she says, "I want to represent my people, but not through government.

Because there is no way for you. If you are honest, then there is no place for you in government.

You must be involved in something else." She explains that the "status quo" is one of deception

and lying from politicians. Corruption is also credited as being a motivation for cynicism

because politicians "take the money of the people," but do not do things directly for those

people. Her efficacy is invoked through the claim that she wants to "represent my people," but

not through political efforts and that she is honest, thus politics is not a place for her, which

alludes the argument that all politicians are liars. Like Participant 54 that claimed that the

government could not do good things for citizens, Participant 15 also argues that people and

groups outside of the government are the ones that can make positive contributions to society.

Broken promises. Lying is articulated as a facet of corruption and dishonesty

participants explain as impetus for their cynicism. Participants uniquely distinguished general

lying politicians partake in from election practices where bribing occurs and politicians make

promises to citizens, but when they are elected into office they do not fulfill those promises.

This excitement that is garnered during elections seems to quickly fade when politicians fail to

carry through on their plans and promises and this has negative consequences resulting in

cynicism and apathy for participants. Participant 45 describes,

> The interesting thing is the hype of the election. When I was in school the teachers
> would always talk about it. The not interesting part is the corruption. They don't serve
> people – they use people. They use the ignorance of people in many ways. They misuse
> the trust even they buy votes. Democracy is lost here.

She explains that for her the interesting part of politics are elections, but corruption is the

negative aspect of politics. Politicians are described to "use the ignorance of the people," and

take advantage of them during the election cycle. Participant 45 articulates both corruption and a

distrust for politicians as her motivations for cynicism towards the government. Participant 18

expresses a similar view and experience,

> In my country it is interesting to see the new ways they corrupt people. How people
> brainwash and so what we realize is that each elections people are loud – they become
> good orators. They say we will do this and this and make great differences and they are
> just speeches. I think not interesting is that a lot of speeches, a lot of talk, but at the end
> they aren't doing anything.

Corruption is again described as the main action of politicians by Participant 18. She explains that elections are a time where promises are made and politicians are "good orators." Her cynicism is depicted as politicians giving a lot of talk, but not backing up their talk with actions. Politicians, for Participant 18 are not accomplishing anything and are merely talking to citizens.

Bribing is also described by participants as a justification for their abstinence from political participation. Participant 17 explains,

> I don't vote. I don't trust but it is all the same story. They never change anything. Imagine what they are doing in Morocco – they give money, food, to people to vote for them. And why do people vote for them? He is my brother, or my father's friend, so I have to vote for them. It's not like he deserves or she deserves or they will get a chance to change and make us live in a better place. But once someone who deserves is there – I will vote for them.

The justification for Participant 17 not voting is driven by cynicism that nothing can change in her political system. She illustrates the absurdity of elections for her is the bribing to get votes and the motivations for voting for someone are based on knowing them, not that they are qualified. Her final statement does express optimism that she may participate in the future if "someone who deserves" to be there is running for office. However, this does express tension with her opening statement that it is all the "same story" which is driven by frustration with the cyclical bribing and voting for unqualified people.

Cynicism is also motivated by the belief that politics has failed them and has not been productive or helpful overall. Participant 2 explains,

> I find politics very interesting, but currently there are a lot of areas that might make me disinterested. Maybe because of areas of inconvenience, areas in politics that have let us down – failure to administrate, or failure to govern. That has questioned our tolerance to politics, but I wouldn't call it disinterest.

Participants have expressed that they believe the system is broken and corrupt and change is not really possible in their political systems, and Participant 2 is much more direct in criticizing the

"failure." She first points out that "areas of inconvenience" exist in politics, which she explains has the government "failing" the citizens through administration and governance. For her, this "failure" has motivated her cynicism and as she remarks the larger society's "tolerance" for politics. Cynicism is articulated through the lack of trust participants express during the election process for politicians. This cynicism motivates participants to actively avoid and abstain from political participation and breeds apathy towards politics.

Lack of transparency. Participants articulate a frustration with the lack of transparency that exists for acquiring political information as previously mentioned during elections, but also more generally throughout the government's operations. While information is given through the media, participants criticize the reliability of the media's information, as well as the general smokescreen that exists around politics. When asked if barriers exist to becoming knowledgeable about politics in her country, Participant 27, a 22-year-old engineering student from Morocco answers,

> The first barrier in our country is the lack of transparency. The big projects and decisions we just get the final copy, we do not know about the procedure – it stays in the parliament. Even if the constitution there are some clauses about transparency and the government should show the public what happens and how they get to those decisions and justify their positions to the people. It remains a political game. If you want to know the truth you should go there, and even going there you will be confused – because I tried and I really was confused – it's complicated.

Participant 27 argues that the first barrier to acquiring political knowledge is the "lack of transparency" in the government. She explains that they may get the final decision in the "final copy," but they are not made aware of the process the politicians engaged in to reach the decisions. Transparency is specifically mentioned in her country's constitution as an obligation of the government to the citizens, but she maintains that this transparency does not exist, which is why she labels it a "political game." The label of "political game" points out the tensions

between what actually happens and what the constitution says which also highlights the "game" one engages in when trying to figure out what is really going on in the political system. This participant is quite interested in politics and as she says she went to the government to seek out truth herself, but she was unable to understand what was going on as it was "complicated."

Participant 2 echoes these sentiments of a lack of transparency in the government and says,

> They say ignorance is bliss and that is maybe something that the government thrives on. Due to lack of transparency there just might be a proliferation of bad governance and that hampers knowledge sharing. Lack of knowledge leads to bad governance.

She recites a common phrase, "ignorance is bliss" and argues that the government benefits from this belief of the citizens. Because of the lack of transparency, Participant 2 explains that bad governance is the result. The citizens' lack of knowledge allows for the government to continue "bad governance" because the citizens are unable to hold the government accountable for their actions.

This smokescreen and lack of transparency can also serve to completely mask what is really going on in the government. Politicians benefit from the smokescreen as it hides what is happening behind closed doors, but the negative consequences of this smokescreen is the apathy and cynicism it breeds. Participant 41 explains,

> Sometimes, not actually sometimes, I would say all the time things that they show to people is not what the real thing is. There is a different thing going on – a difference scene going on in the back, which not every civilian gets to see. That is what politics is about, it's about diplomacy and sugar coating the facts and the negative parts, so it's hard for me sometimes to understand what is going on.

For Participant 41, the information the public is given is not the "real thing." As she argues, there are different actions happening behind closed doors and those actions are not shared with the public. She expresses her view that the government "sugar coats" the negative aspects of

politics which can be a barrier to acquiring political knowledge. This cynicism is motivated by a lack of trust for the government and also for the sharing of information about what is going on in the political system which she blames for her inability to understand what is going on in politics.

Participants did blame the media for contributing to the lack of transparency about political information. When asked if barriers exist for acquiring political information, Participant 3 remarked,

> Yeah because of the media. Media is not so much helpful. They are not revealing the picture of politics and everyone knows that every system has corruption and this is the other part that prevents us from having full knowledge of the politics which is an obstacle to get into the system and know what is going on.

She argues that the media is to blame as a barrier to gaining political knowledge because they are not very "helpful." Corruption is viewed as an expected part of politics, but yet the media does not highlight or explain this corruption, nor do they critique it. The media also "prevents" citizens from having "full knowledge" on politics, so they only partially share political information. As a result of the media only sharing what they do, the citizens are not fully aware of what is going in the government and it breeds apathy and cynicism. In addition to not sharing the full picture, Participant 18 describes the media as being biased. She says,

> Maybe because there is a lack of transparency. They don't say everything. Also a lack of trust because we don't trust someone else to know. Even on the news they don't talk about it really what is happening because sometimes the media is biased. They only say what some people want.

Participant 18 echoes the previous sentiments that there is "lack of transparency" that is barrier to being knowledgeable about politics. She also expresses that the information given is not complete because "they don't say everything" which implies they are leaving out information. A lack of trust is also invoked as a motivator for her cynicism because no one really knows what is going on in the government. Her comment reveals a multi-layered smoke screen that highlights

the lack of transparency, complicated political processes, nepotism, ulterior motives, and also compromised media systems. The media being "biased" is also directly blamed for the lack of transparency because they filter information based on what they want the citizens to have access to, which again implies only partial information is provided to citizens.

Tensions with optimism. Participants express cynicism towards the government and then in the same remark express optimism as well which highlights an on-going tension between cynicism and optimism through the participants discourse. Participant 41 describes,

> The interesting part is that you are able to speak your thoughts and your mind. And you have that platform and opportunity and sometimes you even have the authority to assert your thoughts and actions. The negative point is that no matter how hard you try to stay away from all the bad aspects of politics – you are not who you are.

For participant 41, involvement in politics allows a "platform and opportunity" to express oneself which is a positive aspect of politics. This optimistic view of politics is immediately followed with a cynical view that you cannot stay away from the "bad aspects of politics" no matter how hard you try. She highlights the "bad" part of politics and also argues that if you get involved in politics you then are "not who you are" which implies that you lose yourself and identity through involvement in politics. Participant 43, a 23-year-old Architecture major from Morocco expresses a similar view,

> I would like to be in political office because I can translate the issues of my community to some actions if I am there whether it is laws or activities or actions or changing stuff or agreeing on stuff. The important thing for me is being the vehicle of public opinion. Why I would not like to be there – political arena is so not clean and has a lot of hidden agendas and stuff. I don't want to be involved in this and I just want to be there to help if there is something to do.

She explains that she would like to be involved in politics because of the possibility to do something for her "community." Actions for her are described through a variety of possibilities that can enhance "issues" that her community faces. She wants to be the "vehicle of public

opinion," but the political system is "not clean" and has many "hidden agendas" which are interconnected reasons why she does not want to be involved in politics. This tension is revealed between her hopeful language that she can be the "vehicle of public opinion" and the cynical rationale for abstaining from involved due to the "not clean" nature of politics.

The cynicism of the corrupted government can be a motivation that overrides any political interest in participants as expressed above. While participants may be interested in making change for their communities, their cynicism has produced a conscious abstinence from politics and a general sense of apathy.

Summary

Cynicism is an underlying justification for many participants' responses throughout the interviews and is the most frequently reoccurring theme within the interview data. The four sub-themes demonstrate the motivations behind the cynical discourses of MMIAPEZ women. Due to the perception of corruption, and the participants' lack of trust for their governments and politicians, MMIAPEZ women express high levels of cynicism. Participants also perceive the inability to get accurate information about what is happening in the government to contribute to the corruption, and thus their cynicism towards the government. It is important to note that MMIAPEZ women also expressed cynical views in tension with optimism that things would eventually improve in their country. However, overall this cynicism dominates MMIAPEZ women's discourse and breeds apathy because participants feel politics is corrupt and dysfunctional and they do not believe change is possible, which results in their active avoidance of politics.

Theme 3: My Choice, My Life, My Future: Political Ambition and Political Efficacy

Within this theme, three sub-themes demonstrate MMIAPEZ women's levels of political ambition and political efficacy. The three sub-themes that emerged are: 1) low political ambition and political efficacy, 2) high political ambition and political efficacy, and 3) women's perceptions of female politicians in MMIAPEZ.

NVivo analysis demonstrates that 37 of 58 participants made remarks coded as "low political efficacy" with a total of 64 references to "low political efficacy." Additionally, 21 of 58 participants made remarks coded as "high political efficacy" with a total of 32 references to "high political efficacy." Participants were asked scale questions during the interview to measure levels of political interest, ambition, and efficacy. To measure political interest, participants were asked "On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being no interest at all and 10 being extremely interested, how would you rank your level of interest in politics in your country?" The mean was 6.36 with a standard deviation of 2.56 which indicates a slight tilt towards interest (Table 5).

Table 5 Levels of Political Interest

Scale Indicator	Frequency	Percent
1-2 – Extremely uninterested	6	10.3
3-4 – Slightly uninterested	8	13.8
5-6 – Neutral	11	18.9
7-8 – Slightly interested	20	34.5
9-10 – Extremely interested	13	22.4

Participants were also asked to rank their level of political knowledge on a scale of 1-10 with 1 being not knowledgeable and 10 being very knowledgeable. The mean was 5.47 with a standard deviation of 2.01 which indicates an average in the middle of the range of political knowledge (Table 6).

Table 6 Levels of Political Knowledge

Scale Indicator	Frequency	Percent
1-2 – Extremely unknowledgeable	5	8.6
3-4 – Slightly unknowledgeable	11	19.2
5-6 – Neutral	24	41.4
7-8 – Slightly knowledgeable	15	25.8
9-10 – Extremely knowledgeable	3	5.1

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed with the statement "I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics." The mean was 3.0 with a standard deviation of 1.04 which reflects the split in participants' answers (Table 7).

Table 7 Consider Self Well-Qualified for Politics

Responses to "I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics."

Scale Indicator	Frequency	Percent
1 – Strongly agree	4	6.9
2 – Agree	18	31.0
3 - Neutral	11	19.0
4 - Disagree	24	41.4

5 – Strongly disagree	1	1.7

The participants' responses reveal the split in their perceived ability and qualifications to participate in politics which will now be discussed through their discursive constructions of political ambition and efficacy.

Low political ambition and political efficacy. The majority of participants expressed low political efficacy and explain that they did not feel qualified or knowledgeable enough to participate in politics. General lack of interest is also common for MMIAPEZ women as a justification for low political ambition. Most women viewed political participation in the immediate sense and indicated that they were not ready not to participate in politics. Cynicism towards their government and their own political knowledge, interest and capabilities reveals the multi-faceted constructions of their personal political efficacy.

Not qualified. Participants describe themselves as not yet qualified to participate in politics. Having the political knowledge and interest does not translate into qualification. Another common justification is that their college major is in a different area, which disqualifies them for participation in politics. Rather than just being aware of politics, participants argue that you must be extremely knowledgeable to be qualified. Participant 14 explains,

> Because my awareness doesn't really give me the qualification. I am aware of it, but I am not very aware of it. So I think to be part of the political system you need to know more than an average citizen. I know what an average citizen should know. I am doing my duty – I should be going beyond my duty to be in politics.

She argues that "awareness" of politics does not give the necessary "qualification" to participate in politics. Her political knowledge is that of an "average citizen," but to be involved in politics she explains that you should go "beyond" the "average citizen" knowledge level. This echoes

earlier cynical views of participants that express frustration with unqualified people entering into politics. Participant 43 expresses a similar view on knowledge and qualification when asked if she considered herself well-qualified to participate in politics. She answers,

> Because as I told you I do not think that I have the knowledge that is decent enough. I don't like the fact that people are jumping into politics without knowing – without having the knowledge. I would not do this myself.

Participant 43 expresses her feelings that her political knowledge level is not "decent enough." She then articulates her frustration that people enter politics without adequate levels of political knowledge, and that she would not enter without the appropriate political knowledge. This reveals the sentiment many participants share that they take politics seriously and tend to believe that people who participate in politics should be extremely knowledgeable. Even though lack of knowledge is a justification for their low political ambition and political efficacy, this does express high expectations for knowledgeable politicians.

Some participants outright acknowledge they do not have adequate political knowledge to be politically involved, but others express that they are still acquiring the required political knowledge. Participant 9 says,

> My interest in politics has been the past two to three years. So most of the information I have to-date is still not complete, there are still many things I have not learned. So still a lot of things about politics that kind of frustrate me at times to the extent I need to take a break from it you know.

Rather than completely dismiss her ability to participate based on inadequate knowledge, Participant 9 describes her political knowledge as incomplete. Her recent political interest means that she has only started to acquire political knowledge and she acknowledges "there are still many things" she has not yet learned. Her negativity is also reflected in her last statement when she says that politics can "frustrate" her "at times" so that she withdraws from acquiring political

knowledge and takes a "break" from it. Unlike the previous participants that display a dismissal of their abilities based on their political knowledge, Participant 9 is not dismissing her potential to gain the knowledge she would need to be politically active. Instead, she indicates her frustration does cause her to take breaks from learning more about politics.

Another justification for participant's low political ambition and efficacy is that their college major is in a different area than politics, which for them functions as a disqualifier for political participation even if they are interested in politics. Participant 25, a 20-year-old Business Administration major from Mongolia describes,

> I have a strong interest in politics, but I'm studying business, so it's kinda – I have confusion about it. I hear about my parents and cousin and I want to make a difference in the field, but I've already chosen my major, so it's like confusion for me.

She constructs her chosen major as a barrier for participation in politics even though she is interested. Because she did not chose a major in law or political science, she views her major in business as a disqualification for political participation. Her political interest is not viewed as an important contribution, rather her choice of major keeps her away from being qualified to participate in politics.

Not ready. Participants discursively construct their participation as a journey and explain that they do not currently view themselves as able or interested participating. They tend to place temporal restrictions on themselves by viewing their ability and desire to participate in politics in the immediate time construction as not ready. While the previous women generally articulated their lack of knowledge as a disqualifier for political participation, the view of political participation as a journey does not foreclose the possibility of participating in the future for some participants. Participant 55, a 20-year-old International Economic Relations major from Mongolia explains,

I feel like right now at this age I do not want to be in politics because it is very messy and I am not that interested right now. I feel like, and a lot of people in Mongolia feel like the government is corrupted and no collaboration between the parties. If you join a party – your life is set, but you have to kiss someone's ass. I might go into politics later when I'm like fifty. Just because I feel like the work I am doing right now will progress, and when it does progress into the future, I need to be in politics to make these changes, like I need to be in the Ministry of Education to make those changes.

Her cynicism is immediately expressed through her indictment of politics as "messy," and that is confirmed with tying her personal feelings to "a lot of people in Mongolia" who also feel that corruption exists. As mentioned earlier, cynicism breeds apathy and an active avoidance from politics which she also expresses here. She articulates that she is doing "work" right now but this is not taking place in the political sphere, and she clarifies later in the interview that she is involved with a community organization. Additionally, she articulates that party involvement is not a desirable action as "your life is set" and that you must abide by the party leaders. She also declares that she is not interested in politics "right now," but this is qualified by the fact that she might get involved in politics "later." She places temporal restrictions on her political involvement by claiming she does not want to be involved now, but possibly later. Her current passion and work in education she believes will eventually lead her into politics because she expresses that she would "need to be in politics" to accomplish her goals and policy changes.

Unlike Participant 55 who eventually sees herself as someone who could be involved in politics, Participant 43 also views herself as not currently able or qualified to participate in politics, but is not sure if she will ever be. She says,

I think that I should know a lot of things before getting involved in them. I am trying to know but do I have the strength and knowledge to evaluate and analyze all the parties that exist, and their background, and their history and their ideologies, and what they are willing to do to be involved with them? No, I don't trust myself to be able to do that at this age and point in my life. So I am trying to understand, it is a journey for me, if one day I feel that I want to belong to one party over another, maybe I will be.

Her level of political knowledge is indicted when she claims that she should know "a lot of things before" she gets involved. This is further qualified when she says "I am trying to know," but then immediately acknowledges that she does not have the necessary knowledge for the various political parties to make an informed decision. She doesn't "trust" herself to be able to make this caliber of a decision at this "age" and "point" in her life. This is similar to Participant 55 who places temporal restrictions and limitations on her political participation by viewing her ability only in the present time orientation. While she echoes the earlier sentiments of participants that express that they do not have sufficient levels of political knowledge, she does not foreclose the possibility of it happening in the future. For her, this is a "journey" and she does not definitively know what the end result will be. Participant 1, a 21-year-old Business and Finance major from Morocco expresses a similar perspective when asked if she considers herself well-qualified to participate in politics with, "I am not ready yet. I'm just starting my path. Maybe in a couple of years, yes." Similar to Participant 43 who uses "journey" to describe her future, she uses "path" to express that she is not sure where the future will leader her in political involvement. She also reiterates the earlier temporal restrictions of participants by only viewing her capability and ambition in the present time and not forecasting her future political participation.

Not a welcoming place. Participants express that politics is not seen as a place for women or young people and is a rather hostile environment. While the previous section focused on temporal restrictions participants' placed on themselves, this section highlights the spatial limitations participants constructed about their possible participation in politics. Gender discrimination and bias function as a barrier for female participation in politics and are articulated as a justification for low ambition and efficacy. Participant 40 explains,

> I would not want to be in politics because we have a male-dominated society. We do have women in politics, but they also belong from political backgrounds – their family backgrounds are political – the women in politics currently, but I don't think so that I would suit well in politics because it requires a lot of experience, which the women in politics currently acquire from their families and they learn – they have good training since the beginning, so I don't think that I would be able to suit well because I find it very messy so I don't want to be a part of it.

Participant 40 immediately claims she would not want to be involved in politics because of the "male-dominated society." She explains that many of the current female politicians come from political families which prepare them for a career in politics, and she lacks this experience. She justifies her low political efficacy by not being part of a political family and not having the level of experience needed. Her cynicism also influences her political efficacy as she does not think she would "suit well" because politics is "messy" and she would not want to be "part of it."

Defeatist outlooks are the main impetuses for participants' low political ambition and low political efficacy as they express frustration and skepticism with the current system. Participants express their skepticism by constructing the political system as a broken, they do not believe that they could facilitate change nor desire to be part of the corruption. As was discussed in the cynicism theme, participants cite the barrier to political participation as corruption that cannot be changed or overcome. Additionally, due to the corrupt nature of the government and lack of trust participants have, they have articulated that they believe change cannot come from the government, rather it should come from outside the government such as nongovernmental organizations. Participant 54 describes,

> I do not want to be in political office first of all because I cannot relate to that type of work. I had been in a political party and I know some friends of mine who are part of political parties and this is not my thing. Also I think there is so much corruption and I wouldn't fit in that corruption environment even if I wanted to change something. If I went there, I would go there to change something because I am not satisfied with what is going on, but I do not want to work in that environment.

She first distances herself from political involvement because she "cannot relate to that type of work," which expresses her disinterest in politics. Participant 54 does acknowledge that she was previously politically involved and was part of a political party, but has since withdrawn from the political party. Corruption is a motivation for her low political efficacy as she states that she wouldn't "fit in that corruption environment" and would be unable to facilitate any change. This negative outlook is used to justify her active abstinence from political participation. She also ends her statement by reiterating that she would not want to be in politics because of the "environment" which elicits the previous comment of corruption.

Politics is also viewed as an arena for young citizens to be actively engaged. Participant 52, a 19-year-old English Literature major from India says,

> I don't want to be because the opportunities are not given first of all. They don't even give opportunities for the younger generation and we can't express our ideas. Our ideas would be suppressed and domination would be for those who have been for many years. They don't give chance to younger generation.

She argues that "opportunities" are not given to youth and they are precluded from being able to express themselves politically. If younger people are involved in politics, she articulates that the more-experienced politicians would silence the youth. This cynical view of politics as an unwelcoming environment for young citizens is her justification for low political efficacy because she does not believe her voice and views would be appreciated or valued. As discussed earlier, cynicism breeds apathy and results in active avoidance of politics. While previous participants have communicated gender as the main barrier for political participation, Participant 52 emphasizes age as a barrier because value is not placed on young citizens.

Loss of values. Another justification for low political efficacy and ambition is the participants' expressions that they would not want to enter politics because they would lose their

sense of self and moral compass. Politics is viewed as a messy, corrupt system and being involved in such a system would cause a loss of their values and result in actions they might regret. Participant 18 argues,

> I won't be able to do what politicians are supposed to do. Because maybe my personality type. I don't think I will be able – maybe if I want to maybe I can. But I don't want to and if I ever went into politics I would be sick, maybe some depression because I can't handle conflicts and people arguing. But I'm not really interested in politics because I believe it won't help especially in my country. I'm not very interested in all the details and searching for more. Maybe because my family isn't interested in politics – they've lost interest and trust in politics. It is not any focus of mine.

Her first explanation to the question of if she views herself as qualified for political office is due to her "personality type" as she does not believe she is capable of doing "what politicians are supposed to do." The cynical views of politics as corrupt and a messy place are justifications for not being involved. She explains that if she got involved in politics she would "be sick" and possibly have "depression" because of the political environment that is ripe of "conflicts" and "arguing." A more blatant justification for her low political efficacy is "I believe it won't help especially in my country." Her explicit defeatist outlook has clouded her perceptions of her ability to make changes in her country. The final justification for her low efficacy is her lack of interest in politics. Her lack of political interest is also influenced by her family since they also lack interest and "trust" in politics.

The skepticism that underlies the participants' views of politics characterizes politics as a messy, undesirable environment, and participants cannot see themselves as being part of this system. Participant 44 says,

> I do not want to be in political office. Personally I am a very peaceful person so I feel like if I get into politics, I'm interested in it, but I feel if I get in it I will lose my values. I live by my values and I don't want to lose my values so I prefer to just watch and observing and not playing the game.

For Participant 44, the loss of "values" is the paramount justification for her lack of involvement in politics. Even though she admits that she has "interest" in politics, she wants to stay true to her "values," thus she would rather just "observe" rather than be directly involved in politics. Additionally, she conveys that she fears losing her values and thus her act of abstaining from politics is a way to preserve her personal values. Negativity is again a driving motivation for the low political efficacy as she views politics as a messy and corrupt system that would force her to lose her current sense of "values" which is why she does not want to be involved. Participant 48, a 22-year-old Aerospace Engineering major had a similar perspective, "I wouldn't want to be in political office because I think that people who work in these offices must make some choices sometimes they do not necessarily want to make. I want to have a free conscious." She echoes the sentiment that she would possibly lose something by being involved in politics as she would have to possibly "make some choices" that she might not "want to make." Her skepticism collides with her desire to have "a free conscious" which she believes could not happen if she was involved in politics. This comment reveals her negative outlook that assumes that everything that touches politics is tainted and messy. Again, cynicism is justification for participants to actively avoid political participation.

High political ambition and political efficacy. Women that expressed a high internal efficacy displayed self-confidence in their ability to understand and participate in politics. Participants expressed that they are capable of being in political office, that it is their chosen career path, want to be a driver of change in their country, and that being involved in politics provides them the opportunity to create change. Participant 29, a 24-year-old Economics major from Afghanistan encapsulates all three of these major themes of high political efficacy. She says,

> What I am interested in politics because I want to do something for my country seriously – especially for women. Violence against women, adult education and all other problems that women are now suffering now in my country. I want to do something for them. Without politics – without being in politics I can't do that. Without having power and authority I can't do that.

Her interest in politics is motivated by her desire to "do something" for her country, and specifically "women." She acknowledges this is her future path and career goal to be involved in politics, while at the same time arguing that she is capable, but must be in politics to accomplish her goals. For her, she must have the "power" and "authority" that politics affords her to truly make change in the various problems that women are "suffering" in Afghanistan.

Capability. Participants with a high/positive efficacy and ambition express their capability to be involved in politics as: having morals and being honest, having education and knowledge, and being concerned and passionate about the issues in their country. Education was the most commonly cited justification for a participant's ability to participate in politics. Participant 28 explains,

> Because I do think that I have a higher degree of education than most of the politicians Pakistan has right now. And I'm more concerned with the issues of my country and I research more on them than most of the politicians we have because they are just involved in gathering money for themselves.

She articulates her "higher degree of education" to make her preferable to current politicians that lack this education. For her, education is a primary factor to distinguish a politician's ability, which reinforces previous participants' remarks that places an importance on knowledge for a politician's credibility and capability. This also highlights tensions discussed earlier as gender discrimination as society tends to discriminate against educated women and does not view them as "good women" since they violate traditional gender expectations. In addition to education, her concern for the "issues" of her country make her more qualified than current politicians who

are in politics to "gather money" and do not care about the citizens. Participant 51, a 20-year-old

English Literature major also from Pakistan expresses a similar opinion of education,

> Because I spent a lot of time in my education in my academics. I've read extensively
> about this – not like a lot of politicians in Pakistan I'm not illiterate and uneducated, I've
> actually read more and I follow political issues. I write to magazines. I think I am
> qualified enough became I am better than them – at least I am educated and literate.

She also uses her education as an explanation for why she would be more qualified than current

politicians which continues the sentiment that education is a powerful qualification for

politicians. Participant 51 distinguishes herself from "a lot of politicians" in her country that are

"illiterate and uneducated" and explains her interest and knowledge make her more qualified to

be a politician than the current politicians. Her claim that she is "better than them" is a criticism

of current politicians and reinforces the ideology that politicians should be highly educated and

knowledgeable. In addition to education as a qualification for being a capable politician,

participants explain that everyone is able to participate in politics. Participant 36, a 23-year-old

Social Work major from Zambia argues,

> Because I am eligible as a human being. As a human being having equal opportunity as
> it states in the laws of Zambia. And also because I have given myself time to educate
> myself about politics and there is that the only way I can, on a large scale, help my
> community in terms of child-related issues is to put my voice across.

She explains that as a "human being" she is "eligible" to participate in politics at the forefront.

"Equal opportunity" means that she is qualified just as a "human being" to be engaged and

involved in politics. Contrary to Participant 51's statement that education and literacy make her

qualified for political office, Participant 36 qualifies herself for political office simply as being

"human." These two participants paint a large scope of the continuum of how participants view

qualification for political office which ranges from mere human existence to educated and

literate.

In addition to education, being passionate about issues of their country is a qualification that makes one capable of participating in politics. Participant 30 explains,

> Because I think in order to be in politics you need to be aware of the current situation and be very educated and passionate about the problems people are facing and I think I have all three of them in me. And I have been the student representative for my department for three years, so I can actually empathize with the people.

For Participant 30, there are three justifications for her ability to participate in politics: being aware, being educated and being passionate. Unlike the previous comments that distinguished themselves from current politicians, she focuses on her personal qualifications and capabilities to argue why she is qualified. She also articulates that her past experience as a student representative has allowed her to "empathize with the people," which speaks to her passion.

Having a moral compass and being honest is also expressed as a reason for a participant to have political efficacy and ambition. Participant 8 says, "I feel that my concept of good and right and of justice and honest is something that is missing or very vague in the political system." She expresses her cynicism that politics is not currently a very honest system, but she has the "concept" of "good and right" that makes her capable of participating in politics. She also calls upon "justice" and honesty as characteristics that distinguish her from current politicians.

Future paths. Some participants express their direct interest in politics as a future career path. Passion can be a driving force for their chosen career in politics. When asked if she is well qualified to participate in politics, Participant 9 explains,

> Primarily the first thing that is most important is that you have an interest in this and that I do and my interest is pretty selfless right now. I don't know if I get in the process how it turns out to be. But for now, it is a very selfless interest for my country. So that's the first thing. And I think it is the most important thing. And secondly yes I do have the knowledge and can convince people of that as well.

She articulates "selfless" interest in her country and being in politics as a motivation and justification for her political involvement. For her, this "selfless interest" is "the most important thing" which also implies that this perhaps is lacking in the status quo. This cynicism was discussed earlier as participants expressed their frustration that politicians act in their own self-interest. Later in the interview she does make remarks about politicians being self-motivated and are only involved for their own interests and to make money. The second qualification for being able to participate in politics is having "knowledge" which echoes the capability she possesses to be a politician. Again, knowledge is constructed as a primary qualification by participants for politicians. Participant 10 has a similar explanation of her future career,

> Well politics is my choice and my life and my future and I need to participate in politics because they make a decision about myself so I think it is important to raise my voice and my voice to be heard.

She explicitly states that a political career is her "choice" and her "life" which is qualified by the argument that it is important to make her voice heard. While she doesn't explicitly cite any direct qualifications of her ability to participate in politics, it is her chosen career path. She expresses high political efficacy by claiming it is "important" to "raise her voice" which implies that she can make a valuable contribution to politics.

Past experiences in clubs and organization are also a motivating factor for future political involvement. Participant 40 says,

> Because I have been a part of the National Parliament of Pakistan – my motive is to serve my country and to work for the benefit of citizens of my country. So I got the opportunity to join this platform and so yeah, I became part of it and I got involved with mainstream politics in my country. That's how it developed because I get to meet members of the Parliament and National Assembly.

She calls her involvement in the youth National Parliament of her country and she explains her desire to "serve" her country and to provide for her country. Through her involvement in this

organization she has been able to meet various politicians, and it was the driving force for her involvement in politics.

     Desire to do something. The MMIAPEZ women articulate motivations for their political ambitions as wanting to improve their communities and their desire to facilitate change. Participant 5 mentions,

> I want to improve myself and I want to do something for the community. Staying at home is like you are doing nothing. It's not that you aren't doing nothing – yeah you are raising boys, but you aren't contributing to the development of your community and your country.

Her motivations are articulated as personal and communal. Personally she wants to "improve" herself, which she implies can be done through involvement in politics. Her communal motivation is her desire to "do something for the community" which is followed by an attack of "staying at home" is equivalent to "doing nothing." This statement calls into question the traditional gender roles, addressed in Theme 1, held by societies and she argues that even though you are "raising boys" you do not contribute to your society. For Participant 5, she must get outside of the home to accomplish something and for the betterment of her community.

     Participants express that while they can make a difference at a local and lower level, politics is an arena that affords them the power and opportunity to make larger change. Participant 41 explains,

> I would want to be in political office so that I have the mic or opportunity to speak about the situations that I want to speak about and to have the platform where I can professionally say and talk about situations.

For Participant 41, political office affords the "opportunity" which she also describes as the "mic" to speak on the issues she is passionate about. Without this "mic" she implies that she is unable to openly speak about issues and make change which suggests that politics is the only

avenue that can afford her the opportunity to facilitate change. This is contrary to earlier participants with low political efficacy that claimed they would rather be involved in community organizations or non-governmental organizations than politics due to the corruption. Participant 41 views politics as "platform" she needs to make a larger change. Participant 43 echoes this sentiment,

> I would like to be in political office because I can translate the issues of my community to some actions if I am there whether it is laws or activities or actions or changing stuff or agreeing on stuff. The important thing for me is being the vehicle of public opinion.

She has the desire to be the "vehicle of public opinion" and through political office believes she can accomplish various tasks. For Participant 43, "action" is a driving factor which is also reflecting in her interest of "changing stuff." Her interest in political office is to better her community and country to improve the issues facing her community.

In Afghanistan, may security threats exist for women that involve themselves in politics as mentioned previously in the gender barrier theme. Participant 29 describes,

> No one knows that I am doing politics – no one is stopping me but I never share it with people. I am doing it with myself and some of my friends, but mostly it's dangerous for a woman to do such things. I received many warnings from the Taliban to stay away – stay away from these things otherwise you will lose your family. I receive so many threats from them. I don't want to give terrorists – I don't want them to feel empowerment. I don't want them to feel like they are strong and they can do those things – I want to make them feel weak.

She admits that she is interested and active in politics currently, but "no one knows" because she does not "share it" with most people. Security is addressed as an issue when she acknowledges that "mostly it's dangerous for women" and in order to manage this security threat she attempts to keep her political involvement a secret. Instead of having a cynical view and abstaining from politics, Participant 29 expresses a passion for being involved and a desire not to give into the threats given to her from the Taliban.

Tensions with skepticism. Participants with high political efficacy acknowledged corruption in the government and cynical views, but also articulated that they desire to make changes or will be involved if needed. Unlike previous participants that justified their abstaining from politics as a result of their negative outlook towards politics, these participations do not actively foreclose the possibility of political participation. Participant 7 says, "I have trust in myself so that I can make a change. Even though there are corruptions and a lot of problems our country is functioning. Even though there are imbalances it functions." She indicts the current political system as having "corruption" and "problems," but optimistically describes herself has being able to "make a change." Her efficacy is quite high when she says she has "trust" in herself that she is capable to bring changes to a corrupt and problematic political system. While most participants that expressed skepticism and frustration with corruption voiced an active avoidance of politics, she wants to be involved in spite of this negativity and corruption.

Political interest may be lacking for participants, but they remark that they would participate if they are needed. Participant 38 explains,

> If they needed me – there is not a lot of activism of women in Afghanistan – we have some. Most of them are just interested in education and knowledge. First I want to get knowledge and then if they needed me to participate in politics then I would participate. I don't like politics but if they needed me I would.

While she does not have a high interest to be politically involved, Participant 38 argues that she would "if they needed me." A driving factor for this is driven by the lack of "activism of women" in her country. She also articulates that she wants to acquire more "knowledge" before she feels able to participate politics. Her defeatist outlook is bluntly expressed as "I don't like politics," but instead of actively avoiding political participation, she claims she would be involved if "needed."

Women's perceptions of female politicians in MMIAPEZ. The MMIAPEZ women were asked if barriers to female political participation existed and through this question and other questions pertaining to gender and participation, participants discussed female politicians in their home countries. Participants mentioned that women were present in politics because of the required quota system, which yielded both positive and negative feelings among participants. Participants were fairly evenly split on whether there were a lot of women present in their political systems or not. While parity is quite far away in female representation in MMIAPEZ, participants also acknowledged that more women should be involved in politics.

Quota systems. As mentioned in Chapter 3, almost all governments in MMIAPEZ have quota systems for women. Participant 2 explains,

> Technically we do have a system that allows for thirty-three percent of seats in Parliament to women, but it is hard to find women to exercise that right. So we might have thirty-three percent of seats reserved but not enough women fill them. That's again because of the lack of knowledge. Also the process of participation and representation can make a lot of obstacles for women especially when she has a gendered role like looking after her family, children, and husband.

In Mongolia, while the quota system exists for thirty-three percent of seats to be reserved for women, it is difficult for women to "exercise that right" and often those seats do not get filled with female candidates. She credits the lack of knowledge as a justification for the lack of women in politics and also the gendered expectations that exist in society. These gendered expectations place burdens on women that may discourage them from running for political office. Also from Mongolia, Participant 10 argues,

> As for the women's participation there was a new law passed in the last election – they made a quota. Out of 76 there should be at least 10 percent or higher women politicians. The women who usually do politics they find are very intelligent and very educated. Now we have ten out of seventy-six but I don't see equal participation.

These differing perspectives on the quota system in Mongolia illustrate the complex nature of the quota system for female participation. As noted in Chapter 3, Mongolia has a quota system in Parliament for at least twenty percent of candidates on a party's list must be women, and at the local level this number is higher at thirty percent. Participant 10 does acknowledge that the women that are involved in politics are "very intelligent" and "very educated" which gives a positive evaluation of female politicians in her country.

Some participants acknowledge that the mere presence of the quota system may not be desirable. When asked if there are barriers to female participation, Participant 1, a 21-year-old Business and Finance major answered,

> Yes, there are. Actually they just implemented the quota policy and like now we have thirty percent of women's participation in politics. In the government we only have one women and she's not a feminist so we cannot truly hope to see some changes.

For Participant 1, she articulated that the quota system does exist in her country, but immediately points out that a current female politician is not a "feminist" so she cannot bring changes that the country needs. She is implicitly arguing that perhaps this female politician is not advancing the issues of women's rights enough.

Low perceptions of female visibility. Participants were divided on their perceptions of female presence in political systems with 33 of the 58 participants articulating they did not believe there are enough women in politics and there could be more. Women who articulated there were not enough women in politics were mostly women with lower levels of political efficacy. Lower levels of political efficacy can influence how one perceives the current political system. As a result, these low levels of political efficacy can explain that the women are not engaged enough with politics to notice or be aware of the women that are actively involved in politics in their country. The skepticism of these women and their lack of political efficacy

could account for their articulations and quantifications of women currently involved in their governments. Even though women may be politically involved, Participant 18 argues that it is still a problem in terms of representation,

> We have only one minister who is a female. Even if she is a female – she doesn't want to be there – not because she is a woman. They actually elected her just to say that we also have women. I think that this shouldn't be the reason. I think Morocco's problem is that there are not a lot of women who are politicians and work in politics.

She specifically attacks the quota representational system and argues that we should not elect women just because "she is a woman." In this regard, the female minister is more of a token representative to answer the argument of women not being involved in the political sense. The problem for Participant 18 is that women are not politicians, and this is the reason for low levels of female representation. This low levels of female representation is also described by Participant 26,

> In this political party that is governing Morocco, it has only been one minister who is a woman among thirty-five males. People protested that why is there only one minister that is a woman in the government, they retake elections just to satisfy women, but they are not believing in women's capabilities.

She gives a more concrete illustration of the inequality in gender representation in her political system. The barrier she articulates as the justification for lower numbers of female representation is that society is "not believing" in female politicians and that they are capable of being in those positions. Her comment highlights a tension between the claim that society does not believe in women, but yet they "retake elections" to "satisfy" women. This reflects the previous sentiments that gender barriers and gender discrimination may slowly be eroding over time as they do try to "satisfy" women.

Even though quota systems exist, Participant 36 points out that the gendered barriers prevent them from being in political office:

> There is a lack of women in Parliament. We have very few number of women that are participating in Parliament. Possibly because they are not given a chance – they are not mostly voted in. And secondly because most structures do not allow women – or do not give the ability that women need in politics.

Gender barriers are expressed as the reason women are "not mostly voted in" and they are not afforded adequate opportunities for political representation that first exists because they are not voted into office. Additionally, as previously mentioned, participants share the phenomena that women are not voting for female candidates when they run for political office. This presents an additional barrier for female politicians. She articulates the second reason as structural barriers that "do not allow" "or do not give" the opportunities to women to be involved in politics. The gender barrier functions as a primary reason women lack representation in Parliament for Participant 36.

While acknowledging that women are present in the political system, Participant 34 expresses that she wishes there were more. She argues,

> Definitely I wish more women would come forward and participate in these things and make their voices heard. I believe a lot of women in America are contributing and I think participation in politics – women could contribute more in my country.

For Participant 34, the female political representation is there, but she does "wish more women" would be involved and "participate." She makes a comparison to female politicians in the United States and "believes" that women are participating in the United States and she wishes that more "women would contribute" which expresses that there is not enough female representation in her country.

At the end of our interview, I asked Participant 31, a 19-year-old Sociology major from India if she had anything she would like to add and she said, "I believe the very fact that women are not adequately represented in political system makes it challenging for issues that concern

women more to be brought forward in the political bodies." She expresses that if more women were involved in politics that hopefully more concern could be paid to women's issues in her country.

High perceptions of female visibility. Participants are rather divided on the issue of the perception of female presence in their political systems as 25 of the 58 participants claimed there are not enough women in politics. Participants who claimed there are not enough women gave more descriptive explanations and answers, and participants who perceived a lot of women to be involved in politics gave very short answers and made very short claims such as "yes there are many women involved" or "yes lots of women are in politics" without descriptions and explanations overall. The women who declare that women are visible and numerical in their governments are typically the same participants who have higher levels of political efficacy. Higher levels of political efficacy can motivate an individual to be more politically knowledgeable and involved, thus their perceptions of women's involved could be slanted towards seeing more involvement than those with low political efficacy. This is important to note as they may be seeking out political information and participation, they may be more likely to notice women in the government and it may perceptually be of larger quantity than for someone who is not paying as much attention. Some participants argue that there are quite a few women in politics. Participant 41 says,

> Yeah, there are so many. There are a lot of womens [sic]. We have parliamentarians, we have – I know my professor last month was a candidate for the rank of Minister of Health and she got voted and is now the Minister of Health in Afghanistan. There are many women, especially in Parliament there are a lot of women.

For Participant 41, there are "so many" women in the Parliament and she cites a personal reference of knowing her former professor who is now the Minister of Health. Without citing a

number or giving a more concrete representation of how many women are involved in politics, the qualifier she uses is "a lot" and "many." Participant 42 echoes this sentiment,

> Oh yeah there are a ton of them who hold political office in my country and I see more and more people becoming part of the legislative assembly and parliament. I'd like the numbers to be higher, but I've seen a significant increase and I think we are getting better.

She says there are "tons of them" in reference to the amount of women in political office and she argues that this number is climbing as she sees "more and more" participating. Participant 48, a 20-year-old Software Engineer major from Afghanistan has a similar perspective and says, "I couldn't name them but there are women in the parliament and we have women who are ministers." Her level of political efficacy is self-reported as a relatively low level which could explain why she may not know the names of the female politicians, but she is aware that there are female politicians in her government.

Summary

Participants were more likely to express low levels of political ambition and political efficacy, which are largely driven by their defeatist outlook towards politics. Participants also justify their disinterest in political participation due to the lack of qualification and experience, as well as the potential they would lose themselves and their values in the process. The various justifications for low political ambition and political efficacy impact participants and become entangled in their perceptions of their ability to participate in politics. Participants construct their justifications for low political ambition and political efficacy as temporal and spatial restrictions, as well as an area where loss of values is possible. These negative expressions of participants' rationalization for active avoidance of politics reinforces the impact cynicism has on political efficacy and political ambition.

Women expressing high levels of political ambition and political efficacy are motivated by their desire to participate in politics due to their perceived capabilities and their passion to do something for their country and society. In spite of gender barriers and gender discrimination, women with high levels of political ambition and political efficacy view themselves as capable and worthy of participating in politics. Even though skepticism is present in participants' remarks, they do not actively abstain from political participation, but rather use that skepticism as a motivation to justify their political participation.

Participants were fairly evenly divided on the response of answering the question if barriers for women's political participation currently exist in their country. Some participants believe that women are quite visible and represented, whereas other participants disagree and express their frustration with the low levels of female representation in politics and argue for more female presence in politics with low levels of political efficacy resulting in perceptions of not enough women and high levels of political efficacy resulting in higher perceptions of women's involvement in politics. Future research can confirm this interpretation with the use of generalizable statistical data to analyze the correlations between levels of political efficacy and perceptions of female presence in politics.

Follow-up Survey Responses

At the conclusion of the leadership institute, participants were given a follow-up survey that asked for their written responses. The purpose of this follow-up survey was to address RQ3 and evaluate whether participants expressed a shift in their discourse after participation in the leadership institute. Participants were asked if after their participation in the intensive leadership institute, their opinions on politics and political involvement have changed. This study does not make causal claims nor claim a direct effect, but rather this study seeks to investigate possible

shifts of discourse and opinions from participants about their political interest, involvement and ambition at the end of the institute. Three major themes emerged from the follow-up surveys: participants expressed increased confidence, participants viewed positive changes in their political perspectives about involvement, and participants did not see a change in their political perspectives.

Increased confidence and positive perspectives. Nearly all participants (n=51) remarked that after their involvement in the institute, they felt more confidence in themselves and their leadership capabilities. Participant 5 explains,

> Before this experience, politics was an impossible thing to do. Now this is the lesson I learned from my experience nothing is impossible. "The sky is only the limit." I got the confidence and motivation needed to go on in my path.

She admits that her previous perspective on politics was rather cynical and she believed political participation was "impossible." However, after her "experience" at the institute her outlook has altered, and she believes that "nothing is impossible." This positive reflection is articulated by her statement that she has gained "confidence and motivation."

While perspectives on the state of politics in MMIAPEZ countries may have not altered for some women, the confidence boost they experienced has served as a motivation to be politically involved. Participant 44 describes,

> After my participation in the leadership institute, I do see politics in my country differently. Not that it got better or that it has improved, but I just feel like I wanna go back home and be engaged in politics as much as I can, which is the thing I was very afraid of doing before.

She argues that she does view politics "differently" but qualifies this sentiment that is has not gotten "better" or "improved," but her motivation for being politically involved has changed. Participant 44 explains that she wants to be "engaged in politics" when she returns home, and

that this is because she is now confident to be involved. Her last statement expresses that she was "afraid" "before," but implied in her statement is this newfound confidence.

The increased confidence is also viewed as an opportunity for more female participation in politics. Participant 10 says,

> The leadership institute made me feel much more confident in myself, in what I am striving for and passionate about. Since we had only one woman as Minister of Education in history, I started to believe I could be the second. What has changed my outlook is that the more women need to be politically involved, more women's voices need to be heard.

She declares that she now feels "much more confident" and this confidence has transpired into her believing that she could be the "second" female Minister of Education in her country. Additionally, she claims her "outlook" has changed in the view that more women need to be involved in politics and more female "voices need to be heard." Her increased confidence as well as her encouragement of more female participation is expressed as her experience in the institute. Participant 43 had a similar perspective and shares, "KWLI gave me the confidence I was lacking, and I am definitely considering running for office." For Participant 43, this increased "confidence" has motivated her to possible run for political office someday.

Increased confidence is also expressed as "courage" from participants and the belief that regardless of their gender, they are able to voice their opinions. Participant 9 explains,

> Being there has given me the courage to stand up for what I believe in without any reservations as to how I would be mocked or ridiculed on the basis of my gender. It has propelled me to make my views heard without using my gender as a shield for not really speaking my mind. I am now more confident when it comes to addressing issues and analyzing situations than I was before.

"Courage" for Participant 9 is articulated as being able to express herself without fear that she would be "mocked or ridiculed" because she is a woman. Additionally, she asserts that she has

been "propelled' not to use "gender" as an excuse for not expressing herself. Her "confidence"

is declared as helping her not to use gender as an excuse for not being involved or vocal.

The majority of participants (n=34) expressed positive sentiments and shifts in their

political perceptions. Participants were asked if they viewed politics differently after their

exposure to adaptive leadership and many remarked that their previous viewed on politics have

shifted. Participant 22 explains,

> I think yes, because politic [sic] is the simplest example of leadership. We see them as leaders and we admit that they can have authority for many things just because they are in higher positions. But for now I've realized that authority is so different than adaptive leadership.

She makes the connection between politics and leadership and argues that politics is the

"simplest example" of acting leadership. She also indicts the concept of authority politicians

have, but she states that adaptive leadership has helped her realize that this is different.

Participant 22 later writes,

> I have changed. I will be much more active when I get home because now I believe that even a one single person's little action can influence the entire system. So I will let the system hear my voice and influence the society by my active participation in the political activities.

She claims that she will be "much more active" when she returns home as the result of believing

that even one person can "influence" the larger "system." For her, expressing herself and her

opinions is important to do through increased political involvement. Participant 47, a 20-year-

old Software Engineering student from Afghanistan echoes this sentiment,

> When I go back home, I will participate more with social activists and I will try to be a politically active person. Because it's so important and right now I have the ability to join with my political friends. I realize I can do lots of things for women if I will be in politics.

She also articulates that she has a desire to be more politically involved when she returns home and she believes it to be "important." Additionally, she argues that she can specifically do "things for women" if she is actively engaged in politics.

Participants explained that they may not have previously been interested in politics, but they now believe that it is important to be aware and involved. Participant 5 argues,

> I think it is time for me to start learning about politics. It is very important to know how politics works in my country. I was not interested before but now I should, especially for someone who is interested in change and contributing to the development of her country.

She points out that she was "not interested" in politics previously, but now believes that she should be. For Participant 5, "it is time" to start "learning about politics" since she is interested in promoted change in her country. While she doesn't claim an active desire to increase involvement, she focuses on becoming more politically aware in her country which demonstrates an increase sense of obligation to her country.

Participants express that now they believe that politics has multiple perspectives that deserve value. Participant 11 explains,

> This institute gave me a broader perspective of politics. I'd been cooperating and communicated with many different kinds of girls who have different backgrounds. And it was interesting to hear and contrast different kind of concerns. Now I got that, in my home country that there are things that must be changed and there are things I now appreciate.

She describes her political perspective as "broader" because her experience at the institute gave her opportunities to interact with women from various "backgrounds." These experiences gave her the ability to see multiple different perspectives which has driven her to recognize things that "must be changed" while also appreciating others.

While skepticism may still be present for participants, they articulate a positive statement with political perceptions or involvement. Participant 24, 20-year-old Business and Trade major

from India explains, "It seems to be more approachable and accessible now. It is a dirty game. But now I can know that there are still ways one can get across to it." She still views politics as a "dirty game," but believes that she can still be involved and "get across to it" which indicates a positive perception of political involvement. Participant 33 also expresses that her skepticism still exists, but now has an appreciation for politics. She says, "I am more willing and anxious about what is going on politically in my country. This is because I thought politicians do nothing but now I know that it takes more than one person to get something done." For Participant 33, she is still "anxious" about politics in her country, but she acknowledges that she previously viewed politicians as not doing anything. She now argues that it takes "more than one person" and this altered perspective is constructed as responsibility rests with many people instead of just one single politician. Participant 4 expresses similar sentiments,

> My view has changed. First it seemed as an ugly game to just gain power and money, but not now I think. Politics is about standing up for one's rights and equality, but sadly, some mean politicians ruined the real meaning of politics.

She expresses a cynical view that politics is an "ugly game" that politicians enter simply for "power" and "money." However, she says this view has changed and while some "mean politicians" have "ruined" the genuine nature of politics, she believes politics is about expressing your voice and "standing up" for things you believe in such as "rights" and "equality." So while her first construction of politics was as a corrupt system, she has expanded her perspective to be one that is more positive.

Participants acknowledge that gender barriers exist for women in politics, but argue that more female participation is valuable. When asked if she sees politics differently, Participant 9 declared, "Yes, I can be part of it. It will be an adaptive challenge because conditions for women are not very feasible." She acknowledges that the gender barrier still exists for women, but calls

upon her experience and learning of adaptive leadership as her perspective on being involved.

An "adaptive challenge" is one that requires a change in priorities, habits, and beliefs (Heifetz,

Grashow, & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). Since women are not afforded equal

opportunities in her country for political participation, she labels this an "adaptive challenge" and

acknowledges that she wants to be involved. Participant 10 expresses a similar sentiment,

> Now I see that women need to be involved in politics. Most women think it is a platform
> of men, but unfortunately it should be a game of both as those to make policy in our
> countries sometimes forget what women and children want.

Again, the gender barrier is called upon in politics, but Participant 10 claims "now" she "sees"

that more female participation should exist in politics. She also argues that having women in

politics is important for women's and children's issues to be addressed.

The inclusivity call for more female representation in politics is also expressed by the

sentiment that everyone should be involved in politics regardless of major, Participant 41, "A

theme is a need for every single person to be involved in politics actively regardless of what their

field of study is." Justifications for low self-efficacy in the interviews were explanations from

participants that their major was in a different field of study than law or politics, and this served

as a disqualification for them to participate in politics.

No perceived changes. While most participants gave positive reflections of political

involvement during the follow-up surveys, some participants (n=11) did express that their

perspectives on politics remained consistent with their interview responses. When asked if her

perspective on political involvement has changed, Participant 21, 20-year-old Marketing major

from Morocco says, "No, because the reality is so clear and so complex at the same time and it's

hard for me to change my perspective about it." Her negative outlook is expressed with politics

being "complex" while also being "clear," which is her justification for why her perspective

remains the same and she does not desire to be politically involved. Participant 26 echoes this sentiment and describes, "No I'd prefer to practice leadership alone and be active in that field more than politics." She explains that she still does not want to be politically involved, but would rather engage in "leadership alone."

Participants also expressed that they did not see a connection between adaptive leadership and politics, thus they still remained uninterested in political involvement. It is important to note that the intention of the leadership program is not to specifically motivate political participation, rather the focus of the institute is on leadership theory and practice. Participant 49, states "No change in opinion because we learned about adaptive challenges for the most of the time. We didn't really talk or learn much about political situations." For her, there is a disconnect between politics and leadership, thus she argues her opinion to still not be politically involved exists.

Participants who expressed a positive sentiment towards multiple perspectives mentioned the benefit of these multiple perspectives, but other participants argue that those different perspectives had no influence. Participant 34 declares, "Nothing has changed about the way politics are in my country, regardless of the different perspectives." Even though she was exposed to a variety of perspectives and opinions, she shares that her desire to not be politically involved is still true.

Skepticism is also still a justification for lack of political involvement. Participant 42 says, "I still believe politicians are in it for the power and not to bring change. I feel disinterested overall. And I'd rather spend my time exploring other answers." Her negative outlook is expressed in politician's self-interest for "power" and "not to bring change" which makes her feel "disinterested." For her, politics is less desirable than finding other alternatives to problems facing her country.

Another justification for low political efficacy was the lack of political knowledge of participants. Participants explained that this lack of knowledge still existed after their participation in the institute, thus they did not see themselves as able to participate in politics. Participant 30 explains, "I still think I do not have the adequate knowledge about my country or global politics. It is because we haven't been politically engaged." As she explains the institute does not explicitly focus on politics, so she does not possess "adequate knowledge" about politics to be politically involved.

Summary

The follow-up surveys investigated the participant's discursive constructions of their political interest, ambition and efficacy at the end of the institute. This study does not attempt to show a direct effect of the leadership institute on the participants, rather the purpose of this study is to uncover participants' perspectives regarding how the leadership program influenced their opinions. Participants expressed an increased level of confidence in their ability to participate in politics. Overall, participants tended to have more positive perspectives on their ability to participate in politics at the end of the institute, but some participants expressed that their perspectives remained the same.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this project is to understand how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct their political efficacy and ambition, as well as the barriers that exist for their political participation. This study found that MMIAPEZ women discursively construct gender as the predominant barrier for women's political participation. MMIAPEZ women also revealed high levels of political cynicism that discursively framed their own perceived ability or inability to participate in politics. While previous literature on gender and political participation is heavily focused on Western society, this study seeks to understand non-Western perspectives for female political participation. Additionally, this project seeks to understand how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct their perceived political efficacy and ambition after their involvement in a leadership institute. This chapter will discuss the findings as they relate to each research question, discuss the contributions and limitations of this project, and offer suggestions for future research.

Exploration of Research Questions

The themes that emerged in this study jointly answer the following research questions: RQ1) how do young women from MMIAPEZ discursively frame the barriers that exist for political participation in their country?, RQ2) how do women from MMIAPEZ discursively construct their ability to participate in politics?, and RQ3) how do women from MMIAPEZ discursively construct their perceptions of political participation and interest after involvement in an intensive leadership institute?

Research question one. Research question one (RQ1) asked: *How do young women from MMIAPEZ discursively frame the barriers that exist for political participation in their country?* The theme, *Losing Wife-Life: Gendered Barriers to Political Participation*, revealed

the multi-faceted gender barriers MMIAPEZ women constructed as barriers to political participation. The data from this study indicate that MMIAPEZ women articulate gender as the most prominent barrier that exists for female political participation in their countries. In contrast to previous Western research that suggests that barriers for female political participation such as societal barriers and stereotypes have been lowered or removed (Rhode, 2003), this study finds that when women describe potential barriers, the response pattern that emerges centers on their perception of barriers. These are barriers, based on their descriptions, which exist from societal constructions, but which the women have internalized as a required way of being a woman in their society. As Burns (2010) and Paxton and Hughes (2013) argue, societal structures greatly influence and determine a woman's ability or inability to run for political office.

The findings of this study confirm this previous research that cultural and social expectations can hinder a woman's ability or desire to run for political office in Western countries (Burns, 2010; Carroll, 1994; Paxton & Hughes, 2013; Rhode, 2003). What this study offers is confirmation that social expectations of women also serve to inhibit and block non-Western women from participation. In MMIAPEZ, societal desire for traditional roles and the expectation that a woman would stay at home to take care of the household and her family are discussed as the most common barriers to political participation. This supports Carroll's (1994) argument that socialization for women is oriented towards working inside the home and does not encourage achievements outside of the home. Even as Western scholars argue that such socialization today is less influential for young women in the United States compared to when Carroll's work was authored, and at least among non-Western women the socialization against women's participation is internalized within the discourse surrounding political participation, ambition, and opportunities.

While the reference to gender broadly is articulated as a barrier, it is important to note that MMIAPEZ women are uniquely situated as college-educated women. In other words, in many ways they are women challenging traditional societal barriers for women by seeking degrees of higher education, whereas the limitations they place on themselves in terms of political participation are the same ones they are violating in their educational attainment. This highlights an ever-present tension between the dominant discourse and preference for traditional gender roles. A paradox is demonstrated as these college-educated women violate traditional gender roles and expectations, yet they ascribe to these same traditional gender roles as justifications and barriers for their participation in politics. As the participants explain, educated women are stigmatized and viewed poorly because they do not confine to traditional gender expectations. As educated women, the participants are arguably more aware of the gender barriers that exist in their societies, and are also more defeatist in their discourses about the potential of women to be involved in politics.

As the *Losing Wife-Life: Gendered Barriers to Political Participation* theme illustrates, the discourse of MMIAPEZ women – in their discussions as to what barriers stand in the way of their political participation – reflected the societal dominant narrative of traditional gender expectations for women and can perhaps explain why women challenging traditional gender expectations in one area of interest actually consider it a barrier to their participation in another. This pervasiveness of a dominant narrative for gender expectations aligns with Eagly and Karau's (2012) role congruity theory, which explains gender roles and expectations for gendered behaviors. As the discourse of the women participating in this study reveals, traditional gender roles are perceived and articulated as barriers for political involvement because cultural expectations require women to take care of the home and family instead of being involved in

careers or activities outside of the home. Gender bias was also perceived to be one of the multi-faceted gender barriers women face in MMIAPEZ. The power imbalance for women makes it difficult, if not impossible in some circumstances for women to be in leadership and political positions. While most of the MMIAPEZ women's discourse placed emphasis on gender barriers as performing traditional gender roles, women did also articulate that their societies do not view women as acceptable leaders and men are preferred as politicians. This gender bias also confirms Eagly and Karau's (2002) role congruity theory that society places preference on male leaders since women are viewed through a gendered lens and have certain prescribed expectations of staying home and taking care of children, which renders them not as valuable as leaders and politicians.

Additionally, a woman's capability, credibility, and confidence was articulated as a facet of gender barriers that exist for MMIAPEZ women. These findings confirm previous research that finds that women struggle being confined to traditional masculine concepts of leadership and are viewed as inferior or incapable of performing leadership roles (Lee & Shaw, 2010; Rhode, 2003; Sandberg, 2013; Wilson, 2004). Rhodes (2003) suggests that challenging traditional concepts of leadership can lead to greater acceptance of women, but in MMIAPEZ the existence and dominance of gender barriers themselves pose a primary threat to low levels of political participation.

While the gender barriers the MMIAPEZ women articulated in this study support role congruity theory, the unique perspective of these non-Western countries is important to highlight. Role congruity theory is based and supported in Western concepts and studies, but this study demonstrates that a similar phenomenon is present in non-Western countries. Arguably, the emphasis on traditional gender roles is more prevalent in MMIAPEZ countries

than previous literature focused on Western societies, which potentially makes the societal stereotypes against female leaders even more robust. Additionally, through the investigation of MMIAPEZ women, this study reframes role congruity theory to include education. As previously discussed, the education paradox MMIAPEZ women face is an additional gender barrier for female political participation. These women are encouraged by their families to obtain an education, yet society views them poorly if they attempt to utilize this education and instead expect them to fit within traditional gender expectations.

Eagly and Karau (2007) challenged the glass ceiling concept as an explanation for women's progression in leadership and offered a new metaphor of 'the labyrinth' that captured "the varied challenges confronting women as they travel, often on indirect paths, sometimes through alien territory, on their way to leadership" (p.1). While the glass ceiling metaphor may no longer be the most accurate metaphor for American women, it does most accurately reflect MMIAPEZ women's experiences than the labyrinth. The articulation of more stringent gender barriers for MMIAPEZ women renders the labyrinth as an inapplicable and unrealistic metaphor. In other words, the rigorous gender barriers that exist for MMIAPEZ women foreclose any possible labyrinth paths and instead function as multiple layers of glass ceilings for women. These glass ceilings are constructed both by societal gendered expectations as well as MMIAPEZ women's cynicism and skepticism. Their discursive cynicism illustrates that they construct personal sub-layers of glass ceilings in addition to the societal glass ceiling imposed on them.

This study provided an opportunity to investigate the application of role model theory to MMIAPEZ women because most of MMIAPEZ is ranked higher than the United States in female political representation in the higher levels of office. The results were surprisingly mixed

and evenly split on the perceptions of visibility and impact of female politicians. Roughly half the women perceived that there was not enough women in their country's political system and the other half reported perceiving that a substantial number of women are involved in their country's political system. Women with high political efficacy were more likely to perceive a substantial number of women in politics, whereas women with low political efficacy tended to perceive fewer women were involved in politics. This finding suggests that levels of political efficacy can influence perceptions of women in politics in terms of perceived presence.

Research question two. Research question two (RQ2) asked: *How do women from MMIAPEZ discursively construct their ability to participate in politics?* The themes of *Diplomacy and Sugar Coating: Constructions of Political Cynicism and My Choice, My Life, My Future: Political Ambition and Political Efficacy* reveal that MMIAPEZ women have high levels of political cynicism and the majority of women have low levels of political efficacy. Political cynicism was the most mentioned theme throughout this study and bears important implications for MMIAPEZ women's political discourse. Banwart (2007) argues that political cynicism can negatively impact young voters' future political behaviors. This is especially important for young MMIAPEZ women to examine potential impacts of cynicism of their constructions of political behavior. Instead of a passive act of avoidance, the women in this study demonstrate active avoidance and intentionally are avoiding participation in politics. This study suggests that the high levels of cynicism of MMIAPEZ women is an underlying motivation for discursive constructions of gender barriers, political efficacy, and political ambition. The implications for high levels of cynicism in MMIAPEZ women is the active avoidance of politics resulting in less female political participation.

Among the various types of cynical discourses, one of the most dominant cynical discourses was the articulation of a lack of trust for the government. This political cynicism reinforces Dermody, Hanmer-Loyd, and Scullion's (2010) research that cynicism results from an erosion of trust in both the political institution and the politicians. As Stroud (2011) argues, the underlying root of cynicism is the loss and lack of trust for the political system, which is the most consistent discourse of MMIAPEZ women. Additionally, corruption has fostered a climate of cynicism for the youth in particular (Strama, 1998). Combined with Banwart's (2007) finding that cynicism can negatively impact young citizens, this study suggests that the perceptions of corruption have had impactful impressions on MMIAPEZ women and influenced their overall desires to participate in politics. Overall, MMIAPEZ women were more likely to express apathy and demonstrate an active avoidance of politics that they uniquely contributed to the existence of corruption.

While loss of trust and corruption are the main driving forces of cynicism, the lack of transparency and connection to what is going on in the government fosters cynicism. Pattyn, et al. (2012) found that political cynics feel disconnected from the political system. This study's findings expand this previous research and demonstrate that MMIAPEZ women feel disconnected from the happenings of the political system and construct the lack of transparency as a motivation for cynicism.

Cynicism is a feeling articulated by MMIAPEZ women that breads apathy and the women discursively construct their cynicism as an active and intentional act of avoiding participation in politics. This active avoidance of abstaining from politics is demonstrated in the low levels of political efficacy and ambition. MMIAPEZ women were more likely to express low levels of political ambition and efficacy. The most articulated justification for a lack of

desire to be involved in politics was the claim that they were not qualified to participate in politics. This provides a non-Western application of Lawless and Fox (2010) and Kling et al.'s (2009) argument that women are more likely to dismiss their qualifications and doubt that they are capable of running for political office. These women have actively pursued participation in an intensive leadership institute in the United States through a competitive selection process, but yet they still question their qualifications to participate in politics. This finding potentially raises more questions than answers as one would expect women that actively seeking leadership training would express high levels of political efficacy and political ambition. However, this study found that these MMIAPEZ women were more likely to express low levels of political efficacy and political ambition. As Kirkpatrick (1997) argued, the most "important and interesting question regarding women's political behavior is why so few seek and wield power" (p. 23). For MMIAPEZ women, the most commonly constructed justifications for their lack of political participation are gender barriers and cynicism.

Another justification for low levels of political efficacy and ambition is that they do not feel they are knowledgeable enough about politics. Scholars have long found that political knowledge can influence an individual's likelihood of political participation, but that it also influences the individual's attitudes and ability to participate in politics (Bartels, 1996; Delli Carpini, and Ketter, 1996, 2000; Jennings, 1992; Ondercin & White, 2011; Sanbonmatsu, 2003). The MMIAPEZ women's perception that they do not possess enough knowledge about politics discursively is used to qualify their perceived ability to participate in politics. Additionally, they do not view their political efficacy and ambition in a future-oriented way to answer that later in life they would be qualified and able to participate in politics. Instead they view their political participation in the present-tense in their role as a student. This finding confirms Bennett's

(1997) argument that even with a greater possession of information, well-informed women tend to distrust their ability to understand politics. The implication of MMIAPEZ women distrusting their ability to understand politics results in another justification for their active avoidance of politics.

The skepticism of MMIAPEZ women is the main impetus for low political efficacy and low political ambition. As Pinkleton et al. (1998) argued, "Citizens are likely to participate in the political process to the extent that they feel their participation can make a difference" (p. 35). MMIAPEZ women articulate the belief that they lack the ability to change their corrupt political systems and have no desire to be part of these corrupt systems. The result of this cynical view is for the women to actively disengage from politics, but to actively participate in the civil sphere to promote change for their communities. Young citizens in particular have been caught in a cycle where cynicism lowers their perceived efficacy, which in turn increases their cynicism and disengagement further (Muglan & Wilkinson, 1997; Park, 1999; Pinkleton et al, 1998; White et al, 2000). MMIAPEZ women view politics as this corrupt system that cannot accomplish anything, so if they want to facilitate change and progress, they must be involved outside of the political system and through avenues such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

While more women were likely to disclose low levels of political efficacy and ambition, some MMIAPEZ women expressed high levels of political efficacy and ambition. Even though women are less likely than men to consider running for political office (Lawless & Fox, 2010), this study confirms some women do possess political ambition and political efficacy. MMIAPEZ women with high levels of political efficacy discursively exuded confidence in their ability to participate in politics with the justification that politics was their chosen career path. One of the main impetuses for wanting to be politically involved was articulated as the desire to

facilitate change in their communities. MMIAPEZ women work on their "Leadership for Change Project" (LCP) throughout the leadership institute that focuses on a women's or children's issue in their community. The women that are participating in the leadership institute have strong passions for doing something in their communities, which is reflected in their discourse to be engaged in politics. Additionally, skepticism does interact with political efficacy for MMIAPEZ women who indicate desire to be involved in politics. Skepticism acts as a motivation for active disengagement from politics for women with low efficacy and ambition, skepticism is more of a discursive caution for women with high political efficacy. Women with low political efficacy discursively constructed cynicism as an impetus for their active avoidance of politics. Women with high political efficacy expressed skepticism, but this did not breed apathy or generate an active avoidance of politics.

Research question three. Research question three (RQ3) asked: *How do women from MMIAPEZ discursively construct their perceptions of political participation and interest after involvement in an intensive leadership institute?* The follow-up surveys for MMIAPEZ women sought to understand if shifts in political interest, involvement and ambition occurred after their participation in an intensive leadership institute. This study does not make causal claims, but rather seeks to explore possible shifts in discourse and attitudes in MMIAPEZ women. It is important to note that the follow-up was conducted as surveys and participants did not give as discursively rich answers as in the interviews.

The most common response from the women was an increased level of confidence in themselves. Rhode (2003) argues that the internationalization of lacking confidence in women is a major obstacle for female participation in politics. Sandberg (2013) echoes this sentiment and argues that women hold themselves back through their low levels of confidence. Increased

confidence was discursively constructed as two-fold: they now saw themselves as qualified and able to participate and they believed in their own capabilities more. As Lawless and Fox (2010) argue, women tend to underestimate their experiences and skills in everyday life that could translate to participation in politics. In the follow-up surveys, women explained that they now saw their potential to create change and be meaningfully involved in politics. Schlesigner (1966) argues that kindling political ambitions for women is a vital element of encouraging more women to run for political office. While the goal of the leadership institute is not explicitly to kindle political ambitions, MMIAPEZ women claimed that they did now see politics differently and argued that they should be more politically involved. Rather than view politics through a universal cynical lens, some now argued that they needed to be involved to create the change necessary in politics.

Even though MMIAPEZ women shared positive perspectives and claimed their view on politics has shifted, they still remained skeptical and cynical. However, their claims that they needed to be more politically involved now overshadowed this skepticism instead of letting it be a motivation for apathy and disengagement. Their discourse included a stronger theme of appreciation for politics and disclosed more understanding of politics and their involvement.

While positive statements were the majority of responses to the follow-up survey, for some women their responses suggested their views and attitudes about political involvement did not shift to the positive, and were instead consistent with the theme of being cynical and politics. In fact, the responses for some MMIAPEZ women specifically articulated that they did not see a connection between the leadership institute and politics. Additionally, among those who expressly indicated they made no connection between the leadership institute and politics, the same women expressed an ongoing active disengagement from politics and apathy as a result of

their cynicism towards their government. The literature does find that cynicism lowers Western citizens' perceived efficacy, and in turn increases their cynicism and disengagement even more (Park, 1999; Pinkelton et al., 1998). The results of this study suggest that like their Western counterparts, there is a link for MMIAPEZ women between their cynicism and discourse about their ability to create change and be positively involved in politics. Cynicism plays an important role in MMIAPEZ women's perceived ability to participate in politics and overall is the impetus for their active avoidance of politics. However, the increased confidence MMIAPEZ women articulated can suggest that increasing a woman's confidence can potentially outweigh the impact of cynicism on her political efficacy.

Research Contributions

The goal of this study was to understand how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct their political knowledge and interest, as well as their perceived ability to participate in politics, and the findings of this study have both theoretical and practical contributions. Previous research has primarily focused on a Western approach to understanding gendered components of political participation and interest, and this study contributes to existing literature by expanding to non-Western contexts. By focusing on MMIAPEZ women, this study seeks to understand how women in countries that still possess many gender barriers for political participation cope and discursively manage their own perceived political efficacy and ambition. Additionally, by focusing on young women, this study contributes to our understanding about the effects of cynicism on political efficacy and political ambition in non-Western countries.

This study revealed a nuanced understanding of how MMIAPEZ women discursively construct cynicism. As previously discussed, Western research has demonstrated the potential negative effects of cynicism on future political behaviors, and this study advances this research

by also investigating the role gender barriers play in women's constructions of political efficacy and political ambition. One notable finding was the discursive constructions of lack of transparency and the smokescreen of information participants perceived, which played a large role in their constructions of cynicism.

Additionally, this study has revealed that cynicism is typically deployed discursively as a justification for active avoidance from politics, but at the same time can be used as an impetus for a woman's desire to participate in politics. The discursive shift in ambition and increased confidence of participants after participation in the leadership institute is an important finding that has practical implications. It is possible that encouraging women to participate in a leadership program can translate to greater civic efficacy. Perhaps introducing politically themed leadership programs could translate to increased political efficacy while also allowing the opportunity for young women to education themselves and decrease their cynicism and skepticism towards politics.

Role congruity theory is supported by this study and participants' constructions of gender and gender bias as barriers to political participation. The stringent role of traditional gender roles magnifies the implications of role congruity theory as these traditional gender role expectations magnify the assumption that women should be confined inside the home to take care of their family. When a woman tries to defy these expectations, she is seen negatively, which hampers her ability to run for political office or leadership positions.

Western research has demonstrated that role model theory provides another explanation for gender representation in political office and contends that the presence of female politicians is essential to increasing political involvement of women and young girls. This study did suggest that quotas provide an additional variable to consider on how female representation can influence

young women's political behavior. One important finding of this study was how a woman's perception of quantity of female politicians is related to her levels of political efficacy. Women with high political efficacy perceived substantial women in their political systems, whereas women with low political efficacy perceived low levels of female presence in their political systems. This finding suggests that a woman's political efficacy has an important role in her perceptions of female politicians and for researchers can serve as an area of future investigation. If political efficacy influences the perceptions of female presence in politics, finding ways to increase young women's political efficacy could be worthwhile. Perhaps institutes focusing on fostering political efficacy in young citizens is a possible avenue for bolstering this political efficacy in young women.

MMIAPEZ women were found to be extremely cynical towards their political institutions and this has several implications that are important for practitioners. First, this cynicism breeds apathy and in turn results in low perceived political efficacy. Practitioners should be aware of this implication so they can best investigate and implement ways to increase young women's political efficacy. Secondly, MMIAPEZ women articulate a difference between politics and civil service and while politics is generally an undesirable place for them, civil service is viewed as a place where they can contribute to their communities. MMIAPEZ women do not see politics has a viable place for them – they see politics as stacked against them due to gender barriers and their cynicism. However, MMIAPEZ women do possess civil service efficacy and have interest in contributing to their communities. Instead of focusing on political participation as being involved in governmental activities, practitioners should focus on the role that young women can play in civil service to create change in their communities.

Limitations of Research

While this study demonstrates some important findings concerning MMIAPEZ women and their discursive constructions of political participation, there are some important limitations that must be noted. Many of these limitations involve the sample's demographics. Religion and class are two of the most significant limitations of this study. While religion and class are important intersections to understanding political interest, knowledge, and interest, this study did not specifically acquire information on participants' socioeconomic status or religion. Participants at times shared casually in the interview their religion or eluded to their socioeconomic status, but it was not captured for every participant. Future research should investigate both religion and socioeconomic status to better understand how they can influence a woman's political interest and participation.

An additional limitation of the study's demographics is the level of education of the participants. All of the participants were currently enrolled university students, which acknowledges they have access to education that many women in their countries are not afforded. Education privileges women, but we do not yet know to what degree this occurs. Women who feel more efficacy about politics have the tools of education to participate, whereas the vast majority of their peers do not have. MMIAPEZ women have self-selected to apply which suggests that they have a greater interest to be involved in their communities. Additionally, this study leads to further questions such as - does education magnify corruption? It is possible that the more knowledge women gain through education fosters more cynicism as they are made more aware. One might speculate that non-educated women may be more accepting of their lack of role in politics because they are not fully aware.

Finally, the design of the follow-up surveys limits the understanding of the women's discourse after participation in the leadership institute. The follow-up survey was composed of a couple of open-ended questions and also scale questions that were repeated from the initial survey gauging political interest, knowledge, efficacy and ambition. The survey asked participants to also explain their scale-ranking in one sentence, but many participants did not follow these instructions and only circled the scale number as their answer. This resulted in limited information and discourse surrounding many of the questions. I was able to use the open-ended questions to analyze the discourse of MMIAPEZ women after the institute, but future research should better capture this data. The intent was to capture data while the participants were in the United States so that there was a 100% response rate as it would be harder to elicit responses once they've returned to their countries. However, future research should either conduct short follow-up interviews to gather richer discourse from participants, or rely upon open-ended questions only for the follow-up survey.

Future Research

This study has furthered our understanding of gendered notions of political interest, efficacy, and ambition for MMIAPEZ women, while also raising additional questions for future research. First, although this study has expanded the existing Western-focused research on gender and political involvement, there is room for continued understanding of the relevance of Western-based theoretical explanations. For instance, additional research is needed to fully understand the application of role model theory to non-Western contexts such as how the presence of female politicians can influence young women's political behaviors. The existence of quota systems in MMIAPEZ present a unique variable that Western role model theory does not necessarily account for. This study sought to understand if the presence of female politicians

influenced women's political efficacy and ambition, but a more focused study on this particular issue could produce more nuanced results. The presence of quota systems in most of MMIAPEZ presented a unique opportunity to investigate the visible presence of female politician's on young women's efficacy. Additionally, maybe role models should be in the civic arena as participants have suggested they are more interested in engaging in the civic sphere rather than politics due to their cynicism. Focus has primarily been on politics and trying to encourage women to run for political office, but in MMIAPEZ countries, investigating how role models in the civic sphere can influence young women's participation and involvement may prove to be more fruitful than political participation.

Cynicism was the most frequent theme present in this study and MMIAPEZ women expressed frustration with the lack of transparency in politics. Western research has identified cynicism as the "feeling that the government in general and the political leaders in particular do not care about the public's opinions and are not acting in the best interest of the people" (Kaid, McKinney, & Tedesco, 2000, p. 198). MMIAPEZ women also reveal a lack of trust in their governments and politicians, but they also articulate a lack of transparency that fosters their cynicism and overall lack of trust. Researchers should examine how the perceived lack of transparency in politics can influence political interest and efficacy. While research has demonstrated cynicism can have negative impacts on young citizen's efficacy, a more meticulous study to examine the role of perceived information and knowledge should be explored because this study has revealed the perception of information availability and accuracy is a major construction of MMIAPEZ women's cynicism.

Another possible avenue for future research could be the investigation of cultures' conceptions of time and how that influences one's perceived political efficacy. In this study,

participants almost universally referred to questions of their political interest and ambition in the present-time orientation and argued that they were not currently ready to participate in politics because they lacked knowledge and experience. Instead of answering this question on a time continuum and responding that, perhaps, in the future they have/not have a desire to be involved, they always answered for their current situation. Hofstede (2001) argues that cultures can be evaluated on their long or short-term orientation, which is the preference a culture gives to living in the present time or focuses on the future. Most of MMIAPEZ countries would be considered to be short-term oriented, which would emphasize their concern for the present situation more than thinking about the future, whereas the United States ranks highly on the long-term orientation scale (Hofstede, 2001). This area of research could help better understand the role of culture in one's perceived political efficacy. As previously noted, much of our understanding of gender and politics is primarily focused on Western cultures, thus exploring how culture influences a young woman's political efficacy is a valuable area of research.

Further research is also needed to more fully understand the role of cynicism and the impact it has on one's political efficacy and ambition. This study illuminated many tensions with cynicism and political efficacy and highlighted that women with high political efficacy still possessed skepticism about their political governments. Research could examine how cynicism manifests on multiple elements political predictors, such as: political interest, knowledge, participation, efficacy and ambition. Research (Banwart, 2007) demonstrates that cynicism can have negative consequences to political participation, but trying to understand more particularized facets of cynicism could provide more understanding and in turn could benefit those involved in politics. As cynicism levels continue to remain high for young citizens, it is

important and vital to understand motivations for cynicism that could lead to practical applications for lowering young citizens' cynicism and skepticism.

Finally, researchers should consider examining the relationship between one's participation in leadership training and political ambitions. This study attempted to investigate whether participants' discourse and perceptions of efficacy shifted at the end of their involvement in the leadership institute, but a closer examination of the influence of leadership training on women's political ambition both in Western and non-Western contexts. Carroll (1994) argues that recruiting politically ambitious women to run for political office is vital to the overall representation of women, so can a leadership institute function as a recruitment resource?

Conclusion

In this study, I investigated the discursive constructions of political interest, efficacy, and ambition of MMIAPEZ women. This study revealed that cynicism was the largest barrier for female political participation in MMIAPEZ. Gender barriers were articulated as an additional barrier for female political participation in MMIAPEZ. The findings of this research demonstrate that cynicism plays an important role in MMIAPEZ women's perceived political efficacy and political ambitions. Additionally, MMIAPEZ women's discourse after participation in the leadership institute revealed an overall positive shift in political perceptions, and increased self-confidence. While we do not possess the ultimate solution to encouraging more women to participate in politics, we do have a better understanding of what barriers exist for female political participation in MMIAPEZ.

Women still express cynicism towards their political systems, but that does not diminish their desire to change and help their communities which is evidenced by their pursuit and participation in an intensive leadership institute. MMIAPEZ women have demonstrated that

being a woman in and of itself serves as a barrier to participating – psychologically as well as behaviorally – in politics. While this study does find high levels of cynicism are discursively constructed by MMIAPEZ women, it is important to focus on the voices of hope that emerged as well. We have not entirely answered the question Kirkpatrick (1974) posed of why so few women enter politics, but this study has provided a deeper understanding for the justifications MMIAPEZ women provided for their lack of and pursuit of political participation. The next important question we should answer, is how can we foster and capitalize on the positive desires of MMIAPEZ women to actively be engaged in their communities and does this have to occur in the political realm?

REFERENCES

Adriaansen, M. L. (2010). Substance matters: How news content can reduce political cynicism.
International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 22(4), 433-457.
doi:10.1093/ijpor/edq033

Atkeson, L. R. (2003). Not all cues are created equal: The conditional impact of female
candidates on political engagement. *The Journal of Politics, 65*(4), 1040-1061.
doi:10.1111/1468-2508.t01-1-00124

Atkeson, L. R., & Carrillo, N. (2007). More is better: The influence of collective female
descriptive representation on external efficacy. *Politics & Gender, 3*, 79-101.
doi:10.1017/S1743923X0707002X

Attar-Schwartz, S., & Ben-Arieh, A. (2012). Political knowledge, attitudes and values among
Palestinian and Jewish youth in Israel: The role of nationality, gender and religiosity.
Children and Youth Services Review, 34, 704-712. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.12.017

Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Banwart, M. C. (2007). Gender and young voters in 2004: The influence of perceived
knowledge and interest. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *50*, 1152-1168.
doi:10.1177/0002764207299362

Barabas, J. (2014). The question(s) of political knowledge. *The American Political Science
Review, 108* (4), 840-855. doi:10.1017/S0003055414000392

Bartels, L. M. (1996). Uninformed votes: Information effects in presidential elections. *American
Journal of Political Science, 40,* 194–230. doi:10.2307/2111700

Baxter, L. A., & Babbie, E. (2004). *The basics of communication research*. Toronto: Thomson Wadsworth.

Bélanger, E., & Nadeau, R. (2005). Political trust and the vote in multiparty elections: The Canadian case. *European Journal of Political Research, 44*, 121–146. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2005.00221.x

Bennett, L. M., & Bennett, S. E. (1989). Enduring gender differences in political interest: The impact of socialization and political dispositions. *American Politics Quarterly*, *17*(1), 105-122.

Bennett, S. E. (1991). Left behind: Exploring declining turnout among non-college young

Whites, 1964-1988. *Social Science Quarterly*, *72*, 314-33.

Bennett, S. E. (1997). Knowledge of politics and sense of subjective political competence: The ambiguous connection. *American Politics Quarterly*, *25*, 230-240.

Berger, A. A. (2000). Media and communication research methods: An introduction to qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. pp. 111-127.

Bernard, H. R. (2011). Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (5th ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Bledoe, T., & Herring, M. (1990). Victims of circumstances: Women in pursuit of political office. *American Political Science Review, 84*, 213-223.

Bridge, D. L. (1997). The glass ceiling and sexual stereotyping: Historical and legal perspectives of women in the workplace. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy and Law, 4,* 581-643.

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bullough, A., Kroeck, K. G., Newburry, W., Kundu, S. K., & Lowe, K. B. (2012). Women's political leadership participation around the world: An institutional analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23,* 398-411.

Burn, S. M. (2010). *Women across cultures: A global perspective*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Burns, N., Schlozman, K. L., & Verba, S. (2001). *The private roots of public action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bystrom, D. G., Banwart, M. C., Kaid, L. L., & Robertson, T. A. (2004). *Gender and candidate communication: Videostyle, webstyle, and newsstyle*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, A., Gurin, G., Miller, W., Eberhart, S., & McWilliams, R.O. (1954). *The voter decides: A study of the voter's perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and Company.

Campbell, D. E., Wolbrecht, C., (2006). See Jane run: Women politicians as role models for adolescents. *Journal of Politics, 68,* 233-247. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00402.x

Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Carr, J. D., Barnidge, M., Lee, B. G., & Tsang, S. J. (2014). Cynics and skeptics: Evaluating the credibility of mainstream and citizen journalism. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 91*(3), 452-470. doi:10.1177/1077699014538828

Carroll, S. J. (1994). *Women as candidates in American politics.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana
University Press.

Chanley, V. A., Rudolph, T. J., & Rahn, W. M. (2000). The origins and consequences of public
trust in government. A time series analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 64*, 239–256.

Citrin, J. & Muste, C. (1999). Trust in government. In J. P. Robinson, P. F. Shaver, and L. S.
Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of political attitudes* (pp. 465-532). San Diego, CA:
Academic Press.

Clark, J. (1994). Getting there: Women in political office. In M. Githens, P. Norris, & J.
Lovenduski (Eds.), *Different roles, different voice*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative research. *Theory into
Practice, 39,* 124-130.

Deaux, K. & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.).
Handbook of social psychology, 4th ed. New York, NY: Random House.

Delli Carpini, M. X. (2000). Gen.com: Youth, civic engagement, and the new information
environment. *Political Communication*, *17*, 341-349.

Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it
matters.* London: Yale University Press.

Delli Carpini, M. X., and Keeter, S. (2000). Gender and political knowledge. In Sue Tolleson-
Rinehart, S. and Josephson, J.J., (Eds.), *Gender and American Politics*. Armok, NY: M.
E. Sharpe.

Dermody, J., Hanmer-Lloyd, S., & Scullion, R. (2010). Young people and voting behavior: Alienated youth and (or) interested and critical citizenry? *European Journal of Marketing, 44*, 421-435. doi:10.1108/03090561011020507

DeSantis, L., & Ugarriza, D. N. (2000). The concept of theme as used in qualitative nursing research. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 22*(3): 351-72.

de Vreese, C. (2005). The spiral of cynicism reconsidered. *European Journal of Communication, 20*(3), 283-301.

Dolan, K. (2006). Symbolic mobilization?: The impact of candidate sex in American elections. *American Politics Research, 34*(6), 687-704.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 781-797. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00241

Eagly, A. H. & Karau S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573-595. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

Eveland, W. P., Jr., & Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Connecting news media use with gaps in knowledge and participation. *Political Communication*, *17*, 215-237. doi:10.1080/105846000414250

Frazer, E., & Macdonald, K. (2003). Sex differences in political knowledge in Britain. *Political Studies, 51,* 7–83. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.00413

Gilman, S. C. (2007). Shane, the lone ethnographer: A beginner's guide to ethnography. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Gans, C. (2004). Low voter turnout and the decline of American civic participation. In

M. S. McKinney, D. G. Bystrom, L. L. Kaid, & D. B. Carlin (Eds.), *Communicating*

politics: Engaging the public in democratic life (pp. 80-85). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Garcia-Retamero, R., & Lopez-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55*, 51-61. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9068-1

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic.

Global Database of Quotas for Women. (2015). Quota *project: Country overview*. Retrieved from http://www.quotaproject.org/country.cfm.

Hansen, S. B. (1997). Talking about politics: Gender and contextual effects on political proselytizing. *The Journal of Politics, 59*(1), 73-103. doi:10.2307/2998216

Hayes, D. (2008). Does the message matter? Candidate-media agenda convergence and its effect on voter issue salience. *Political Research Quarterly, 61*(1), 134–46.

Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Heifetz, R., & Laurie, D. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review,* 2-14.

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2006). *The practice of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hoffman, L. H., & Young, D. G. (2011). Satire, punch lines, and the nightly news: Untangling media effects on political participation. *Communication Research Reports, 28*(2), 159-168. doi:10.1080/08824096.2011.565278

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behavios, institutions, and organizations across nations. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hoyt, C. L. & Burnette, J. L. (2013). Gender bias in leader evaluations: Merging implicit theories and role congruity perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(10), 1306-1319. doi:10.1177/0146167213493643

Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2012, December 31). *Women in national parliaments*. Retrieved from http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/arc/classif311212.htm.

Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2015, December 1). *Women in national parliaments*. Retrieved from http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm.

Iyengar, S., Hahn, K. S., Bonfadelli, H., & Marr, M. (2009). Dark areas of ignorance' reconsidered. *Communication Research, 36*(3), 341–58. doi:10.1177/0093650209333024

Jennings, K. M. (1992). Ideology among mass publics and political elites. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 56*, 419–41.

Jerit, J., & Barabas, J. (2012). Partisan perceptual bias and the information environment. *Journal of Politics, 74*, 672–84. doi:10.1017/S0022381612000187

Jerit, J., Barabas, J., & Bolsen, T. (2006). Citizens, knowledge, and the information environment. *American Journal of Political Science, 50*, 266–82. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00183.x

Kaid, L. L., McKinney, M. S., & Tedesco, J. C. (2000). Civic dialogue in the 1996 presidential campaign: Candidate, media, and public voices. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Jorgenson, J. (1995). Re-relationalizing rapport in interpersonal settings. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), *Social approaches to communication* (pp.155-170). New York, NY: Guilford.

Karp, J. A., & Banducci, S. A. (2008). When politics is not just a man's game: Women's representation and political engagement. *Electoral Studies, 27*, 105-115.

Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M., & Jenkins, K. (2002). *The civic and political health of the nation: A generational portrait*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Kenski, K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2000). The gap in political knowledge: Are women less knowledgeable than men about politics? In Jamieson, K.H., (Ed.), *Everything You Think You Know About Politics . . . And Why You're Wrong*. New York: Basic Books.

Kenski, K. (2001, November). *Explaining the gender gap in political knowledge: Tests of eighteen hypotheses*. Presented at the National Communication Association Convention, Atlanta, Georgia.

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

Kling, K .C, Hyde, J., Showers, C., & Buswell, B. (1999). Gender differences in self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 470-500.

Lariscy, R. W., Tinkham, S. F., & Sweetser, K. D. (2011). Kids these days: Examining differences in political uses and gratifications, Internet political participation, political information efficacy, and cynicism on the basis of age. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(6), 749-764. doi:10.1177/0002764211398091

Lawless, J. L. (2004). Politics of presence? Congresswomen and symbolic representation. *Political Research Quarterly, 57*(1), 81-99.

Lawless, J. L., & Fox, R. L. (2010). *It still takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, J. & Shaw, S. (2010). Women worldwide: Transnational feminist perspectives on women. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lizotee, M., & Sidman, A. (2009). Explaining the gender gap in political knowledge. *Politics & Gender, 5*(2), 127–51. doi:10.1017/S1743923X09000130

Luskin, R. C. (1990). Explaining political sophistication." *Political Behavior, 12*, 331–61.

McDevitt, M., & Kiousis, S. (2007). The red and blue of adolescence. Origins of the compliant voter and the defiant activist. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50, 1214-1230.

doi:10.1177/0002764207300048

Mohanty, C. (1991). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. In Mohanty, C., Russo, A., & Torres, L. (Eds), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Press.

Mondak, J. J. (1999). Reconsidering the measurement of political knowledge. *Political Analysis, 8* (1), 57–82.

Mondak, J & Anderson, M. (2004). The knowledge gap: A reexamination of gender-based difference's in political knowledge. *Journal of Politics*, 66, 492-512. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2004.00161.x

Mouttaki, A. (2015). Solving the literacy gender gap in Morocco. March 7. Retrieved from https://www.good.is/articles/morocco-women-girls-parents-literacy.

Moy, P., & Pfau, M. (2000). With malice toward all? The media and public confidence in democratic institutions. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mulgan, G. & Wilkinson, H. (1997). Freedom's children and the rise of generational politics. In Mulgan, G. (Ed.), *Life after politics: New thinking for the twenty-first century*. London: Fontana.

Mutz, D. C. (2002). Cross-cutting social networks: Testing democratic theory in practice. *American Political Science Review, 96*(1), 111–26. doi:10.1017/S0003055402004264

Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2007). Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much? *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 122*, 1067-1101.

Nyhan, B. & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior, 32*(3), 303–330. doi:10.1007/s11109-010-9112-2

O'Malley, E. (2009). The competencies for civic leadership: An introduction to the core curricular underpinnings of the KLC. *The Journal of the Kansas Leadership Center,* 7-15.

Ondercin, H. L, & White, D. J. (2011). Gender jeopardy: What is the impact of gender differences in political knowledge on political participation? *Social Science Quarterly, 92*(3), 675-694. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2011.00787.x

Palmer, B., & Simon, D. (2008). Breaking the political glass ceiling: Women and congressional elections. New York, NY: Routledge.

Park, A. (1999). Young people and political apathy. In Jowell, R., Curtice, J., Park, A., Thomson, K., Jarvis, L., Bromley, C. and Stratford, N. (Eds), *British social attitudes. The 16th Report. Who shares new labour values?* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Parks, S. D. (2005). *Leadership can be taught: A bold approach for a complex world.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Pattyn, S., Hiel, A. V., Dhont, K., & Onraet, E. (2012). Stripping the political cynic: A psychological exploration of the concept of political cynicism. *European Journal of Personality, 26*(6), 566-579. doi:10.1002/per.858

Paxton, P. M. & Hughes, M. M. (2013). *Women, politics, and power: A global perspective.* London: Sage Publications.

Paxton, P. M. & Kunovich, S. (2003). Women's political representation: The importance of ideology. *Social Forces, 82*, 87-113.

Pianesi, A. (2013). The class of the forking paths: Leadership and "case-in-point." *The Systems Thinker, 24* (1), 2-6.

Pinkleton, B., & Austin, E. W. (2001). Individual motivations, perceived media importance, and political disaffection. Political Communication, 18(3), 321-334.

Pinkleton, B. E., Austin, E. & Portman, K. J. (1998). Relationships of media use and political dissaffection to political efficacy and voting behavior. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 42*, 34-49.

Prior, M. (2007). Post-broadcast democracy: How media choice increases inequality in political involvement and polarizes elections. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. *American Prospect, 24*, 34-48.

Reingold, B., & Harrell, J. (2010). The impact of descriptive representation on women's political engagement. *Political Research Quarterly, 63*(2), 280-294. doi:10.1177/1065912908330346

Rhode, D. L. (2003). The difference "difference" makes. In D.L. Rhode (Ed.), *The difference "difference" makes: Women and leadership.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ridgeway, C. J., & Correl, S. J. (2000). Limiting inequality through interaction: The end(s) of gender. *Contemporary Sociology, 29,* 110-120.

Rinehart, S. T. (1992). *Gender consciousness and politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ritter, B. A., & Yoder, J. D. (2004). Gender differences in leader emergence persist even for

    dominant women: An updated confirmation of role congruity theory. *Psychology of*

    Women Quarterly, 28, 187-193.

Ross, M. H. (1986). Female political participation: A cross-cultural explanation. *American*

    Anthropologist, 88(4), 843-858.

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

    Publications.

Sanbonmatsu, K. (2003). Gender-related political knowledge and the descriptive representation

    of women. *Political Behavior, 25*, 367–88.

Sanbonmatsu, K. (2014). Women's election to office in the fifty states: Opportunities and

    challenges.   In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.), *Gender and elections: Shaping the future*

    of American politics. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead*. New York, NY: Alfred A.

    Knopf.

Sapiro, V. (1983). *The political integration of women*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Sapiro V. & Conover, P. J. (1997). The variable gender basis of electoral politics: Gender and

    context in the 1992 US election. *British Journal of Political Science 27*(4), 497-523.

Schlesinger, J. A. (1966). Ambition and politics: Political careers in the United States.

    Chicago, IL: Rand NcNally.

Seager, J. (2009). *The penguin atlas of women in the world*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Silverman, D. (2000). Evaluating qualitative research. In *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Starobin, P. (1995). A generation of vipers: Journalists and the new cynicism, *Columbia Journalism Review, 33*, 25-33.

Strama, M. (1998). Overcoming cynicism: Youth participation and electoral politics. *National Civic Review, 81*(1), 71-78.

Strauss, A. M., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stroud, N. J. (2011). The influence of debate viewing context on political cynicism and strategic interpretations. *The American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(3), 270-283. doi:10.1177/0002764210392163

Tian, Y. (2011). Communication behaviors as mediators: Examining links between political orientation, political communication and political participation. *Communication Quarterly*, 59, 380-394. doi:10.1080/01463373.2011.583503

UNESCO (2012). Adult and youth literacy, 1990-2015 analysis of data for 41 selected countries. Retrieved from http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/UIS-literacy-statistics-1990-2015-en.pdf.

UNESCO (2016). Enhancement of literacy in Afghanistan (ELA) program. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/kabul/education/enhancement-of-literacy-in-afghanistan-ela-program/.

Verba, S., Burns, N., & Schlozman, K. L. (1997). Knowing and caring about politics: Gender and political engagement. *Journal of Politics*, *59*, 1051-1072.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. (1995). *Voice and equality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Westholme, A. & Niemi, R.G. (1986). Youth unemployment and political alienation. *Youth and Society, 18*, 58-80.

White, C., Bruce, S. & Ritchie, J. (2000). *Young peoples' politics, political interest and engagement amongst 14-24 year olds*. Layerthorpe, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). Development between the ages of 11 and 25. In D. C. Beriner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Wilson, M. C. (2004). Closing the leadership gap: Why women can and must help run the world. New York: Viking.

Wolbrecht, C. & Campbell, D. E. (2007). Leading by example: Female members of Parliament as political role models. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*(4), 921-939. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00289.x

World Economic Forum (2014). *The global gender gap report*. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GGGR14/GGGR_CompleteReport_2014.pdf.

Yoon, K., Pinkleton, B., & Ko, W. (2005). Effects of negative political advertising on voting intention: An exploration of the roles of involvement and source credibility in the

development of voter cynicism. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 11*(2), 95-112. doi:10.1080/1352726042000315423

Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M. X. (2006). *A new engagement: Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Appendix A: 2013-2015 KWLI Schedules

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2013

			Wednesday June 19th	Thursday June 20th	Friday June 21st	Sat. June 22nd	Sun. June 23rd
7:00-8:00				Sleep In	Breakfast		
				Sleep In		Breakfast 8:00am	
8:15-8:30				Sleep In		Leave for HVGSC	
				Sleep In		8:30am	
8:30-10:15			2013 Participants Arrive!!!!!	Sleep In	8:30am MBTI Session I Budig Computer Lab Wendy Shoemaker	Team Building	10:00am Depart Lawrence
10:15-10:30					(all morning)	at Hidden Valley	11:00am
10:30 - 12:15				Orientation Part I GSP Hall		GS Camp 9:00-1:30pm	Brunch at Cheesecake Factory
				Staff			
12:15 - 12:30				Announcements	Announcements		
				12:15pm Depart for Downtown			
12:30 - 1:45				12:30pm Lunch at India Palace	Lunch Break		
					1:30pm Getting Your KU ID! at KU Union		Plaza shopping
1:45 - 3:15				Downtown Lawrence Tour			
3:15 - 3:30					Break		
						Rest!	
3:30 - 5:00				3:30pm Safety Talk Captain Bailey, KUPD GSP Hall	3:30pm Orientation Part III GSP Applied English Center		
				4:15pm Bus System Review		Optional Evening Activities	
5:30 - 7:00				Dinner Break	Dinner Break		
Evening				Orientation Part II at 7:00pm GSP Hall	7pm KU campus tour Jennifer Garren		
					Group Activity		Rest!

www.manaraa.com

	Monday June 24th	Tuesday June 25th	Wednesday June 26th	Thursday June 27th	Friday June 28th	Sat. June 29th	Sun. June 30th
			Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2013				
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
8:15-8:30	Announcements	Announcements		Announcements			
8:30-9:45	Orientation Part IV GSP Dr. Becky Eason/Jenny Memmott	Class Session: MVV GSP Core Faculty Team	Office Hours GSP Staff	8:30 am Assessment Review: Your Leadership Strengths GSP Wendy Shoemaker	8:15am Depart for United Way Community Engagement United Way Panel Erika Dvorske, United Way		
9:45-10:00	Break	Break	Break	Break		Home Stays	Home Stays
10:00-12:30	Where do we begin? GSP Core Faculty Team Academic Orientation GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Tour of United Way Erika Dvorske		
12:30 - 1:45	Working Lunch Session (lunch brought in)	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Home Stays	Home Stays
1:45 - 3:15	1:45-2:45 prepare for reception Official Photo - GSP - 3pm	Introduction to Gender GSP Dr. Suzy D'Enbeau	Open afternoon catchup time/free time	Transnational Networks & Resources GSP Dr. Suzy D'Enbeau	Friday Prayers and Tea Islamic Center		
3:15 - 3:30		Break		Break	Break	Home Stays	Home Stays
3:30 - 5:00	3:30 depart for reception 4pm Welcome Reception Spencer Library	Class Session: "Wall Post" GSP Core Faculty Team		Class Session: MVV GSP Core Faculty Team	Friday Prayers and Tea Islamic Center		
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner Break	Dinner Break		Dinner Break	Dinner Break		
Evening	Bonding night Dorm activities ...and homework!	Errand night ...and homework!	**depart at 5:15pm** "Speed Mentoring" Program and Dinner Macell's 5:30pm	7pm Self Defense Class with Prime Martial Arts Martial Arts Room in Ambler Recreation Center	7 pm Activity Session Jazzercise		Return from Home Stays

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2013

	Monday July 1st	Tuesday July 2nd	Wednesday July 3rd	Thursday July 4th	Friday July 5th	Sat. July 6th	Sun. July 7th
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
8:15-8:30		Announcements			Breakfast		
				Fourth of July Holiday			
8:30-9:45	Office Hours GSP Staff	Class Session: MVV GSP Core Faculty Team	Office Hours GSP Staff	8-9am Breakfast at Hotel 9:30am Depart for Cosmosphere	Travel to Topeka	Cultural Dinner Preparation	National Jr. Angus Show Cattle Judging Kansas City American Royal Complex Hale Arena
9:45-10:00	Break	Break	Break				
10:00-12:30	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team		Lunch in Topeka Afternoon Activites	Cultural Dinner Preparation	
12:30 - 1:45	Lunch Break	Lunch Break					
1:45 - 3:15	MVV Workshop GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session: "Wall Post" GSP Core Faculty Team	Leave for Hutchinson **Boxed lunches**			Cultural Dinner Preparation	
3:15 - 3:30	Break	Break					
3:30 - 5:00	Class Workshop GSP Core Faculty Team "Narrowing Your Topic"	Grantwriting for Nonprofits GSP Dr. Becky Eason & Jenny Memmot	4:00pm Yoder Farms Tour		Travel to Lawrence	Cultural Dinner Plymouth	Oak Park Mall
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner Break	Dinner Break	Dinner Carriage Crossing in Yoder		Dinner Break		
Evening	Bonding night Dorm activities ...and homework!	Executive Women's Dinner Maceli's 6:00pm	Rest!	Evening Fireworks Hodgson Family Farm	Pre-Cultural Dinner Prep		

	Monday July 8th	Tuesday July 9th	Wednesday July 10th	Thursday July 11th	Friday July 12th	Sat. July 13th	Sun. July 14th
		Ramadan begins					
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
8:15-8:30		Announcements		Announcements			
8:30-9:45	Office Hours GSP Staff	Class Session: GSP Core Faculty Team	Office Hours GSP Staff	Class Session: "Wall Post" GSP Core Faculty Team	Topeka Day Tour Capitol Building	Sleep in! Sleep in! Sleep in! Sleep in!	Church Services (optional)
9:45-10:00	Break	Break	Break	Break			
10:00-12:30	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Women and Politics	1pm Travel to Legends	
12:30 - 1:45	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break			
1:45 - 3:15	The Struggle for Women's Rights GSP Dr. Beth Innocenti	Class Workshop GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Workshop GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Workshop GSP Core Faculty Team		2pm Dinner at Granite City Brewery	Optional Activities
3:15 - 3:30	Break						
3:30 - 5:00	Citizen Philanthropy GSP Dr. Kala Stroup					Shopping at Legends	
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner Break	Dinner Break	Dinner Break	Dinner Break	Dinner Break		
Evening	...and homework!	...and homework!	Optional activities: Swimming at Robinson and/or Movie Night **Ramadan Celebration Dinner (...and homework!)	Errand night Best Buy, Walgreens, Dillons, Western Union, etc... ...and homework!	...and homework!	7:05pm T-Bones Game	Workshop LCP 7:00pm-9:00pm (mandatory)

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2013

	Monday July 15th	Tuesday July 16th	Wednesday July 17th	Thursday July 18th	Friday July 19th	Sat. July 20th	Sun. July 21st
		Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2013					
			MVV project due for feedback				
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
8:15-8:30		Announcements				8:00am Depart for MCI	NCC Constitution Mall (all day)
8:30-9:45	Office Hours GSP Staff	Micro-finance/Women's Leadership GSP Sadaffe Abid	Leadership For Change Project Day Schedule TBA	Leadership For Change Project Day Schedule TBA	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team		
9:45-10:00		Break				12:05pm Flight to Philly	
10:00-12:30	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team			Break / Manage Self and MBTI GSP Wendy Shoemaker		
12:30 - 1:45	Lunch Break	Lunch Break		Lunch Break: 12:15-1:15	Lunch Break: 12:15-1:15		
1:45 - 3:15	Storytelling Workshop GSP Core Faculty Team	Class Session: "Wall Post" GSP Core Faculty Team		Class Session: "Sanctuary" JRP Core Faculty Team	Class Session GSP Core Faculty Team		
3:15 - 3:30							
3:30 - 5:00				return to GSP to prepare for Closing Celebration	Packing and cleaning!!		
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner Break	Dinner Break	Dinner Break	5:30 leave GSP for Lied Center	Dinner Break	Dinner at Hotel	Dinner at Jones Restaurant
Evening	Bonding night Dorm activities ...and homework!	TBA	Music Empowerment Jenny Memmott (optional) ...and homework!	Closing Celebration Seynour Gallery, Lied Center 6:00-8:00	Evening Activity		

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2013

	Monday July 22nd	Tuesday July 23rd	Wednesday July 24th	Thursday July 25th	Friday July 26th	Sat. July 27th	Sun. July 28th
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	DC State Department conference				
8:15-8:30	Breakfast			Smithsonian Museum Visit	Library of Congress	Mt. Vernon (all day)	Depart for Home
8:30-9:45	Meet with Beth Sprecker		DC State Department conference				
9:45-10:00							
10:00-12:30		Travel to Capitol Building 10:00am Sharp!					
		11:00am Meeting with Congresswoman Jenkins	DC State Department conference				
		Tour Capitol Building					
12:30 - 1:45	Travel to DC (leave by 2pm sharp!!)	Union Station			WLI Scheduled Meeting		
1:45 - 3:15			DC State Department conference	Cultural Fair			
		Supreme Court Visit					
3:15 - 3:30							
3:30 - 5:00		Return to hotel to prepare for reception	DC State Department conference		Arlington		
		KU Alumnae Reception 5:00pm-7:00pm					
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner Break	Dinner Break		Dinner with SUSI participants	WLI Scheduled Dinner		
Evening	Night Tour of DC 7:00-10:30				WLI Debrief		

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2014

	Monday, June 23	Tuesday, June 24	Wednesday, June 25	Thursday, June 26	Friday, June 27	Sat. June 28	Sun. June 29
7:00-8:00							
8:15-8:30							
8:30-9:45							
9:45-10:00		Kansas participants arrive in Lawrence	KWLI Staff and Kansas participants travel to DC	International participants arrive in Washington DC	Retreat (Osprey Point)	Retreat	Visit Smithsonian Museums
10:00-12:30							
12:30 - 1:45							Friends and Family Day** **schedule with KWLI staff
1:45 - 3:15						Return to Washington	
3:30 - 5:00			Lodging at Embassy Suites, Dulles	Lodging at Embassy Suites, Dulles		Lodging at Hotel Dupont	
5:30 - 7:00						First Night of Ramadan 6:30pm Lebanese Taverna	5:00pm Dinner at the Browns
Evening		BBQ at the Alexanders Home Stays					

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2014

	Monday, June 30	Tuesday, July 1	Wednesday, July 2	Thursday, July 3	Friday, July 4	Sat., July 5	Sun., July 6
7:00-8:00							
8:15-8:30				DC meetings/ KU Alumnae Tour of Capitol Hill Rep. Lynn Jenkins' Office	4th of July Tour the Washington Mall	Pack, prepare to leave for Kansas	Sleep In
8:30-9:45							
9:45-10:00		US Department of State SUSI Conference (all day)				Travel to Airport	
10:00-12:30			Lunch at Mount Vernon	Lunch at Capitol	Lunch at Smithsonian Museums		11:30am Lunch at India Palace
12:30 - 1:45	DC Programming					Fly to Lawrence, Kansas	12:30 Tour of Downtown Lawrence
1:45 - 3:15			Tour of Mount Vernon	Cultural Artifact/ Smithsonian Program and Tour			
3:30 - 5:00	3:30pm Prepare for Cultural Festival			Late Afternoon/Dinner/ Evening Crystal City Mall	Group Dinner 6:00pm Depart for Marina 6:30 Board Schooner		5:00 Dinner
5:30 - 7:00			Dinner on own			Arrive KC 7:20pm	
Evening	5:00pm Cultural Festival 8pm Group Dinner	SUSI Dinner	7:00 Night Tour DC		7:00-10:00pm Sailing and Fireworks	Check into dorms	KU Campus Tour

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2014

	Monday, July 7	Tuesday, July 8	Wednesday, July 9	Thursday, July 10	Friday, July 11	Sat., July 12	Sun., July 13
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
8:15-8:30	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Attend one of three KU classes or Homework/Coaching	Home Stays	Home Stays
8:30-9:45	Getting your KUID Kansas Union	Class	Office Hours	Class			
9:45-10:00	Break	Break	Break	Break			
10:00-12:30	Class	Class	Class	Class			
12:30 - 1:45	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break		
1:45 - 3:15	Class	Class	Class	Class	Class		
3:30 - 5:00			2:30 Break				
		4:00 Break	4:00pm Welcome Reception Spooner Hall				
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner	Leave for Maceli's 5:15pm	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner		
Evening	7pm Willow Orientation (Hashinger)	WE Connect: Speed Mentoring Maceli's 5:30pm	Option: Town Band at South Park Small Group to Willow Homework	Free Night Homework	Free Night		

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2014

	Monday, July 14	Tuesday, July 15	Wednesday, July 16	Thursday, July 17	Friday, July 18	Sat., July 19	Sun., July 20
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
8:15-8:30	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements			
8:30-9:45	Class	Office Hours	Class	Office Hours			
	Break	Break	Break	Break	United Way Panel Discussion and Tour	Cultural Dinner	
9:45-10:00	Class	Class	Class	Class			
10:00-12:30							
12:30 - 1:45	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break		
1:45 - 3:15	Class	Class	Class	Class	Class		Afternoon at Oak Park Mall
3:30 - 5:00		4:00 Break					
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner	Leave for Maceli's 5:45pm	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner		
Evening	Errand Night Homework Small group to Willow	WE Connect: Executive Women's Dinner Maceli's 6:00pm	Homework Small group to Willow	7:00pm Jazzercise	Free Night Cultural Dinner Prep		

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2014

	Monday, July 21	Tuesday, July 22	Wednesday, July 23	Thursday, July 24	Friday, July 25	Sat., July 26	Sun., July 27
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	9am-2pm Hidden Valley Team Building Course	Sleep In
8:15-8:30	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Visit to and programs in Topeka		
8:30-9:45	Class	Class	Class	Class			
9:45-10:00	Break	Break	Break	Break			
10:00-12:30	Class	Class	Class	Class			
12:30 - 1:45	Lunch Break	Working Lunch	Lunch Break	Lunch Break		Friends and Family** **schedule with KWLI staff	
1:45 - 3:15	Class		Class	Class	Class		Practice Presentations
3:30 - 5:00		2:30 Drive to Edwards Campus					
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner	Edwards Campus Women's 4:00pm - 6:00pm	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	Movie Night!	Last Day of Ramadan Celebration
Evening	Errand Night Homework		7pm Willow processing (Hashinger)	Homework	Free Night		
	Small group to Willow	Dinner					

Weekly Schedule -- Women's Civic Leadership from the Heartland -- U.S. Institute on Women's Leadership -- Summer 2014

	Monday, July 28	Tuesday, July 29	Wednesday, July 30	Thursday, July 31	Friday, August 1	Sat., Aug. 2	Sun., Aug. 3
7:00-8:00	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast			
8:15-8:30	Announcements			Clean, Pack		Depart for	
8:30-9:45	Class	**Leave for Union 9:30am	**Leave for Union 8:00am			Chicago	
9:45-10:00		Final Presentations	Final Presentations	9:00am Depart Lawrence for St. Louis Bus	Depart for Springfield		International Women Return Home from Chicago (all day)
10:00-12:30							
12:30 - 1:45							
1:45 - 3:15	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break		Lunch		
3:30 - 5:00	Class	Final Presentations	Class -- Final Session	City Museum	Tour of Lincoln Library and Presidential Museum		
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner	Dinner	5:45 Depart for Lied	Group Dinner scheduled	Group Dinner scheduled	Reception KU Alumnae and guests	
Evening	Final Presentation Preparations	Errand Night	6pm Closing Celebration and Dinner Seymour Gallery, Lied Center	Optional: Arch Tour			

KWLI Week 1: June 22 to June 28

	Monday, June 22	Tuesday, June 23	Wednesday, June 24	Thursday, June 25	Friday, June 26	Saturday June 27	Sunday June 28
7:00am	**Ramadan begins on June 18th		Mary driving staff, van picking up KS women at hotel		Breakfast	Breakfast	Retreat at Osprey Point
8:00am					8:30am Load up		
9:00am		UPAs and staff set up residence Hall (Addison buy granola bars for travel)	8:45am Meeting, loading at Springhill		9:00am Travel to Osprey Point	Osprey Point: Academic Orientation	Travel to DC
10:00am	KWLI Staff and UPAs set up residence hall			International participants arrive in Washington DC			
11:00am							
12:00pm			11:35am Southwest Flight WN 3476 Kansas City to Washington National Airport		Osprey Point: Arrive/Lunch	Osprey Point: Lunch	Check in, etc.
1:00pm							Lunch delivered to hotel (women eat it on their own)
2:00pm					Osprey Point: Cultural Orientation (Astrid)	Osprey Point: Cultural Orientation	Shopping at Crystal City Mall
3:00pm		Kansas participants arrive in Lawrence	2:55pm Land at DCA / Get Luggage 3:40pm Louie Pick up			Osprey Point: Free/fun time	
4:00pm					Osprey Point: Team Building		4pm Meal at the Brown's
5:00pm				Lodging needs to be near Dulles, and ideally have a free shuttle to the airport			
6:00pm		Group Dinner with Lawrence Donor (LaRisa and Jessica coordinating)			Osprey Point: Dinner	Osprey Point: Dinner	
7:00pm			Dinner		Osprey Point: Cultural Orientation		Free Time
8:00pm		Kansas Women (Hotel: 3 double rooms)	KS women orientation at hotel (3 doubles; 4 singles)		Osprey Point: Free/fun time	Osprey Point: Academic Session and Surveys (KWLI, State)	
9:00pm				(13 double rooms, 4 single rooms)			(13 doubles, 5 singles)

KWLI Week 2: June 29 to July 5

	Monday, June 29	Tuesday, June 30	Wednesday, July 1	Thursday, July 2	Friday, July 3	Saturday, July 4	Sunday, July 5
7:00am	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast			
			7:15-8:00am arrive/check in at State Dept.				
8:00am	Sleep in/free time at hotel	8:20 departure Travel Time	8:30 Conference begins		Sleep In	Sleep In	Sleep in
9:00am	Travel time	Capitol Tour (Meet at Rep. Jenkins office)					
10:00am	10am Library of Congress Tour			10:00am WH for security			
				10:30am Tour at White House			
11:00am	Travel Time	Lunch at Capitol Visitor Center				Travel downtown	Free Time (lunch on their own)
12:00pm	Smithsonian free time (friends and family can join in morning and at lunch; lunch on your own)	Travel Time/Security	Department of State SUSI Conference (all day - end at 4:45pm)	1:00pm Leave for airport (15 minute drive)	Lunch at India Palace		
1:00pm		1:00pm State Department with Judy and Allison (12:00 to 3:00 reserved)					
2:00pm				1:30pm Check in at airport (lunch at airport on own)	Reorientation	Tour of Lawrence (UPAs plan)	
3:00pm		Travel Time					Errands, homework, etc. *encourage to do MVV for Tuesday
4:00pm	Travel Time	3:45pm Prepare for Cultural Festival (change clothes, set up booths - time flexible)		3:30pm Southwest Flight WN 3743		Tour of Campus (UPAs plan)	
5:00pm	Dinner *Buca De Bepo	5:00pm State Department Cultural Festival (Mary Snap?)	SUSI Program Dinner at the Melrose Hotel	5:15pm Arrive at MCI	Dinner at Mrs. E's	Dinner. Cookout at Clinton Lake? (UPAs plan)	
6:00pm				Travel to Lawrence (2 14 or 16 passenger vans, 1 cargo van)			
7:00pm	7:00pm Night Tour with Barbara	Lebanese Taverna (with Mary Snap?)		Dinner (will need something delivered)	Unpacking, running errands	Fireworks & Festival Downtown Lawrence (UPAs plan)	Free Time
8:00pm							
9:00pm	(13 doubles, 5 singles)			Unload luggage at Hashinger			

www.manaraa.com

KWLI Week 3: July 6 to July 12

	Monday, July 6	Tuesday, July 7	Wednesday, July 8	Thursday, July 9	Friday, July 10	Saturday, July 11	Sunday, July 12
7:00am	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Packing for weekend and breakfast	
8:00am	travel to Union	KWLI Class	Class: Guest Wendy Shoemaker - MBTI Basics Activities (8:30-10:00)	KWLI Class			
9:00am	9am Getting KUIDs at KS Union						Home Stays
10:00am	Take assessments (DWYA and Strengths Finder) with Wendy	COMS 560	COMS 560	COMS 560	Spirit of Service Panel		
11:00am						Home Stays	
12:00pm					Lunch (may need to order - talk with Jessica?)		
	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch & Learn - Dr. Kala Stroup non profit management			
1:00pm							
2:00pm	KWLI Class	KWLI Class: Wall Post 1	1:30 Guest Speaker: Liz Stigler Introduction to Gender	Cultural Check Point	Spirit of Service: Volunteer Session 1		
				KWLI Class			
3:00pm			2:45 Break				
4:00pm		4:00 Break					
	Announcements		4:00pm Welcome Reception	Announcements	Announcements		
5:00pm	Dinner	Leave for Maceli's 5:15pm					
		5:30 WE CONNECT: Speed Mentoring at Maceli's		Dinner	Dinner		
6:00pm			Dinner				
7:00pm		Keynote Speaker: Dr. Tammara Durham, Student Affairs			Bonding Activity/ Free Time (UPAs plan)		Free Time
8:00pm	Free Time		Free Time	Free Time			
9:00pm		Free Time					

KWLI Week 4: July 13 to July 19

	Monday, July 13	Tuesday, July 14	Wednesday, July 15	Thursday, July 16	Friday, July 17	Saturday, July 18	Sunday, July 19
7:00am	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Cultural Dinner Prep	KWLI Alumni Day
8:00am	KWLI Class	Class: Guest Wendy Shoemaker MBTI - In the Grip Session (8:30-10)	Cultural Check Point	Travel to Mentor Walk	Free Time/MVV Phase 3 workshop time		
9:00am			KWLI Class	WE CONNECT: Mentor Walk			
10:00am	COMS 560	COMS 560	COMS 560	Office Hours (COMS 560 work day w/o KWLI women)			
11:00am				Women get lunch before they go	Lunch		
12:00pm				12:15pm Depart to Topeka			
1:00pm	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	1pm (time flexible) Visit to Topeka (Kansas Action for Children panel, Abbie State House tour)	Spirit of Service: Volunteer Session 2		
2:00pm	KWLI Class	KWLI Class: Wall Post 2	Guest Speaker: Angela Gist. Women, Power, and Communication				
3:00pm			Guest Speaker: Hannah Britton (NO NOT VIDEO TAPE)				
4:00pm							
	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Women get dressed	
5:00pm	Dinner	Break	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner		
		Leave for Location 5:45pm				5:30 Cultural Dinner **Eid Celebration	
6:00pm	Free Time	6:00pm WE CONNECT: Executive Women's Dinner	Free Time	Travel to the Rec Center	Cultural Dinner Prep		
7:00pm				Self Defense Class at Rec Center (Prime Martial Arts- Chris)			
8:00pm							MVV Phase 3 workshop time
9:00pm		Free Time		Free Time		Cultural Dinner Clean UP	
					**Last Day of Ramadan		

KWLI Week 5: July 20 to 26

	Monday, July 20	Tuesday, July 21	Wednesday, July 22	Thursday, July 23	Friday, July 24	Saturday, July 25	Sunday, July 26
7:00am	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	All day: Friends and Family.	Free Time
8:00am	KWLI Class	KWLI Class	Cultural Check Point	KWLI Class	9-10:30 Andrea Hudy at KU Athletics	Video Recording	
9:00am			KWLI Class				Leave for Ropes Course
10:00am	COMS 560	COMS 560	COMS 560	COMS 560	Athletics tour, question		9: 30am Ropes Course
11:00am							
12:00pm	L&L- Women in Male Dominated Fields	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	L&L- International Students & Grad School (12:45)	Lunch at Mrs. E's		
1:00pm							
2:00pm	KWLI Class	KWLI Class	Guest Speaker: Terri Easley Public Speaking	KWLI Class: Wall Post 4	Spirit of Service: Volunteer Session 3		Fun activity option around Lawrence (UPAs plan)
3:00pm	Guest Speaker: Beth Innocenti. Women, Rhetoric, and History		3-4:30 Guest Speaker: Robin Ward Marketing and Branding				
4:00pm							
	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements	Announcements		
5:00pm	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	**WP4KU Event	Dinner		
6:00pm	Free Time	Free Time	MW workshop in the workshop room (UPA help!)		Fun activity: Karaoke (UPAs plan)		Final Presentation Preparation
7:00pm	Wind Chimes with Alesia						
8:00pm							
9:00pm	Free Time			Free Time			

KWLI Week 6: July 27 to August 2

	Monday, July 27	Tuesday, July 28	Wednesday, July 29	Thursday, July 30	Friday, July 31	Saturday, Aug. 1	Sunday, Aug. 2
7:00am	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	
8:00am	Leave for Union	**Leave for Union 8:00am	Clean, Pack				
9:00am				Wrap Up Surveys	8:30am Depart for Springfield (1 hour 30 minute drive)	9:00 Depart for downtown (take train?)	
10:00am	Final Presentations in Alderson	Final Presentations in Alderson			10am Lincoln Museum in Springfield		
11:00am			9:00am Depart Lawrence for St. Louis on Bus (arrive about 1:45)	10 -2pm Zoo		Free time downtown on their own Chicago. Activities: Chicago Bean, Shopping. Lunch on their own	International women return home from Chicago (all day)
12:00pm					Travel to Eureka (1 hour, 21 minutes) **Lunch on their own at Subway		
1:00pm	Lunch Break	Lunch Break		Lunch (on their own at Zoo Café)			
2:00pm			Lunch (on their own at City Museum)	Depart Zoo			
3:00pm	Final Presentations in Alderson	Class: Mary wrap up		Chill at Hotel	Eureka College with Jamel Bell		
4:00pm			City Museum				
5:00pm		Prep for closing dinner		4:15pm Arch Tour			
	Dinner	5:45 Depart for Lied			Travel to Chicago (2 hours, 20 minutes)	Group Dinner	
6:00pm		6pm Closing Celebration and Dinner at Leid Center Pavillion	Chill at hotel				
7:00pm				Group Dinner at Imo's Pizza	Dinner in Chicago (on your own)		
8:00pm	Errand Night		Group Dinner at Mango			Group Wrap Up, Bonding, and Packing	
9:00pm		PACKING!			Free Time at Hotel		

Appendix B: Interview Participant Demographics

Participant #	Year	Age	Country	Major
Participant 1	2013	21	Morocco	Business & Finance
Participant 2	2013	19	India	Political Science
Participant 3	2013	23	Afghanistan	Business Administration
Participant 4	2013	20	Pakistan	English Literature
Participant 5	2013	24	Morocco	English Studies
Participant 6	2013	20	Egypt	Chemical Engineering
Participant 7	2013	20	India	Economics
Participant 8	2013	19	India	English Literature
Participant 9	2013	23	Pakistan	Sociology
Participant 10	2013	18	Mongolia	English
Participant 11	2013	19	Mongolia	Geographical Information Systems
Participant 12	2013	23	Egypt	Information and Comm. Technology
Participant 13	2013	21	Afghanistan	Medicine
Participant 14	2013	21	India	Law
Participant 15	2013	22	Afghanistan	Business
Participant 16	2013	21	Egypt	Medicine
Participant 17	2013	21	Morocco	Economic and Business Management
Participant 18	2013	22	Morocco	Medicine
Participant 19	2014	22	Pakistan	Marketing
Participant 20	2014	20	Mongolia	International Business Management
Participant 21	2014	20	Morocco	Marketing
Participant 22	2014	20	Mongolia	International Management
Participant 23	2014	25	Zambia	Law
Participant 24	2014	20	India	Business and Trade
Participant 25	2014	20	Mongolia	Business Administration/HR
Participant 26	2014	19	Morocco	English
Participant 27	2014	22	Morocco	Engineering
Participant 28	2014	21	Pakistan	International Business and Marketing
Participant 29	2014	24	Afghanistan	Economics
Participant 30	2014	21	Pakistan	Sociology
Participant 31	2014	19	India	Sociology
Participant 32	2014	19	India	Business Administration
Participant 33	2014	23	Zambia	Finance and Management
Participant 34	2014	20	Zambia	Banking and Finance
Participant 35	2014	25	Afghanistan	Diplomacy- Social Science and Politics
Participant 36	2014	23	Zambia	Social Work
Participant 37	2014	19	Morocco	Medicine
Participant 38	2014	23	Afghanistan	Business
Participant 39	2015	22	Pakistan	Psychology
Participant 40	2015	21	Pakistan	Economics

Participant 41	2015	23	Afghanistan	Medicine
Participant 42	2015	20	India	Computer Science and Engineering
Participant 43	2015	23	Morocco	Architecture
Participant 44	2015	19	Morocco	English Literature
Participant 45	2015	18	India	Psychology
Participant 46	2015	20	India	English
Participant 47	2015	20	Afghanistan	Software Engineering
Participant 48	2015	22	Morocco	Aerospace Engineering
Participant 49	2015	20	Mongolia	Finance Management
Participant 50	2015	23	Afghanistan	Medicine
Participant 51	2015	20	Pakistan	English Literature
Participant 52	2015	19	India	English Literature
Participant 53	2015	18	Pakistan	Psychology
Participant 54	2015	21	Morocco	Marketing
Participant 55	2015	20	Mongolia	International Economic Relations
Participant 56	2015	21	Afghanistan	Medicine
Participant 57	2015	19	Mongolia	Renewable Energy
Participant 58	2015	21	Mongolia	International Business

Appendix C: 2013 Interview Protocol

Background Information:

-What is your age?
-What year are you in your university program?
-What is your major / focus of study at your university?
-What country do you currently reside in?

1. What do you believe to be the general role of gender in your country to be?: what similarities and differences do men and women face in your country?
2. What do you believe the general role of gender to be in your area of study?
3. What influence does politics have on the career you plan to have?
4. Do you plan to have a career outside of the home after you get married?
5. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being no interest at all and 10 being extremely interested, how would you rank your level of interest in politics in your country?
6. What do you find interesting (or not interesting) about politics?
7. How on a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not knowledgeable at all and 10 being extremely knowledgeable, how would you rank your knowledge of politics in your country?
8. How do you personally gain and seek knowledge on politics?
9. Do you think there are barriers to becoming knowledgeable about politics in your country?
10. Who do you talk to in your family about politics?
11. What political topics do you discuss with your family?
12. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not involved at all and 10 being extremely involved, how would you rank your political participation in your country?
13. How would you define political participation?
14. Do you think there are barriers to political participation in your country for women? Please explain….
15. How would you describe the overall role of gender in your country's political system?
16. What is your perception of the role of gender in the American political system?
17. What do you think American women's perceptions are of women in your country regarding political involvement and participation?
18. What do you think the differences and similarities are for American women and women in your country in regards to politics?

For the next set of questions, please rank on a scale of 1-5 with 1= strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neutral/no opinion, 4=disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. Follow ups for each with "why do you feel that way?"
19. I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics. – why do you feel that way?
20. I think political officials care about what people like me think. – why do you feel that way?
21. Sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. – why do you feel that way?
22. I have trust in the political system. – why do you feel that way?

23. I feel that I could do as good of a job in public office as most other people. – why do you feel that way?
24. I feel that I am more informed about politics than most people. – why do you feel that way?
25. The average person can influence the political system. – why do you feel that way?
26. Is there anything I have not asked you about that you would like to share? Any opinions, feelings, or thoughts related to questions in this interview?

Appendix D: 2014 Interview Protocol

Background Information:

-What is your age?
-What year are you in your university program?
-What is your major / focus of study at your university?
-What country do you currently reside in?

1. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being no interest at all and 10 being extremely interested, how would you rank your level of interest in politics in your country?
2. What do you find interesting (or not interesting) about politics?
3. How on a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not knowledgeable at all and 10 being extremely knowledgeable, how would you rank your knowledge of politics in your country?
4. How do you personally gain and seek knowledge on politics?
5. Do you think there are barriers to becoming knowledgeable about politics in your country?
6. Who do you talk to in your family about politics? What political topics do you discuss with them?
7. How would you define political participation?
8. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not involved at all and 10 being extremely involved, how would you rank your political participation in your country?
9. Do you think there are barriers to political participation in your country for women?
10. What is your perception of the role of gender in the American political system?
11. What do you think the differences and similarities are for American women and women in your country in their political systems?
12. What elements of the American political system (if any) would you like to see adopted n your country?

For the next set of questions, please rank on a scale of 1-5 with 1= strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neutral/no opinion, 4=disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. Follow ups for each with "why do you feel that way?
13. I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics. – why do you feel that way?
14. I think political officials care about what people like me think. – why do you feel that way?
15. Sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. – why do you feel that way?
16. I have trust in the political system. – why do you feel that way?
17. I feel that I could do as good of a job in public office as most other people. – why do you feel that way?
18. I feel that I am more informed about politics than most people. – why do you feel that way?
19. The average person can influence the political system. – why do you feel that way?

20. Is there anything I have not asked you about that you would like to share? Any opinions, feelings, or thoughts related to questions in this interview?

Appendix E: 2015 Interview Protocol

Background Information:

  -What is your age?
  -What year are you in your university program?
  -What is your major / focus of study at your university?
  -What country do you currently reside in?

1. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being no interest at all and 10 being extremely interested, how would you rank your level of interest in politics in your country?
2. What do you find interesting (or not interesting) about politics?
3. Why would you want or not want to be in political office?
4. How on a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not knowledgeable at all and 10 being extremely knowledgeable, how would you rank your knowledge of politics in your country?
5. How do you personally gain and seek knowledge on politics?
6. Do you think there are barriers to becoming knowledgeable about politics in your country?
7. Who do you talk to in your family about politics? What political topics do you discuss with them?
8. How would you define political participation?
9. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not involved at all and 10 being extremely involved, how would you rank your political participation in your country?
10. Do you know any women that hold political office in your country?
11. Do you think there are barriers to political participation in your country for women? What are the barriers?
12. If there are more women in the government – do you think it is more responsive to women's issues?
13. What would it take for your government to be responsive to women's issues?

14. What is your perception of women (*the role of gender*) in the American political system?
15. What do you think are the main differences and similarities for women in the United States and your country in their political systems?
16. What elements of the American political system (if any) would you like to see adopted in your country?

For the next set of questions, please rank on a scale of 1-5 with 1= strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neutral/no opinion, 4=disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. Follow ups for each with "why do you feel that way?"
17. I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics. – why do you feel that way?
18. I think political officials care about what people like me think. – why do you feel that way?

19. Sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. – why do you feel that way?
20. I have trust in the political system. – why do you feel that way?
21. Politics and political issues have a direct influence in my life. --- why do you feel that way?
22. I feel that I am more informed about politics than most people. – why do you feel that way?
23. The average person can influence the political system. – why do you feel that way?
24. Is there anything I have not asked you about that you would like to share? Any opinions, feelings, or thoughts related to questions in this interview?

Appendix F: 2013 Follow-Up Survey Protocol

Follow-up survey was emailed to participants and responses were emailed back to the researcher from the participants directly.

1) Now that you are home and have completed your participation in the leadership institute, do you see politics in your country any differently? If yes, how so? If no, why not?
2) After your participation in the leadership institute, do you think your opinion of being politically informed and knowledgeable has changed? If yes, how so? If no, why not?
3) After your participation in the leadership institute, do you think your opinion of being politically active (including various issues in your country) has changed? If yes, how so. If no, why not?
4) Has the leadership institute changed your outlook on politics in your home country? If yes, how so? If no, why not?

Appendix G: 2014 Follow-Up Survey Protocol

Follow-up survey was given to participants on paper the last class day of the institute. Each participant filled out the survey individually.

1. After the leadership institute and studying adaptive leadership, how would you define political participation?
2. After your participation in the leadership institute, do you see politics in your country differently? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?
3. After your participation in the leadership institute, do you think your opinion of being politically informed and knowledgeable has changed? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?
4. After your participation in the leadership institute, do you think your opinion of being politically active (including various issues in your country) has changed? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?
5. Has the leadership institute changed your outlook on politics in your home country? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?

   For the next set of questions, please rank on a scale of 1-5 with:
   1= strongly agree
   2 = agree
   3 = neutral/no opinion
   4=disagree
   5 = strongly disagree.
   ---→Please circle your answer and then provide a BRIEF one-sentence explanation for your ranking below the scale.

6. After my participation in the leadership institute, I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics.

   1   2   3   4   5

7. After my participation in the leadership institute, I think political officials care about what people like me think.

   1   2   3   4   5

8. After my participation in the leadership institute, I feel that sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.

   1   2   3   4   5

9. After my participation in the leadership institute, I have trust in the political system.

1   2   3   4   5

10. After my participation in the leadership institute, I think politics and political issues have a direct influence in my life.

1   2   3   4   5

11. After my participation in the leadership institute, I feel that I am more informed about politics than most people.

1   2   3   4   5

12. After my participation in the leadership institute, I believe the average person can influence the political system.

1   2   3   4   5

Appendix H: 2015 Follow-Up Survey Protocol

Follow-up survey was given to participants on paper the last class day of the institute. Each participant filled out the survey individually.

1. After the leadership institute and studying adaptive leadership, how would you define political participation?
2. After your participation in the leadership institute, do you see politics in your country differently? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?
3. After your participation in the leadership institute, do you think your opinion of being politically informed and knowledgeable has changed? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?
4. After your participation in the leadership institute, do you think your opinion of being politically active (including various issues in your country) has changed? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?
5. Has the leadership institute changed your outlook on politics in your home country? If **yes**, how so? If **no**, why not?

   For the next set of questions, please rank on a scale of 1-5 with:

   1= strongly agree
   2 = agree
   3 = neutral/no opinion
   4=disagree
   5 = strongly disagree.
   ---→Please circle your answer and then provide a BRIEF one-sentence explanation for
your ranking below the scale.

6. After my participation in the leadership institute, I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics.

   1   2   3   4   5

7. After my participation in the leadership institute, I think political officials care about what people like me think.

   1   2   3   4   5

8. After my participation in the leadership institute, I feel that sometimes politics and the government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.

   1   2   3   4   5

9. After my participation in the leadership institute, I have trust in the political system.

   1   2   3   4   5

10. After my participation in the leadership institute, I think politics and political issues have a direct influence in my life.

    1   2   3   4   5

11. After my participation in the leadership institute, I feel that I am more informed about politics than most people.

    1   2   3   4   5

12. After my participation in the leadership institute, I believe the average person can influence the political system.

    1   2   3   4   5

Appendix I: Informed Consent Form

Title of Research Project: "Gender and Political Participation: An Analysis of International Perspectives of Political Knowledge and Involvement"

The Department of Communication Studies at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You may refuse to sign this form and not participate in this study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time. If you do withdraw from this study, it will not affect your relationship with this unit, the services it may provide to you, or the University of Kansas.

The purpose of this research project is to investigate the role of gender in professional and political involvement of women from various countries including political interest and knowledge. This study investigates women's interest in politics from an international perspective. This study seeks to understand perceptions of gender in various cultural contexts including international perspectives of gender in American politics.

PROCEDURES: You will be asked to participate in an in-depth interview that will be audio-recorded. The recordings will only be used by the researcher and will be stored on a password-encrypted computer. The interview will take most participants approximately an hour to complete. You will be asked questions about the role of gender and female participation in your area of study, as well as in your country's political system. You will be asked questions regarding politics and your interest and involvement in your country's political system. You will be asked to share your perceptions of the American political system and the role that women play in American politics.

RISKS: I foresee minimal risks to the participants. In order to minimize risk to you, you have the option to skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. You also have the right to terminate the interview at any time. Your name will not be associated with any information; data will be viewed in the aggregate. I will record the interview; after interviews have been transcribed, all audio recordings will be deleted and destroyed.

BENEFITS: Participation in this study will not result in any direct benefits to you, but your participation will be contributing to society through an additional understanding of the role of gender in politics from international perspectives.

PAYMENT TO PARTICIPANTS: Participants will voluntarily participate in this study and will not be paid for participation.

PARTICIPANT CONFIDENTIALITY: Your name will not be associated in any publication or presentation with the information collected about you or with the research findings

from this study. Instead, the researcher will use a study number or a pseudonym rather than your name. Your identifiable information will not be shared unless (a) it is required by law or university policy, or (b) you give written permission. Permission granted on this date to use and disclose your information remains in effect indefinitely. By signing this form you give permission for the use and disclosure of your information for purposes of this study at any time in the future.

REFUSAL TO SIGN CONSENT AND AUTHORIZATION: You are not required to sign this Consent and Authorization form and you may refuse to do so without affecting your right to any services you are receiving or may receive from the University of Kansas or to participate in any programs or events of the University of Kansas. However, if you refuse to sign, you cannot participate in this study.

CANCELLING THIS CONSENT AND AUTHORIZATION: You may withdraw your consent to participate in this study at any time. You also have the right to cancel your permission to use and disclose further information collected about you, in writing, at any time, by sending your written request to the researcher listed at the end of this consent form. If you cancel permission to use your information, the researchers will stop collecting additional information about you. However, the research team may use and disclose information that was gathered before they received your cancellation, as described above.

QUESTIONS ABOUT PARTICIPATION: Questions about procedures should be directed to the researcher listed at the end of this consent form.

PARTICIPANT CERTIFICATION: I have read this Consent and Authorization form. I have had the opportunity to ask, and I have received answers to, any questions I had regarding the study. I understand that if I have any additional questions about my rights as a research participant, I may call (785) 864-7429 or (785) 864-7385, write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7568, or email irb@ku.edu.

I agree to take part in this study as a research participant. By my signature I affirm that I am at least 18 years old and that I have received a copy of this Consent and Authorization form.

_____   _____

Please Print Participant's Name   Date

_____

Participant's Signature

Researcher Contact Information:

Terri Easley
Principal Investigator
PhD Student
Comm Studies Dept.
1400 Jayhawk Blvd, #102 Bailey Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045
214-783-7953 (cell)
TerriEasley@ku.edu

Mary Christine Banwart, PhD
Faculty Supervisor
Associate Professor
Comm Studies Dept.
1400 Jayhawk Blvd, #102 Bailey Hall
 University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045
785-864-5681 (office)
mbanwart@ku.edu