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Phenomenological patterns identified from lived experiences described in the biographies of Nightingale, Curie, and Roosevelt were found consistent with the Centered Leadership model (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2011) confirming the model as a valuable guide for leadership development of women. This biographical case study of three outstanding women from the last century analyzed information from their own words quoted in collected works, books, and articles they authored or written about them. We documented evidence of the fabulous five dimensions of meaning, framing, connecting, engaging, and energizing from Centered Leadership for all three exemplars supporting the model.

INTRODUCTION

The research in this article started with an interest in Florence Nightingale. We were researching her recently published “Collected Works” (McDonald, 2002-2010) when someone said she was one of only three women on a list of the 100 most influential people of the last 1000 years. We never found that list. We did find several lists of influential leaders and noted very few women on them. We found Florence Nightingale, Marie Curie, and Eleanor Roosevelt on many of these lists. Intrigued, we began examining the lives and contributions of these three exemplary women in hopes of developing an informative perspective on the leadership characteristics of remarkable women. We felt exploring their lives would be of interest and offer some insights valuable to women today.

Problem

The literature exploring barriers restricting the advancement of women into leadership roles is extensive (Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010; Moss-Kanter, 1993; Payne, 2005). Less well studied are women who have emerged as leaders in scientific and applied fields in times even more restrictive than the present. Several recent leadership models appeared relevant. Cheung and Halpern (2010) developed a model recognizing the “culture of genders” (p. 182) that included a focus on relationship oriented leadership traits, the value of teamwork and consensus, and effective work-family interface. Barsh,
Cranston, and Craske, (2008); Barsh and Cranston (2009); and Barsh, Cranston, and Lewis (2011) developed a similar but more comprehensive model, Centered Leadership, which we found interesting.

Centered Leadership

Our investigations exploring the lives of these three standout women led us to deeper consideration of the McKinsey and Company Centered Leadership Project (Barsh & Cranston, 2009; Barsh, Cranston, & Craske, 2008; Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2011). From over eight years of research on remarkable women, McKinsey consultants, Barsh, Cranston, and Craske (2008), developed the leadership model Centered Leadership. The model describes five interrelated dimensions, also known as, “the fabulous five.”

- Meaning. When women find their strengths and put them to work in the pursuit of an inspiring purpose.
- Managing energy. When women recognize from where they derive their energy, how they apply it, and how to manage it.
- Positive framing. When women adopt a constructive way of seeing their world, expand their horizons, and become resilient moving ahead even when things do not go as planned.
- Connecting. When women build stronger relationships, increase their sense of belonging, and identify others who can help them develop.
- Engaging. When women become self-reliant, confidently accepting opportunities, speaking up, and collaborating with others.

We found Centered Leadership useful and adopted it as the framework for our comparison study of the three women. We feel the examples of Florence Nightingale, Marie Curie, and Eleanor Roosevelt provide insights into characteristics that distinguish outstanding female leaders. Integrating experiences selected from their biographies and personal papers using Centered Leadership (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2011) makes the examples of these three women more meaningful for women of today.

Research Questions

Our original question was, “What are some common phenomenological patterns in the lives of Nightingale, Curie, and Roosevelt identifiable in their biographies that could be shared with other women and would contribute to the professional and personal successes of women today?”

After we discovered Centered Leadership (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2011), we modified our research question to, “Will phenomenological patterns identified in the biographies of Nightingale, Curie, and Roosevelt be consistent with Centered Leadership (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis) and how might they confirm the model as valuable to the professional and personal successes of women today?”

Design

We selected a case study approach as consistent with our focus on the three women previously identified by the historical listings. Since the three women have died, the most direct information available was material in their own words cited in collected works; books and articles they authored; and comments, feelings, or behaviors attributed to them by authors of their biographies. To emphasize the analysis of each subject, each of the researchers initially focused on one woman, identifying and classifying data on their subject. After we expanded the focus of data collection to include the other two women, the other two researchers added additional data as appropriate. Data collection continued until the research team identified no additional fresh information in the historical and biographical sources.

Results

We wrote case records for each of the three women. We also explored theoretical models of successful women that might be helpful integrating the case record observations. It was from this search that we identified the McKinsey How Remarkable Women Lead study and decided to test the theory behind the Centered Leadership assessment and development processes (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2011) using the information on our three exemplars. We organized our collected data in a matrix of categories
consistent with Centered Leadership (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis). Following the reorganization of the data, we inductively examined the data for each of our three women leaders for consistency and support of the Centered Leadership model (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis). Doing this, we were able to identify examples from the lives of all three women exemplifying components of Centered Leadership. This was true despite the very different temperaments of Nightingale, Curie, and Roosevelt. This finding confirmed the value of Centered Leadership (Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis) for understanding successful women and for communicating this in systematic ways to other women in leadership. Following are the case descriptions.

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE (1820-1910)

A woman with ideas well before her time, Florence Nightingale earned recognition for her ideas in a world that initially dismissed her as an upper class, privileged woman seeking a charitable activity to occupy her time. She developed and emerged as a major leader in hospital hygiene, health care, and the design and management of hospitals. Her influence became pervasive as it supplied or anticipated many of the building blocks of modern nursing, public health, and hospital care. Known poetically after the Longfellow poem about her as “the lady with the lamp,” Florence Nightingale challenged the already entrenched medical fraternity with straightforward correct science and practice based on careful observations and insightful deductions. She also challenged established public health and hospital practices that persisted as habits even after the accumulating knowledge and experience demonstrated they were dangerous. Her pioneering efforts created the field of professional nursing and the evidence-based nursing practice of today.

A recent biographer, Lynn McDonald, described Nightingale’s central influence,

a ‘Nightingale methodology’ can be identified: read the best information available in print, especially government reports and statistics; interview experts; if the available information is inadequate send out your own questionnaire; test it first at one institution; consult practitioners who use the material; send out draft reports to experts for vetting before publication. (2006, p. XX)

In addition to her other talents, Florence Nightingale was a creative data analyst who collected, tabulated, displayed, and interpreted descriptive statistics analyzing the mortality data for soldiers in the Crimean War. Motivated by her distress over her war experiences in Scutari, she invented the polar area diagram using it to associate the mortality data with unsanitary conditions, contagious diseases, and war wounds. Using her analysis and illustrations, she showed that most of the British soldiers died from unsanitary conditions not from war wounds. After the war, she refined her analysis process and advocated for standardized, accurate statistics as a basis for improving medical and surgical practices. Her paper, Proposals for a Uniform Plan of Hospital Statistics (1861), changed the existing practice of simply reporting deaths to include William Farr’s classification of diseases as the basis for tabulation of hospital morbidity. This approach has become a standard practice in hospitals and other organizations that need to track disease information. In Notes on Nursing, Florence Nightingale wrote:

In dwelling upon the vital importance of sound observation, it must never be lost sight of what observation is for. It is not for the sake of piling up miscellaneous information or curious facts, but for the sake of saving life and increasing health and comfort. (p. 70)

Nightingale became the first woman Fellow of the Royal Statistical Society in 1858 and an honorary member of the American Statistical Association in 1874.

Nightingale’s emphasis on analysis and understanding as the model for nurses continues today. This was demonstrated by Betts and Wright (2009) who quoted Strachan, Delaney, and Sensmeier (2006) that nurses are, “…knowledge facilitators, translators and interpreters of scientific information to support
patient preference and the development of individualised care pathways to support improved health outcomes” (p. 509).

Another example of the continuing influence of Nightingale is a recent Meyers and McNicholas (2008) article. This article reported data collected on Meyers’ multi-ligament knee reconstruction experiences at Warrington Hospitals over 7 years. The researchers displayed the results of the operations in a diagram presenting defined, colored spaces representing each of six possible ligament components. The colored spaces overlapped to show all the combinations used in the surgeries. This was a direct, current application of the descriptive statistical processes developed by Venn and Nightingale.

Nightingale as a Centered Leader

Our content analysis of biographical material supported the identification of Florence Nightingale as a centered leader consistent with the categories identified in the Barsh, Cranston, and Lewis (2011) theoretical model. The following excerpts provide evidence of the model as an analytic tool used to examine some of the reported experiences and comments of Florence Nightingale.

Meaning

Originally unhappy with her social station, Nightingale found happiness by selecting a career in nursing based on her belief that God had called her to the profession. She took great satisfaction from her efforts as a nurse, manager, and consultant contributing to the health of British soldiers. A take-charge administrator at the Harley Street London Nursing home and in the British military hospital in Scutari, she consistently demonstrated independence, persistence, and organization. She withstood initial criticism and resistance of doctors and military officers in Scutari and eventually won their acceptance and support.

Positive Framing

Nightingale demonstrated unceasing concern for the suffering of soldiers. Her dedication to them and her leadership in the army hospital in Scutari won her the accolade of “Angel of the Crimea.” Even when she was seriously ill with Crimean fever, Nightingale continued to work in the Crimea instituting sanitary reforms in Scutari and Balaclava. She began her studies documenting most war casualties were due to nosocomial infections and not a direct result from the wounds. Later in life when confined to her home, Nightingale continued to influence health care reforms and the development of nursing as a profession through her far-reaching correspondence.

Connecting

Although she shunned publicity, as a member of the British landed gentry, Nightingale had connections in high British social circles. Her correspondence with royalty, viceroys, cabinet ministers, and international leaders was extensive. She approached Sidney Herbert, British Secretary of War, and Queen Victoria with appeals to win support for the reforms. She advocated to improve hospital conditions and treatment of British soldiers. She donated the 45,000 pounds raised in her honor by the public to found the St. Thomas’ Hospital nurses training school.

Engaging

One biographer credited Nightingale’s influence to the fact she was a prolific writer. Her recently published collected works (McDonald, 2002-2010) contains 18 volumes. Her writing was persuasive. She invented a statistical process, the polar area graph, known today as the modern circular histogram used for displaying grouped cyclic data. The +plus magazine of living mathematics called Florence Nightingale, “The compassionate statistician” (Magnello, 2010, para. 1).

Energizing

Early in her career, Nightingale eagerly accepted the leadership of a 38-nurse delegation to Scutari, Turkey. She worked to change the conditions in the hospital by directing her nurses to work supporting the physicians and improve sanitation even when resisted. After her return to England, she shunned
publicity and sequestered herself in her home to avoid the press and the adoring public. However, through extensive correspondence, she remained in contact with her supporters and other leaders who could influence nursing and the improvement of hospital conditions. Through her personal model and continuing efforts, Nightingale became an inspirational model for women and nurses creating a legacy of leadership that persists today.

MARIE SKLODOVSKA CURIE (1867-1934)

Marie Sklodovska Curie was from a scientific family of Polish patriots. Her father was a professor of physics at the University of Warsaw. Her mother ran a private high school for aristocratic young women in Warsaw. As a child, Curie polished instruments in her father’s physics laboratory exposing her to science early in her life. Even though she was valedictorian of her class in high school, she did not anticipate attending college since young women in Poland at that time could not do so. Marie worked as a private tutor and studied in an underground Polish “floating University.” There she took classes forbidden in the regular Polish universities. Later, Marie also taught classes in the floating University to working women where she was impressed by how quickly and how well these women learned. Her next employment was as a governess. She lived with a cultured upper class family near Szcuki. There she also started a school for peasant children, teaching them two hours a day. Marie’s sister was in medical school in Paris and Marie worked to pay her sister’s tuition on the promise that once her sister became a physician she would bring Marie to Paris to study. Marie’s hope was to join her sister in Paris to study mathematics and physics. Marie’s intent was to return eventually to Poland and teach high school.

After Marie’s sister married a Polish exile who was a practicing doctor, she invited Marie to move in with her and her husband in Paris. Marie accepted the offer and enrolled at the Sorbonne. There she worked on her masters in mathematics and increased her knowledge of French. Eventually Marie rented a garret in the Latin Quarter of Paris. She placed first in her mathematics exam but she also wanted to study physics. Marie successfully applied for the Alexandrovitch Scholarship for young Poles studying abroad and was able to begin her study of physics. Some years later, she repaid the foundation for the scholarship assigned to her. For her studies in physics, she needed a laboratory and arranged for one with Pierre Curie, then a well-known physicist. The two of them were married after working together for about a year.

Marie had nurtured an interest in radioactivity after reading an article in 1895 by Antoine Henri Becquerel. Radioactive rays were a mystery; similar to X-rays yet different since they were spontaneously produced. However, Marie was not able to satisfy her curiosity and study them. Marie earned a master’s degree in secondary education. After the birth of her daughter, Marie was able to study the rays emitted by uranium and coined the term “radioactivity” to describe the rays. She also hypothesized a new element, radium, as the source. By 1898, Pierre and Marie began collaborating to verify the existence of radium. Marie continued work on her doctorate earning it in 1903. This was the same year she shared the Nobel Prize in physics with her husband and Antoine Becquerel. In 1906, Pierre was killed in an accident. Marie though depressed, continued her work on radium.

After Pierre’s death, Marie took over his laboratory and teaching position at the Sorbonne. She was successful isolating radium metal and invented the technique used to weigh radioactive substances producing the first international standard of radium which was supplied to several other physics research laboratories. Marie managed the construction of the Institute of Radium and in 1911 was awarded her second Nobel Prize, this time in chemistry. During World War I, Marie invented a portable X-ray unit, arranged to have a number of these constructed, then trained 150 French housewives to operate them. The devices came to be known as “little Curies” and were used to diagnose war wounds in medical facilities near the front lines. Despite her two Nobel Prizes, the French Academy of Sciences never admitted her to membership. Marie Curie died in 1934 from leukemia likely caused by her long exposure to radioactive materials.
Marie Curie as a Centered Leader

Our content analysis supported the identification of Marie Curie as a centered leader consistent with the categories identified in Barsh and Cranston’s (2009) Centered Leadership. The following summarizes major information from Curie’s life categorized by the dimensions of Centered Leadership.

Meaning
Marie Curie’s childhood was a happy one. Her intention was to become a high school teacher in Poland and after she left to attend college, she always intended to return. She worked as a governess to support her sister who was studying in France. Later, Curie also moved to France to study. As a student, she lived a Spartan existence not discouraged by being cold or hungry. Although she said self-awareness, “does not exist for me” (Curie, 1937, p. 403), her work first as a laboratory assistant and later as Pierre Curie’s wife and co-researcher eventually gave great meaning to her work. She was described as being most at home in her laboratory.

Framing
Once she started studying radioactivity in the effort to find its source, Curie became single minded in her pursuit. She was happy and absorbed working to extract Radium in the shed that served as the laboratory. After her husband Pierre’s death, Curie took over his teaching position and laboratory at the Sorbonne. The Curies did not patent Radium but instead donated it saying, “…humanity needs dreamers” (Curie, 1937, p. 336).

Connecting
Known as a shy person, on rare occasions when she entertained others, Curie was described as a meticulous hostess. With her husband, she published 32 scientific papers in five years, establishing her reputation. From then on, she regularly received letters from the greatest scientists of the early twentieth century and was the only woman scientist in many scientific and academic meetings. A hands-on scientist and builder, Curie was highly involved with the architect when managing the building of the Physics Laboratory at the Sorbonne. She drew plans, climbed scaffolding, argued with the architect. During WWI, her she donated the award from her Nobel Prize to fund mobile X-Ray units, known as “little Curies,” used to identify shrapnel in wounded soldiers. Curie developed the reputation of being a kind, gentle, person when working with the wounded.

Engaging
Curie took the risk of abandoning the study of Uranium in favor of examining all known chemical bodies that emitted spontaneous rays. Although fame and publicity brought her misery and torment, Curie supported others in their scholarly efforts and research. Curie persisted in her efforts even through a period when she was close to suicide because of the personal attacks of the French press. Marie won her second Nobel Prize based on her own efforts, even though the French Academy of Sciences repeatedly rejected her for membership.

Energizing
Curie loved working in her laboratory. It became her secret universe marked by the rigor of her work, her passions for science and radioactivity. Marie was convinced there was a new element involved in the release of spontaneous rays and suggested the name for radioactivity. Said, “I’ve got to find it. We are sure” (Curie, 1937, p. 157). She ignored initial symptoms of radiation sickness and persisted in her research to find Radium even though the element existed only in her and Pierre’s imagination.

Curie became a world-renowned scientist who made discoveries altering basic scientific tenants in physics and chemistry, discovered two new elements, and won two Nobel Prizes in an age when virtually no women worked in science. She was the first woman admitted to several prestigious scientific societies where she was accepted as a peer.
ELEANOR ROOSEVELT (1884-1962)

Eleanor Roosevelt was born into a well-known, socially prominent New York City family. She had buckteeth and was not considered attractive; however, her father encouraged her to become socially aware by pointing out differences between her clothes and those of other children like newsboys and homeless people. After Eleanor’s mother died when Eleanor was eight, the young woman moved to her maternal grandmother’s home where she was raised under strict discipline. This even included a steel brace for her back to improve her posture. Not a studious child, Eleanor began to develop intellectually when at 15 she attended boarding school in London. There she learned French, Italian, and developed an interest in current events. After boarding school, her grandmother refused to allow Eleanor to attend college. Rather than joining the social activities of other young people in her social class, Eleanor became engaged in various philanthropic organizations and activities. Among these were the Junior League, the Rivington Street Settlement House, and the Consumer’s League.

In 1903, Eleanor renewed her friendship with a relative and former playmate, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Over the objections of both sides of the family, the two were married. As Franklin’s wife, Eleanor bore six children in the next 12 years. She also allowed her mother-in-law to regulate much of her life. This changed in 1910 with Franklin’s election as governor of New York. In 1913, Franklin was appointed Secretary of the Navy and the Roosevelts moved to Washington. There Eleanor, “…looked at everything from the point of view of what I ought to do, rarely from the standpoint of what I wanted to do” (Roosevelt, 1949, p. 23). During WWI, Eleanor became the manager for a Red Cross canteen that included tours of naval hospitals. These experiences led to Eleanor’s demand of Franklin that the country address the living conditions of the poor and the depressed staff she had observed.

In 1918, Eleanor learned that her husband was having an affair with her personal secretary, Lucy Mercer, an affair that lasted until Franklin died. Although Eleanor did not divorce Franklin, she became an independent partner. After Franklin’s paralysis from polio, Eleanor took on the lead parent role for their children while nursing Franklin. Her encouragement was part of the reason he decided to run for president. After his election, Eleanor expanded the previous role of first ladies by promoting social causes like the National Training School for Girls. She also took many social issues to her husband supporting the causes of women, blacks, and the needy. In This I Remember (1949), she explained,

Franklin often used me to get the reflection of other people’s thinking because he knew I made it a point to see and talk with a variety of people. I did not need to go on lecture trips, or go to inspect projects in different parts of the country, but my husband knew that I would not be satisfied to be merely an official hostess. (p. 3)

She initiated first lady press conferences and banned male reporters. Eleanor also wrote a daily newspaper column My Day and lectured all over the country.

After Franklin died, Eleanor continued her public life serving twice as a member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. where she served on the Human Rights Commission and was a key author of the U.N.’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). She was a shrewd, effective advocate for it in the closing debate. Eleanor also served in the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. After her death in 1962, the New York Times printed this summary of her achievements, “…[N]o First Lady could touch her for causes espoused, opinions expressed, distance spanned, people spoken to, words printed, precedents chattered, honors conferred, degrees garneted” (New York Times, 1962). John Cooper, Jr. in the introduction to her biography described her thus,

For the last thirty years of her life, Eleanor Roosevelt was the most famous and at times the most influential woman in the world….It seems doubtful that she would have achieved a stature anything like she did without her husband’s position. Still, in contrast to every other first lady, it is easy to imagine her establishing a public position for herself
if she had remained single, had been widowed in early adulthood, or had married a man who never entered politics. (p. vii)

Arthur Schlesinger in the forward to Lash’s *Eleanor and Franklin* (1971, p. xi) summarized Eleanor succinctly in these words, “Her liberation was not an uncovenanted gift. She attained it only through a terrifying exertion of self-discipline….”

**Eleanor Roosevelt as a Centered Leader**

Our content analysis supported the identification of Eleanor Roosevelt as a Centered Leader consistent with the categories identified in the Barsh and Cranston (2009) model. The following examples from her life demonstrate the presence of the fabulous five dimensions from the model.

**Meaning**

Although her childhood was not a happy one, Roosevelt taught herself to be effective. She volunteered and emerged as a leader for many causes. A willing and vocal advocate for many causes, Eleanor became a skilled negotiator and speaker. As an independent partner to FDR, she brought many issues to him that he might otherwise have ignored. Roosevelt was also a strong voice for a new more-equal role for women in organizations and in government. Her advisory group during the 1924 Democratic convention strongly advocated for the Shepard-Towner Act, landmark legislation that was the first Federal health and welfare program.

**Framing**

Eleanor was aware of her impact and used it to draw attention to issues. She often sat in the sections reserved for Blacks at meetings. She quit the DAR and invited Marian Anderson to sing at the White House after the DAR refused Anderson permission to sing at Constitution Hall. Eleanor entertained gridiron widows on the night the male press gave a stag party for the president. Although she “dreaded” the spotlight on the president’s family, she felt her activities would be curtailed so the president’s would dominate. She advocated, “Do one thing every day that scares you” (Roosevelt, 1937, Book Jacket).

**Connecting**

Many of the women reporters who participated in her press conferences as first lady became devoted followers and protective guardians. Eleanor established a cottage furniture factory and was comfortable having workmen around. She followed Louis Howe’s advice to become more politically active and to persuade FDR to run for president. She commented that as first lady when shaking hands in a reception line she concentrated on faces and recognizing as many people as she could. After FDR’s death, Eleanor built relationships supportive of women and equal rights as the U.S. United Nations Representative. This resulted in her being a primary author of the Human Rights Declaration.

**Engaging**

Eleanor took lessons to improve her speaking voice and developed skills presenting her ideas and values. She was FDR’s legs visiting groups all over the country and around the world. She made sure FDR heard the voices of reform by inviting people with different political persuasions to dinner and purposefully seating them next to him. Eleanor was willing to risk taking on new responsibilities and assumed public service roles on national and international levels to improve the lot of the needy, Blacks, and women. She easily related to people from all walks of life. She wrote books, edited a magazine, wrote a daily newspaper column, held press conferences, and visited many places in person.

**Energizing**

A careful strategist, Eleanor developed great social adeptness extending across economic groups and social classes. Lorena Hickok was her confidante and talking with her helped Eleanor deal with the emotions that “ate into my soul.” Roosevelt demonstrated flow by taking advantage of the opportunities
to be a leader in many organizations. She famously quit the DAR to make an important point about equality when the organization closed Constitution Hall to Marian Anderson. She initiated first lady press conferences holding them for women reporters.

In her biography of Eleanor, Lois Scharf (1987) commented,

Eleanor Roosevelt was a practiced politician and an articulate spokeswoman for views that marked American liberalism in the middle third of the twentieth century. The manner in which she met the changes and challenges of her complex, often battered world personalized the experiences of a generation of Americans. Together with her husband during his three terms in office and then during widowhood, she became symbol and substance of efforts to create a humane social order and a peaceful international community in the wake of depression and wars, both hot and cold. She appealed to the most positive qualities of human nature and to an enlightened, caring government to build a just and secure world. That she became so beloved and admired testifies to the appeal of her messages to those who listened. (p. ix)

CONCLUSIONS

Barsh and Cranston (2009) referred to the essence of Centered Leadership as “The Fabulous Five” dimensions. Each of these major components reflects a way of thinking unique to women but which may apply to men as well. Key elements in the lives of Florence Nightingale, Marie Curie, and Eleanor Roosevelt, when examined through the lens of the model, confirm the fabulous five dimensions of Centered Leadership as meaningful.

Meaning

The defining trait for successful leaders, meaning, led our three women to the jobs and roles they filled. Their ownership of the meaning of what they were doing vitally enabled all else. Nightingale felt called to nursing and pursued it even though her family resisted. Curie felt called to be a teacher and bring credit to her native Poland. Her support of and identification with Polish education continued even though she wound up working and living in France most of her adult life. Intrigued by the source of radioactivity, Curie researched it most of her life even when doing so exposed her to difficult and dangerous working conditions that injured her health. Roosevelt became attracted to social causes including the poor and the rights of women. Her youthful experiences focused her not on the life of a debutant (to which she was born) but on a life of philanthropy and humanitarian service.

Framing

Barsh and Cranston (2009) described framing as a choice and positive framing as a natural ability for many women. Curie exhibited this first by framing her aspirations in terms of becoming a teacher in her native Poland. Later, she stepped into leadership roles at the Sorbonne and Institute of Radium and framed her role to understanding radioactivity, demonstrating the existence of Radium, and defining the international standard for measuring radioactive elements. Roosevelt made several conscious decisions to reframe her role. As a young woman, she rejected the expected role of a New York debutante and volunteered in community service winning acclaim as a Red Cross canteen leader in WWI. In This I Remember, Roosevelt recalled that, “Life was never dull” and “I had many occasions to think seriously about the problem that faces the family of a man in American public life, especially a man who becomes the subject of great controversy…” (p. 9). After her marriage to FDR, she became and remained politically active as a spokeswoman for the poor and underprivileged first as a way to encourage FDR and later for herself. Nightingale knew early on that she did not want the protected life of the English rich to which she was born. After some explorations, she felt God called her to be a nurse. She began exploring nursing even against the expressed preferences of her father. Her assignment to the Crimea cemented her choice of nursing. It was there she earned fame for her success improving the conditions of the military
hospital in Scutari and at other military hospitals. For the rest of her life she framed her activities in terms of improving the sanitation and health of British soldiers, the people of India, and in developing a professional role for nurses through education and professional pay.

**Connecting**

Although shy when young, Roosevelt demonstrated this characteristic by her active involvement in many service organizations, by and by her outspoken and steadfast willingness to use her own position to bring attention to the poor, Black, and disadvantaged in our society. Roosevelt was at first a surrogate for her husband, but soon became a force in her own right. Nightingale skillfully used her family’s social connection and status to generate support for her activities when she was opposed by establishment physicians and military leaders. She avoided most public acclaim but capitalized on it by taking her case directly to Queen Victoria and winning the Queen’s support for the changes needed in the British military. Later in life although semi secluded, Nightingale routinely met with and counseled with many world leaders about public health and nursing issues. Curie initially connected with intellectuals and teachers in Poland while preparing herself to join them. Her studies in France continued through three master’s degrees and her doctorate. Curie was never accepted by the French academics but her marriage to Pierre Curie and subsequent two Nobel Prizes gave her a world-wide following that provide support in several key instances. One of these was the purchase of a gram of Radium for the Radium Research Institute so her studies could continue after the original Radium supply she had refined was exhausted.

**Engaging**

Barsh and Cranston (2009) see engagement as an empowering characteristic. Those who have it pursue meaning by reaching out to others. One way Barsh and Cranston characterized this skill was “stand up, speak up” (p. 196). Nightingale demonstrated this skill early when she stood up to her father and family in her desire to be a nurse. She demonstrated it later during her work in Scutari by standing up to the doctors and army leaders to obtain the changes needed to address the sanitation problems in the hospital. Later she documented her analysis and presented the case for reform in the British military including taking her case directly to the Queen in order to achieve the needed changes. Curie often preferred a lower profile role and disliked the attention of the press. She persisted in her research and won acclaim through her two Nobel prizes. She had friends and a lawyer represent her case to take her husband’s position at the Sorbonne after his death and she headed the construction and operation of the Radium Institute. Eleanor Roosevelt, first learned social graces at boarding school in England but developed considerable skill as an advocate for minorities. Eleanor’s effectiveness as a representative for the President and as a spokesperson for minorities and poor won her great acclaim. After FDR’s death, Eleanor chaired the human rights commission for the UN and was a prime defender of it in the final debate. She was also a spokesperson in the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations.

**Energizing**

The extraordinary commitment and long hours required of leaders have deep reservoirs of energy and be able to not only sustain themselves but also energize others. Part of this is good work-life balance, another is knowing what energizes you. Even though Marie Curie was a focused and extremely hard persistent worker in the physics laboratory, she was still able to be a mother to two daughters. She was meticulous in her accounting and marshaled finances well, being generous to a fault. Curie shared her financial resources with others, even when close to poverty herself. Central to her commitment was her scientific curiosity and interest in radioactivity and radium. Eleanor Roosevelt found her energy being a spokesperson for women, Blacks, and the poor. She became a well-known author and lecturer using her stature and writing to develop public support for needed reforms. Roosevelt was a strong continuing advocate for the New Deal and enjoyed her role as a diplomat without portfolio. Florence Nightingale drew her energy from being of service. Early in her life, she lamented that she was accomplishing nothing. In the Scutari assignment, she was a take-charge administrator who challenged the existing authorities and revolutionized hospital sanitation and administration. Even though she contracted Crimean
fever, she continued to work. The money contributed to her on her return to England was used to establish a school of nursing. Later Nightingale served as a consultant to many public health leaders and national leaders as well.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Remarkable women like Florence Nightingale, Marie Curie, and Eleanor Roosevelt accomplish great things and emerge as leaders others turn to for inspiration and guidance. They exhibit flow (Csikszentmihályi, 2008), their work and accomplishments seem effortless, but this appearance often masks great focus and effort. We learn much by studying such women. Today, there is a need to reframe our cultural perspectives guiding how women are viewed as organizational leaders (Barsh & Yee, 2011). A conceptualization like Centered Leadership (Barsh & Cranston, 2009; Barsh, Cranston, & Craiske, 2008; Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis, 2011), helps us identify and organize the unique skills and abilities of outstanding, exemplary women in leadership roles. When we know the distinctive strengths of women leaders, we can help counter incorrect but deep-rooted beliefs that hinder recognition and advancement of women and guide the development of women building the skills needed of effective leaders. We have come to a new appreciation for the skills of the three women we studied and for the robust theoretical model provided by Centered Leadership (Barsh & Cranston; Barsh, Cranston, & Craiske; Barsh, Cranston, & Lewis) particularly when applied to remarkable women leaders.
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