

Negotiating Your Public Identity: Women's Path to Power

*Catherine H. Tinsley, Sandra I. Cheldelin, Andrea Kupfer
Schneider & Emily T. Amanatullah**

Editors' Note: The authors use the extraordinary 2008 phenomenon of female presidential and vice-presidential candidates in the main U.S. political parties to examine what obstacles remain for women, as they seek to negotiate access to the highest roles in society – and not just governmental roles. After detailing how Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin fell foul of one or the other of a matched pair of “gotchas” in how people evaluate ambitious women, they outline a strategy for negotiating gender that is relevant for all female professionals advancing in their careers.

Introduction

Hillary Clinton's historic candidacy for the Presidency of the United States, followed by Sarah Palin's candidacy for Vice-President, provides a unique lens for considering how gender is negotiated in our culture. Of course, Clinton's loss in the Democratic primary was determined by multiple factors specific to her personality and her campaign. As well, Palin's candidacy can also be evaluated using several lenses other than gender. Yet, their time in the spotlight illuminates

* **Catherine H. Tinsley** is an associate professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. Her e-mail address is tinsleyc@georgetown.edu. **Sandra I. Cheldelin** is the Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Professor at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University in Arlington, Virginia. Her email address is scheldel@gmu.edu. **Andrea Kupfer Schneider** is a professor of Law at Marquette University Law School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Her email address is andrea.schneider@marquette.edu. **Emily T. Amanatullah** is an assistant professor at the McCombs School of Business at the University of Texas at Austin. Her email address is emily.amanatullah@mcombs.utexas.edu.

how female identity emerges and how this affects perceptions of powerful women. In this chapter, we review some of the misogynistic messages directed at Clinton's campaign and the quite different, though also misogynistic messages directed at Palin, and then place these phenomena in a broader context of research on social categorization and stereotyping to offer one explanation for the presence (or absence) of hostility. We focus here on understanding society's reactions to powerful women, having detailed more teaching-specific prescriptions in Tinsley, Cheldelin, Schneider & Amanatullah (2009).

Our thesis is that the U.S. culture still subscribes to core stereotypes about each gender. Characteristics such as independence, assertiveness, self-reliance, and power are thought of as masculine and therefore properly in the domain of males' behavior, whereas characteristics such as communality, caring, and helpfulness are thought of as feminine. Thus an assertive, powerful female whose characteristics and behavior violate expectations created by the core female stereotype threatens the social order, and her deviance is punished. We review research on how people react to female professionals, both in business and in law, which supports this thesis. We then speculate as to how and why core gender stereotypes emerge and are sustained in our culture, with an eye towards managing their consequences. We conclude with advice for negotiating gender that we hope is not only relevant for future female candidates, but for all female professionals advancing in their careers.

A Look Back at the Coverage

All political candidates are subject to attack from supporters of their opponent. Yet many attacks directed at Hillary Clinton were imbued with gender messages.¹ In the window of a Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) restaurant was the announcement of the "Hillary Special" which consisted of "2 fat thighs with small breast and a left wing." In another poster, there is a picture of a witch flying on her broom with *Cackle Cackle* at the top and *Hillary Rotten Clinton* at the bottom. In a third we see Obama and Clinton side-by-side. Beneath them reads *Bros before Hoes*. Another poster asks the question, *What is Hillary?* Beneath the question is a square box with an inverted triangle in the top half, a small square over the tip of the triangle, with letters across the square, "C.U.N.T." Beneath the box is *Citizens United Not Timid*. A banner at the top of a distasteful picture of Hillary reads *Life's a Bitch*, and below it, *Don't Elect One!*

Moreover, the more "neutral" pundits gave their fair share of gender-laden critiques. FOX television had several examples:

- “She needs to run away from the tough bitch image.”²
- “Men won’t vote for Hillary Clinton because she reminds them of their nagging wives. And when Hillary Clinton speaks, we hear ‘Take out the garbage!’” (said with a shrill voice).

MSNBC provided the following:

- “The way she reacted to Obama with the ‘look’ – just the way she ‘looks’ at him – looking like everyone’s first wife standing outside of probate court, okay?”³
- “Let’s not forget and I’ll be brutal. The reason she is a U.S. senator, the reason she is a candidate for President, the reason she is a front-runner is because her husband messed around. She stood up under humiliation. That is how she got to be senator of New York. We keep forgetting she didn’t win on her merits. She won because everybody felt ‘My God, this woman stood up under humiliation.’ Right? That’s what happened. That is how it happened.”⁴

And at CNN we heard,

- “The question is, which Hillary is going to show up? In the last few days we have just about seen it all. At the Thursday debate in Austin, Texas, Clinton showed a softer side. A couple of days later she morphed into a scolding mother talking down to a child. She wasn’t finished, resembling someone with multiple personality disorders.”⁵
- “The news is: It cries! After spending decades stripping away all trace of emotion, femininity and humanity, Hillary Clinton actually broke down and actually cried yesterday on the campaign trail!”⁶

Sarah Palin’s candidacy also demonstrated a remarkable focus on her gender and different types of coverage because of it. In both the mainstream media and Saturday Night Live, much was made of how “hot” she was and how her rallies primarily attracted men.⁷ The scandal over her clothing budget was clearly gender-based (we don’t ask how much male candidates spend on their suits, although the media did fuss about John Edwards’ \$400 haircut).⁸ The nickname “Caribou Barbie” seems to say it all. Palin herself has also helped the gender focus, describing herself as a “hockey mom” and using the analogy of a pit bull with lipstick. And, the initial attack on her parenting is also gender-based – we do not see coverage of male candidates wondering how fast they returned to work after their wife had a baby, or how they could possibly manage a job and five children, including a child with special needs.

Toward the end of the campaign, the likeability versus competence balance was more clearly highlighted. Palin's performance in interviews and in the debates increased her likeability but, at the same time, raised the negative view of her competence. This was apparent during the campaign, and even after the campaign when Republican operatives reported to the press that Palin was so dumb she did not even know that Africa was a continent.⁹

Politicians' policies, voting behavior, and even their personal characters are often the subject of attack. Yet, these examples seem to move beyond the usual triggers to evidence a discomfort that is inextricably linked with gender. We suggest this stems from a socially constructed (and maintained) stereotype of what is feminine that can handicap women who engage in assertive behaviors. Assertive women violate the socially constructed norms for what is appropriate and thus are freely subject to punishment. Likeable and good-looking women are not competent. That is, the attacks above may be thought of as social narratives to reinforce gendered expectations about suitable and appropriate behavior for women.

Evidence from Research

Traditional gender roles typically dichotomize women as communal (e.g., nurturing, other-oriented, kind, submissive) and men as agentic (e.g., competitive, assertive, independent, task-oriented) (Chapman 1975; Eagly 1987). Further because gender roles function like social norms, they serve both descriptive and injunctive functions, dictating what men and women *are* versus how men and women *ought to be*, respectively (Cialdini and Trost 198). Adherence to these social norms leads to two potential prejudices against women in work contexts (Eagly and Karau 2002). Because competency at work, specifically leadership potential and managerial competency are consistently equated with agentic characteristics embodied in male gender roles (Moore 1984; Schein and Mueller 1992; Schein 2001; Eagly and Karau 2002), there is an inherent incongruence between the behaviors expected of competent workers and those expected of typical females.

Thus, the first prejudice stems from the descriptive function of gender roles. Because women are communal and not agentic, evaluators tend to assume that women have less managerial potential because they lack such masculine qualities as competitiveness, assertiveness, and independence considered necessary for high performance (Moore 1984; Schein and Mueller 1992; Schein 2001; Eagly and Karau 2002). Second, when women do demonstrate success in masculine domains, they can be evaluated negatively because

their behavior is perceived to be counterstereotypic and a violation of injunctive gender norms dictating that women ought to be communal not agentic (Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky 1992; Heilman 2001; Heilman et al. 2004; Heilman and Okimoto 2007). The negative social reaction people have towards women engaging in masculine behaviors such as independence and assertiveness has been termed “the backlash effect” (Rudman 1998). The inconsistency between the core feminine stereotype and masculine managerial requirements suggests that women are apt to be perceived as likeable but incompetent (in the first instance and exemplified by Sarah Palin) or competent but unlikeable (in the second and exemplified by Hillary Clinton).

In one set of experiments, Catherine Tinsley and her colleagues (2008) found evidence for this double bind between likeability and competence. They measured how perceivers differentially reacted to videotaped targets based on gender. A series of videos were created which manipulated the reaction of a finance director (alternatively a man or a woman) to either a work crisis (an IT system crash) or a family emergency (a sick child). Videotaped targets either stayed at work or went home. Following the video, respondents rated the director on a series of questions measuring both competence and likeability. Although respondents perceived female directors as more competent when they chose to stay at work as opposed to going home, they also rated these women as significantly less likeable. Alternatively, when the female director went home, she was rated as likeable but suffered negative ratings of competency. When respondents evaluated male directors, behavior did not matter. Male directors were always judged fairly likeable and competent independent of their choices. In other words, the same behaviors (staying or going) evoked different judgments when made by a male versus a female director. Moreover, the female director was constrained by the double bind between being seen as likeable or competent; in no scenario was she perceived as both. Assuming both competency and likeability are necessary for career progression, we see how the incongruence of the core feminine stereotype with characteristics of effective managers may indeed handicap professional women.

Other studies of varying methods have found consistent evidence for this tradeoff between competency and likeability for professional women. Assertive and self-confident women are evaluated more negatively than men who behaved in equivalent ways (Costrich et al. 1975; Heilman et al. 1989; Butler and Geis 1990). Further, these negative judgments (non-likeability) result in tangible penalties. In studies evaluating job candidates, lower likeability ratings

can outweigh competency evaluations to the point where a confident, self-promoting woman is actually less likely to be hired despite high competency ratings, simply because she is perceived as socially unattractive (Janoff-Bulman and Wade 1996). This same pattern of women being socially punished for engaging in counterstereotypic (“masculine”) behavior has been demonstrated in a number of studies exploring why women are passed up for promotions relative to equally qualified men (Fiske et al. 1991; Sonnert and Holton 1996; Lyness and Judiesch 1999; Heilman 2001).

In fact, this incongruence between being perceived as competent and being perceived as likeable is so pervasive in the business world that some researchers argue that women are aware of these social penalties for counterstereotypic behavior and subsequently act in rational ways to hide their successes in cross-gendered contexts (Rudman and Fairchild 2004). Research in negotiations also shows evidence that women are aware of and react anticipatorily to this double bind. Recent studies have found that because women incur social sanctions when initiating negotiations, they are less likely than men to do so (Bowles, Babcock, and Lai 2007). Additionally, when women do assert their interests and ask for additional compensation, they are perceived as less likeable (Bowles et al. 2007; Amanatullah and Tinsley 2008) and are less likely to receive financial compensation (Amanatullah and Tinsley 2008).

This evidence from scholarly research on the existence of a double bind, mirrors the casual observations of Clinton and Palin on the campaign trail. Clinton embodied the woman able to successfully garner attributions of competency but being rejected as afeminine and subsequently unlikeable. On the contrary, Palin exemplified femininity thus was perceived to be very likeable and warm but her competency always remained in question.

But All Else is Not Equal

Fortunately, however, there may be a ray of sunshine amid this storm. Emily Amanatullah and Tinsley (2008) found that situations can moderate, or vary, the extent to which the core feminine stereotype is activated. Like all stereotypes, activation is context-dependent (Fiske and Taylor 1991), meaning that some situations tend to elicit or encourage activation of the core feminine stereotype in the minds of evaluators and other contexts do not. Thus, we expect that assertive women will be less likely to incur social backlash in situations where the core feminine stereotype lies dormant. In other words, we believe that core gender stereotype *activation* is a necessary condition for evaluators to deem assertive behavior in

women as counterstereotypic and to subsequently sanction such assertive behavior both socially and financially. Thus, aspects of the situation which elicit or suppress stereotype usage should correspondingly amplify or attenuate the likelihood of backlash.

Consistent with the prior literature on backlash against assertive women, Amanatullah and Tinsley conducted a series of experiments demonstrating that female targets who initiated a negotiation suffered both a social and financial backlash for this assertive behavior. Specifically, respondents judged the behavior of a hypothetical project manager (alternately male or female) negotiating for a refund on cancelled hotel rooms. Female managers were judged as significantly more offensive and less likely to be given any refund than were male managers, even though all managers engaged in exactly the same behaviors.

However, Amanatullah and Tinsley hypothesized and found several situations in which the backlash against women was attenuated. The first situation in which backlash was attenuated was when resources were so plentiful that the refund request was not perceived as threatening to the respondent. Conditions of threat tend to activate negative stereotyping against both individuals (Fein and Spencer 1997), and other social groups (Gonsalkorale, Carlisle, and von Hippel 2007). Consistently, the results showed that evaluators judged both male and female managers more harshly when they asked for a refund that would further threaten an evaluator's already limited pool of financial resources. It appears that these resource threats activated core gender stereotypes, and therefore females who asked for a refund were penalized significantly more than males were. On the other hand, when resources were plentiful, female targets were slightly more likely to receive the refund than male targets.

A second situation where backlash is reduced depends on the status or role of the women being evaluated. Specifically, the findings indicate that high status women may be less likely to incur backlash because they are less likely to activate core feminine stereotypes. When a negotiation request was made by a senior human resources manager with a track record of success as opposed to a junior project manager new to the firm, the backlash against her was diminished. These senior female targets did not seem to activate the core feminine stereotype, and because this stereotype lay dormant, they were not judged any more harshly than their male counterparts. Subsequently, high status women were just as likely to receive the requested refund as were men. The key, then, appears to be the core feminine stereotype. Activation of this stereotype creates

the impossible double bind for women to being perceived both as competent and likeable. However, when the stereotype is not activated, injunctive expectations of femininity are not enforced. Similarly, in a study of lawyers rating other lawyers in their most recent negotiation, female lawyers were described in terms that were similar to their male colleagues and both were equally likely to be judged as effective (Schneider 2002; Schneider forthcoming).¹⁰ Thus focusing the evaluations on their professional role (as lawyers) rather than on gender roles (as women) led to decreased activation of and comparison to the core feminine stereotype. Therefore, assertive behavior incurred no backlash.

In addition, in situations where core gender stereotype activation is inevitable, emphasizing the aspects of the core feminine stereotype that are consistent with assertiveness can further attenuate the likelihood of backlash. For example, other-directedness is a core tenet of the feminine gender role; as such, situations in which women assertively pursue the interests of others can lead evaluators to interpret such behavior as consistent with, rather than in violation of, gendered expectations. In the previously cited research, beyond professional role activation, the female lawyers who escaped backlash were assertive on behalf of *another* (their clients), and this was quite suitable with the core feminine stereotype. This finding is consistent with other research that shows female assertiveness is deemed appropriate, if not expected, when it is seen as protecting or advocating for others (Amanatullah and Morris 2008; Amanatullah and Tinsley 2008b; Bowles, Babcock, and McGinn 2005). Hence, this is a third situation in which backlash is attenuated – when the assertive female behavior is on behalf of others.

Persistence of the Core Feminine Stereotype

It is natural to ask, of course, how the core feminine stereotype was constructed in the first place and why it persists. While there exist numerous theories on the origin of gender schemas, we suggest it may have had an evolutionary value, as its characteristics have obvious relationships to childbearing – nurturance, caring. It may be that the physical capabilities of women to bear and wean children have been projected onto their expected adherence to personality characteristics which follow suit. As such, biological predispositions toward physical nurturing have manifested into sociological expectations that women be psychologically nurturing as well.

Yet, outside the domain of childrearing in societies where both genders are in the professional work environment, this stereotype's usefulness is more limited. Why, then, is it still held so strongly?

Because stereotypes operate, for the most part, on a subconscious level,¹¹ their elusive nature makes them more difficult to discuss. We speculate that social constructions like these core gender stereotypes help people to define their identity and those of others in their social world, as well as to work through the complexities of their social world.

To manage complexity, people categorize their social world into groups (i.e., social categorization theory), and we derive our identity by our membership in (or exclusion from) these social groups (social identity theory). To simplify, we tend to aggregate people into a dichotomous structure where there is an *other* who is not like me/us. There are in-groups (who define my identity) and out-groups (who are the antithesis of it). That is, we set up “categories of difference” (Okin 1998: 116-117). The frames we use to understand the *other* are organized into binary spheres. Though these are not absolute categories, they are conceived as dichotomous.¹²

Gender may still be a powerful diacritical marker because it is a naturally dichotomous category. There are men and not men (women). Therefore it may be important to protect the gendered categories of difference as a way of protecting the “male” and “female” identities. Hence we see the strong backlash against powerful, assertive females, particularly those who are “breaking the barriers” (i.e., the carefully crafted social constructions).

Both female and male identities emerge and solidify in constant negotiation with their social collectives. Positioning theory (Harré and van Langenhove 1999; Harré and Moghaddam 2003) explains this process in more detail. According to the theory, when we interact with others we create a storyline. As the story unfolds, parties get placed in a fairly predictable position juxtaposed against the other. Hence, identity is negotiated through a narrative that emerges from interpersonal interactions.

If identity is derived from narratives that position a person in certain social groups, then the identity of public figures is negotiated in public through the storylines promulgated through the media. These narratives position the public figure, and these positions have social sanctions constructed within them. For example, if a woman seeks the U.S. Presidency – an office previously held by men only – she is likely to be positioned, at the very beginning, as disadvantaged (“you know, I think someone is going to have to go out and take her behind the barn”). As conflict emerges, so too does the creation of an *unacceptable other*. The enemy gets named (the *woman*) initially by legitimate spokespeople (the political pundits). Hence, we see the strong backlash against a female politician; her attempt

at breaking the social barriers is subject to punishment. The unflattering pictures of Hillary on posters permit hostility (“that look;” “we keep forgetting she didn’t win on her merits”) name calling (“hoe;” “bitch;” “multiple personality;” “c.u.n.t.”) and even violence (images with her hanging from a noose; stabbed).

The contrast with Palin is striking because Palin is seen as the subordinate assistant and, therefore, not threatening. McCain is “proud” of Palin – in almost a paternalistic demeaning fashion. For what actually is he proud? That she is running? And why does *he* get to be proud? As a parent? He invites the audience to be proud with him – as for a child.

Negotiating Change

What does the next female candidate or female professional do to negotiate through the social constructions successfully? What emerges from the research above are three key insights. First, women should work with the core feminine stereotype when possible. Women might try to work within their prescribed roles – capitalizing on society’s expectations of the nurturing female. Second, when women cannot work within the core feminine stereotype, they need to try to minimize the chance of this stereotype becoming activated. And finally, women can consider negotiating with society to move the boundaries of this core feminine stereotype or minimize its relevance for evaluating her behavior. We consider each of these in turn.

1) Working Within the Core Feminine Stereotype

Some gender scholars argue that backlash against assertive women is not a reaction to women being too masculine but rather a reaction against women who are not feminine enough (Heilman and Okimoto 2007). As such, the extent to which women can affirm their consistency with the core feminine stereotype, they may be able to assert their competence while simultaneously avoiding social sanctions. This approach suggests the following prescriptions:

a) If the core feminine stereotype sees women as nurturing and protecting of others, then women’s career advancing moves might be reframed as consistent with this other-directed behavior. Women might negotiate for raises or positions because of the communal welfare of her work team or her family. This serves both the women and those on whose behalf they are negotiating. Although the lawyers in our studies were advocating for their client, clearly a win would help their own career as well. Moreover, Amanatullah and Tinsley (2008b) found that women negotiating a raise for their *work*

team were rewarded just as well as their male counterparts. For politicians, this means arguing how women's policies best help constituents, and this means avoiding any dialogue or debates that are easily reframed as self-promotional. Rather than arguing how good a female politician has been at her job, she should focus on how many people her policies have helped.

Clinton might have been able to demonstrate her care for others in her role as a lawyer, or as a mother, or as first lady; but each of these avenues was effectively closed. Her career as a lawyer had been sullied. Her time as a mother was considered over. And her role as first lady brought up memories both of the failed health care initiative and Monica Lewinsky. In contrast, Palin freely activated the stereotype by demonstrating her apparent motherhood and talking about what she had done on behalf of Alaska's citizens. And because she was the subordinate on a team, even her attacks on Obama could be viewed as her being a team-player—not least, because overtly attacking a presidential nominee is traditionally the province of the vice-presidential nominee of the other party. She was defending her guy so that this type of cheerleading was still within the core feminine stereotype.

b) Further the manner in which Sarah Palin composed herself, with a wink or a smile, further confirmed in evaluators' minds that she met if not exceeded stereotypical expectations of femininity. In contrast, Hillary Clinton, clad in pantsuits and a bobbed coif externally presented a more masculine demeanor. These simple observable cues which are consistent with or in violation of gendered expectations likely influence the way other information about the candidates was filtered and processed. For example, though Palin's flirty conduct helped affirm her adherence to gendered expectations, in excess it may have cost her more in evaluations of competence than it helped in attributions of likeability. As such, women seeking to advance in masculine domains should pay concerted effort to the extremity of their dress and comportment and avoid both excessive femininity and masculinity.

c) Some preliminary evidence in the research on negotiations suggests that female negotiators may be able to avoid social sanctions yet still achieve ambitious outcomes if the means toward achieving that end is softer and less overtly aggressive than a more typical "male" approach toward attaining such an outcome. In other words, it is not what you ask for, it is how you ask. As such, attenuating the perceived assertiveness of a position by adopting a softer, more participative negotiation strategy as opposed to overt dominance may be a means for women to negotiate successfully.

2) *Minimizing Activation of the Core Feminine Stereotype*

It may not always be possible to reframe a situation to appear to be advocating for others or affirm one's femininity while asserting her competence. When professional women are self-advocating, they should work to minimize activation of the core feminine stereotype. The previously cited research shows that avoidance of activation works best in situations of plenty, rather than situations of scarcity and threat, and when women are seen as high status. This suggests the following:

a) Women should try to time their battles. A threat triggers stereotype activation; hence, one strategy might be to evaluate when requests are going to be perceived as less rather than more threatening. Under benevolent conditions, people will be more open to self-advocating females.

b) Women should affiliate as a part of a team. To the extent that they are one member of a diverse team, they are less likely to activate the core stereotype. (Or if they are the team leader, as above, requests on behalf of the team as a whole may be seen as stereotype-consistent behavior.) This may well be one of the key differences in how Clinton and Palin were perceived.

c) Women should appeal to common goals. When parties share a common overarching goal, then requests made by one party are less likely to be seen as threatening. Assertive behavior then is not threatening because it is seen as simply forwarding a shared vision and goals.

3) *Negotiating with Society Over Her Identity*

Finally, if a woman cannot work within the core feminine stereotype or minimize its activation, then her other logical choice is to show how it is irrelevant for judging her. This means, in essence, re-negotiating her identity and role with a larger society. The primary tasks would be to identify the narratives people are promoting, how they are promoting them, and how they have the authority to promote. The good news is that people *can* be moved beyond binary, dichotomous thinking to consider complexities. Everyone engages in multiple roles (positions) – mother and business owner, son and brother, supervisor and friend, board chair and spouse – as well as engaging in multiple *stories* at the same time. Hence, if a storyline subordinates a female, she can work to destabilize the story and recreate a new narrative. This suggests that:

a) Women should destabilize stories that disadvantage them. In their attempt to destabilize a story initiated by the *other* (bossy,

bitchy, unfeminine), these efforts must work together to create a coherent alternative story.

b) Women should break out of the dichotomy or required unidimensionality that exists for each gender by either adding to the complexity and multidimensionality of their roles and responsibilities, or by presenting alternative yet simple and acceptable narratives. For example, the campaign of “hope” that Obama created overrode a message of race. The simplicity model is likely to work best in the political arena, as potential voters may not be willing to grapple with complexities and nuances required to think beyond dichotomous categories. Clinton might have been able to use her former career as a lawyer to present other “stories” had that history not been sullied with accusations of overbilling. Palin did this masterfully, in part because she was introduced to the public so late that no one story was dominant. She is a mom *and* hunter – and governor, and beauty queen, and basketball star. The media coverage at the beginning of her campaign managed to have coverage on all of these competing narratives rather than focusing on a single narrative.

c) Women can seek powerful allies to support their positive narratives. Intentional and vigorous networking can utilize the social capital of others. Palin’s candidacy did this nicely with McCain praising her repeatedly. It also helps that the people most likely to criticize her balance between her job and her family are those who support her political positions. So, as many have noted, the conservative media glossed over several things that might have sunk any Democratic candidate, including Palin’s daughter’s pregnancy.

Conclusion

Clinton was not the author of the demeaning narratives – in this case, the posters and pundits presented the stories about her. There was little exchange, other than at the public debates, to develop alternative narratives. Palin managed this better, although she too was not immune to the apparent tradeoff women face between likeability and competence. The complexities of leadership positions – as professionals in organizations or as the President of the U.S. – require women to be perceived as having both the individual requisite leadership skills *and* the capacity to bridge core gendered stereotypes. A successful leader will be able to manage the stories, to pick their battles, to be seen as a leader acting on behalf of others, and to craft multiple, complex narratives for herself rather than let caricatures determine her public identity. We have no illusions about this: it remains a daunting task.

The next candidate (and any female advancing in her career at a high level) must be her own author of the actions that unfold as stories, the roles of the various actors, and the themes that should emerge. Because of the persistent gendered cultural identity in the U.S., the narratives will need to be intentionally positioned as both non-threatening and complex. The narrative needs to appeal to the multiple roles and complicated lives of both men and women while maintaining a conversation that does not allow the woman to be positioned negatively. This is a tall order. But forewarned is forearmed.

Notes

For detailed teaching-specific prescriptions to address these issues in negotiation courses, see our related article in the April 2009 special issue of *Negotiation Journal* – “Women at the Bargaining Table: Pitfalls and Prospects” (Tinsley et al. 2009).

¹ Copies of these posters and headlines can be found on *Hillary Clinton: Mad as Hell/Bitch*, <http://youtube.com/watch?v+kcdnlNZgZiM>.

² Ibid, GOP strategist on What Hillary Needs to Win Texas and Ohio.

³ Ibid, Mike Barnicle, MSNBC Contributor on *Morning Joe*, Decision ‘08.

⁴ Ibid, Chris Matthews live on MSNBC, New Hampshire Primary.

⁵ Ibid, Cafferty on “The Cafferty File,” *Slowing Obama’s Momentum: Debate Strategy for Clinton* in the Situation Room, Which Hillary will Show up?

⁶ Ibid, CNN Media Matters for American Headline News, *The Crying Game from New Hampshire*.

⁷ Mark Leibovich, “At a rally in Indiana for Sarah Palin on Friday, the men in the crowd made their feelings clear,” *New York Times*, October 19, 2008.

⁸ Patrick Healy and Michael Luo, “\$150,000 Wardrobe for Palin may Alter Tailor-Made Image,” *New York Times*, October 23, 2008.

⁹ http://www.foxnews.com/video-search/m/21384703/smear_campaign.htm?q=Palin+%26+Africa.

¹⁰ Although these women were seen as less creative, less smooth, and less wise – these differences were small relative to the number of adjectives on which they were rated similar to their male counterparts.

¹¹ In our studies, both men and women penalized assertive women, and when confronted with the results, participants expressed no awareness that they had judged female targets more harshly.

¹² Emily Mawhinney describes a number of modernist binaries: center vs. periphery, push vs. pull, homogeneity vs. heterogeneity, consumption vs. production, and workers vs. cosmopolitans (Mawhinney 2005).

References

- Amanatullah, E. T. and M. W. Morris. 2008. Negotiating gender roles: Advocacy context moderates women's anticipated backlash and assertive bargaining. *Working Paper*, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Amanatullah, E. T. and C. H. Tinsley. 2008a. Ask and ye shall NOT receive: Financial responses to women's negotiation attempts and moderation by status-based threat. *Working Paper*, Georgetown University.
- Amanatullah, E. T. and C. H. Tinsley. 2008b. Accepting assertive advocates: The moderation of the backlash effect against assertive women due to advocacy. *Working Paper*, Georgetown University.
- Bowles, H. R., L. Babcock, and L. Lai. 2007. Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 103(1): 84-103.
- Bowles, H. R., L. Babcock, and K. L. McGinn. 2005. Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 89(6): 951-965.
- Broadbent, D. E. 1971. *Decision and stress*. London: Academic Press.
- Butler, D. and F. L. Geis. 1990. Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders: Implications for leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 58(1): 48-59.
- Chapman, J. B. 1975. Comparison of male and female leadership styles. *Academy of Management Journal* 18 (3): 645-650.
- Cialdini, R. B. and M. R. Trost. 1998. Social influence: Social norms, conformity, and compliance. In *The handbook of social psychology*, 4th edn., edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Costrich, N., J. Feinstein, L. Kidder, J. Marecek, and L. Pascale. 1975. When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 11(6): 520-530.
- Duffy, E. 1962. *Activation and behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Eagly, A. H. 1987. *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H. and S. J. Karau. 2002. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review* 109(3): 573-598.
- Eagly, A. H., M. G. Makhijani, and B. G. Klonsky. 1992. Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 111(1): 3-22.
- Eysenck, M. W. 1976. Arousal, learning, and memory. *Psychological Bulletin* 83(3): 389-404.
- Fein, S. and S. J. Spencer. 1997. Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73(1): 31-44.
- Fiske, S. T., D. N. Bersoff, E. Borgida, K. Deaux, and M. Heilman. 1991. Social science research on trial: Use of sex stereotyping research in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. *American Psychologist* 46: 1049-1060.

- Fiske, S. T. and Taylor, S. E. 1991. *Social cognition*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Gonsalkorale, K., K. Carlisle, and W. von Hippel. 2007. Intergroup threat increases implicit stereotyping. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy* 7(2): 189-200.
- Harré, R. and M. Moghaddam. 2003. Introduction: The self and others in traditional psychology and in positioning theory. In *The self and others: Positioning individuals and groups in personal, political, and cultural contexts*, edited by R. Harré and M. Moghaddam. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Harré, R. and L. van Langenhove. 1999. Introducing positioning theory. In *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action*, edited by R. Harré and L. van Langenhove. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heilman, M. E. 2001. Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 657-674.
- Heilman, M. E., C. J. Block, R. F. Martell, and M. C. Simon. 1989. Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74: 935-942.
- Heilman, M. E. and T. G. Okimoto. 2007. Why are women penalized for success at male tasks?: The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(1): 81-92.
- Heilman, M. E., A. S. Wallen, D. Fuchs, and M. M. Tamkins. 2004. Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(3): 416-427.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. and M. B. Wade. 1996. The dilemma of self-advocacy for women: Another case of blaming the victim? *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 15: 143-152.
- Lyness, K. S., and M. K. Judiesch. 1999. Are women more likely to be hired or promoted into management positions? *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 54(1): 158-173.
- Mawhinney, E. B. 2005 *Witness to gendercide: A critical feminist analysis of rape as a tool of war in Bosnia and Rwanda*, presented March 4, 2005 at the 46th International Studies Association (ISA) Annual Convention, Honolulu, HI, WTG11081205.
- Moore, D. P. 1984. Evaluating in-role and out-of-role performers. *Academy of Management Journal* 27(3): 603-618.
- Okin, S. M. 1998. Gender, the public, and the private. In *Feminism and politics*, edited by A. Phillips. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rudman, L. A. 1998. Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74(3): 629-645.
- Rudman, L. A. and K. Fairchild. 2004. Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87(2): 157-176.
- Schein, V. E. 2001. A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 675-688.

- Schein, V. E. and R. Mueller. 1992. Sex role stereotyping and requisite management characteristics: A cross cultural look. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13(5): 439-447.
- Schneider, A. K. 2002. Shattering negotiation myths: Empirical evidence on the effectiveness of negotiation style. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review* 7(1): 143-233.
- Schneider, A. K. 2009. Gender and negotiation. *Marquette Law School Working Paper*.
- Sonnert, G. and G. Holton. 1996. Career patterns of women and men in the sciences. *American Scientist* 84: 63-71.
- Staw, B., L. E. Sandelands, and J. E. Dutton. 1981. Threat rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26(4): 501-524.
- Tinsley, C., S. Cheldelin, A. K. Schneider, and E. T. Amanatullah. 2009. Women at the bargaining table: Pitfalls and prospects. *Negotiation Journal* 25(2): 233-248.

