

**He Runs, She Runs:
Gender Stereotypes, Double Standards, and Political Campaigns**

Chapter 6: Beyond the “B” Word?

Deborah Jordan Brooks
Dartmouth College

deborah.brooks@dartmouth.edu

(Note: This is a draft of Chapter 6 from the Feb 18, 2011 version of the book manuscript for He Runs, She Runs. This chapter will be revised prior to publication of the book so it should not be quoted or cited without permission of the author)

Chapter 6: Beyond the “B” Word?

"There's always a tension in bringing people together to find common ground and standing your ground. I've tried to do both. When I have stood my ground I have engendered opposition. In part because I'm a woman doing it."¹

Hillary Clinton

(January 2007, at a house party in Cedar Rapids, Iowa)

"Half the time when she [Hillary Clinton] shows how tough she is, people say she's too tough...[she has to deal with the] psychological double-bind women sometimes get caught in."²

Bill Clinton

(January 23, 2008, at a diner in South Carolina)

Hillary Clinton sought to be the toughest Democrat in the 2008 primaries. At the outset of her presidential bid, her chief strategist – Mark Penn – argued in an overall strategy paper that recent Democratic presidential candidates had suffered because they were seen as weak, but that “Hillary occupies a completely different ground than these past nominees. People see in Hillary Clinton someone who works hard to get results, someone who is tough enough to make decisions.” Penn went on to further stress vital significance of Clinton appearing as a tough “father” figure for the country if she was to succeed:

¹ Smith, Ben, “Clinton Balances Femininity, Toughness,” *Politico*, January 29, 2007.

² Sicha, Choire, “Bill Addresses Hillary’s ‘Double-Bind,’” *The New York Observer*, January 23, 2008.

“Regardless of the sex of the candidate, most voters in essence see the president as the ‘father’ of the country. They do not want someone who would be the first mama, especially in this kind of world. But there is a yearning for a kind of tough single parent – someone who can combine the toughness they are used to with the negotiating adeptness they believe a woman would bring to the office. They are open to the first father being a woman. And the best role model proves the case. Margaret Thatcher....represents the most successful elected woman leader in this century – and the adjectives that were used about her (Iron Lady) were not of good humor or warmth, they were of smart, tough leadership. As we move forward in this campaign, it is important to understand who we are and who we are not. We are more Thatcher than anyone else....It is important in this process not to lose our strengths that really have positioned us to win in any attempt to shift the personal tone of the campaign.”³

During Clinton’s campaign, she followed Penn’s advice and worked hard to consolidate and promote an image of toughness. At an Ohio campaign event, for example, Clinton told her supporters, “I’m here today because I want to let you know, I’m a fighter, a doer and a champion, and I will fight for you.”⁴ In another prominent example, Clinton stressed that “we need a president who can take whatever comes your way” and simultaneously attacked Barack Obama for whining.⁵ Clinton supporters also frequently spread the word about her tough-as-nails approach to politics at campaign events. In his official endorsement of Hillary Clinton, Governor Mike Easley of North Carolina

³ Mark Penn’s “Launch Strategy Thoughts” memo from December 21, 2006, available at at <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2008/11/penns-launch-strategy-ideas-december-21-2006/37953>.

⁴ Susan Carroll and Kelly Dittmar in Carroll and Fox 2010, 59.

⁵ Boseman, Julie and Jeff Zeleny, “Clinton Impugns Obama’s Toughness,” *New York Times*, April 19, 2008.

described Clinton as someone “who makes Rocky Balboa look like a pansy.”⁶ A day later, an Indiana union leader introduced Clinton to a crowd of supporters by describing her as someone who has “testicular fortitude.”⁷ Clinton responded by saying “the comment means a lot to me. I do think I have fortitude. Women can have it as well as men.”⁸

The strategy worked in terms of establishing that she was the toughest candidate in the Democratic primary field: in a fall 2007 Pew survey, 67% of Democrats said that Hillary Clinton was the candidate they thought of when they heard the word “tough.”⁹ Chris Matthews likened her to Luca Brasi (the toughest, most feared enforcer from the Godfather movies).¹⁰ Yet although Clinton firmly established her toughness credentials with many voters, she seemed to have great trouble appearing caring and compassionate to voters. According to a USA today journalist, “Poised to become our first female nominee for president, Clinton has spent most of the campaign trying to dispel the idea that she's too feminine -- too gentle, too thoughtful, too caring -- to lead the nation. But when she adopts a tough persona, especially on foreign policy and defense issues, some voters

⁶ “Gov. Easley Makes it Official,” *National Journal Hotline*, April 29, 2008.

<http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2008/04/>.

⁷ “Union Leader: Endorsed HRC, Said Nation Needs a Pres with ‘Testicular Fortitude,’” *National Journal Hotline*, April 30, 2008.

<http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2008/04/>

⁸ “Union Leader: Endorsed HRC, Said Nation Needs a Pres with ‘Testicular Fortitude,’” *National Journal Hotline*, April 30, 2008.

<http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2008/04/>

⁹ Kornblut 2009, 27.

¹⁰ “More Violent Imagery from Chris Matthews,” *Media Matters*, January 5, 2008.

<http://mediamatters.org/research/200801050005>

complain that she's behaving like a man.”¹¹ Similarly, a journalist in the *Washington Post* observed: “Clinton's strength is also a source of uneasiness. Throughout her career, she has stirred an irrational hatred that is not primarily of her own making. To much of the public, when she is tough, she seems unwomanly and therefore inhuman; when she is soft, she seems unfit to be commander in chief. It's the old double bind that women have always faced in acquiring power, but wishing it weren't so won't make the dilemma vanish.”¹²

Another journalist underscores that uneasiness with Clinton's toughness was frequently expressed in demeaning ways:

“South Park did an episode about a nuclear weapon hidden in Clinton's vagina. Novelty shops produced Hillary Clinton nutcrackers and toilet bowl scrubbers. Political pundits said Clinton reminded them of their first wives at divorce court, or caused an instinctive reaction to cross their legs. ‘She was marginalised a lot. What we see in corporate America, they treated her the same way,’ said a 27-year-old lawyer from Philadelphia who took time off from her job to work as an organiser in eight states. ‘I think people talk a lot about women being strong, but they don't like to see it - and I think a lot of that went on in this campaign.’”¹³

Penn had long argued that Clinton should not worry about appearing warm and nice at the expense of being tough. In his general strategy paper, he argued: “A word about being human. Bill Gates once asked me ‘could you make me more human?’ I said ‘being human is overrated.’ Now don't get me wrong – connecting with people and

¹¹ Zimmerman, Jonathan, “Why gender still matters in American politics,” *USA Today*, November 14, 2007, pg. 11A

¹² Starr, Paul, “Watch It, Democrats. You Could Still Slip Up.” *The Washington Post*, January 20 2008, Outlook Section, B01

¹³ Goldberg, Suzanne, “Race for the White House,” *The Guardian* (London), June 9 2008, International Section, Pg. 18

understanding their problems with passion is a critical part of leadership. But the idea that if only you were warmer and nicer so many more people would like you and you would be in the White House is wrong. True, more people would like you. Fewer would vote for you.”¹⁴

Yet as difficulties mounted for her in her quest to secure the Democratic nomination, Clinton eventually did shift direction and sought to alter what political scientist Dennis Godford described as her “default” image of being “cold, calculating, [and] ambitious.”¹⁵ Various polls indeed showed that Clinton was in trouble on caring and compassion measures – for example, one Pew poll showed that she was regarded as the “least friendly” of the major Democratic candidates.¹⁶ To redress this general problem, Clinton initiated a drive in late December 2007 “to warm up an image some voters perceive as cold” through an online and in-person campaign to “showcase her personal side with testimonials from friends, associates, and constituents she has helped.”¹⁷

Yet when Clinton tried to simultaneously display both toughness and empathy, she was then criticized for inconsistency in her message. Was she the tough candidate or the feminine candidate? The media, at least, seemed frustrated by the apparent contradiction.

¹⁴ Mark Penn’s “Launch Strategy Thoughts” memo from December 21, 2006, available at <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2008/11/penns-launch-strategy-ideas-december-21-2006/37953>.

¹⁵ Lawrence, Jill, “Strong Organization Characterizes Clinton,” *USA Today*, January 1, 2008.

¹⁶ Lawrence, Jill, “Strong Organization Characterizes Clinton,” *USA Today*, January 1, 2008.

¹⁷ Lawrence, Jill. “New Clinton campaign out to show her likeability,” *USA Today*, Dec 16, 2007. 4A.

“Whatever the outcome, history will have to take note of many miscues in Clinton's campaign. Her demeanor has changed as often as her clothing style and is certainly contributing to public disillusionment with her. It's easy to think that's true when she goes from acting like a nails-tough achiever to, well, a girl.”¹⁸ One journalist used a type of analogy that is very common regarding the discussion of female candidates – a “tightrope” analogy – to describe the challenges faced by Clinton on the toughness front: “the fact is that Hillary has had to walk a tightrope between masculinity and femininity, toughness and sensitivity.”¹⁹

Some academics also highlighted this dynamic as greatly undermining Clinton's political fortunes. For example, in an article entitled “Clinton's Task: Being Likable AND Tough,” Mary Trigg of the Institute of Women's Leadership at Rutgers University noted: “Research demonstrates that there's a very narrow bandwidth of acceptable behavior for women in positions of power, because they have to be feminine, but also exhibit the kind of attributes we look for in a leader...A female leader can't be too assertive and strident, because you get into the 'B' word. It's a hard and lonely trail to walk.”²⁰ Similarly, Georgetown linguistics professor Deborah Tannen (a frequent media presence on the topic of how female politicians are regarded by the public) made the following argument about Clinton in 2007: “We're a very macho culture, and I think every women in public office

¹⁸ Burshtein, Karen, “Dressed to Imprez,” *National Post* (Canada), March 1 2008, Weekend Post, page WP5

¹⁹ Stevens, Lisa, “Hillary-baiting shows extra barriers ambitious women face,” *The Western Mail*, June 6 2008, , pg. 23

²⁰ Noveck, Jocelyn, “Clinton's Task: Being Likable AND Tough,” *USA Today*, January 10, 2008.

has to find her path to negotiate that. To the extent she's a woman and has to prove she's tough, standing her ground is the best thing to do. And to the extent she's a woman and people don't tolerate toughness in women, she's going to be faulted for that."²¹

Looking Beyond Hillary: Do All Women Face a Double Bind Regarding Toughness?

Hillary Clinton is not the only candidate to be assumed to face these challenges. According to Mandy Greenwald, a Democratic consultant, “[Madeline] Albright is one of the few top female politicians who has succeeded in projecting ‘an image of strength without being called a bitch. Think about other prominent female politicians, women like Dianne Feinstein, Christie Whitman, Geraldine Ferraro. Sooner or later that word tends to follow them around’.”²² Marie Wilson, former president of the White House Project, wonders “How do women actually convey toughness? How do they convey they will be a strong leader? And how do they do it in a way without losing their femininity? We expect women to display their masculine side all the time and their feminine side at the same time. It's a tough balancing act. Very few women can do it.”²³ Some argue that this is an ancient phenomenon: “A woman who displays toughness and ambition often sacrifices being liked. This is not a new discovery. It goes back 3,000 years to the first female pharaoh, Hatshepsut. Women in business, academia, science – you name it – are caught in a double bind. If they are not tough enough, they are not up to the job...If a woman is too tough,

²¹ Healy, Patrick. “Politics Means Sometimes Having to Say You’re Sorry,” *The New York Times*, March 4, 2007

²² Dobbs, Michael, “Albright Reshapes Role of Nation's Top Diplomat,” *The Washington Post*, 15 June 1997, pg. A01.

²³ *The News and Observer* (Raleigh, North Carolina), April 15, 2007.

she does not fit our stereotype of female behavior...A frequent response to a strong woman leader in any sphere is, 'I just don't like her'."²⁴

A cursory glance at the media coverage of Clinton's campaign suggests that at least some pundits viewed her candidacy through a gendered lens and were uncomfortable with the idea of a tough female candidate. A male candidate simply would not have provoked this comment by Tucker Carlson: "[T]here's just something about [Hillary Clinton] that feels castrating, overbearing, and scary."²⁵ But does the public generally hold men and women to different standards as the double standards theory posits? Although I do address the possible role of the media in the concluding chapter, establishing whether a gendered relationship exists between candidate behavior and public opinion is the goal of this chapter, and of this book more generally.

It is not simply some members of the media who speculate that female candidates will generally face a double bind for acting tough; some academics do so as well. As Kathleen Hall Jamieson stresses, "it's gender bias, plain and simple. They [female candidates] are supposed to be warm and accessible, because that's what's perceived to be gender-appropriate. But they also need to be tough and competent. The minute they appear that way, their warmth and accessibility are called into question."²⁶ In this view, female candidates face an impossible decision: "A woman has to choose between running as the candidate with the proper competence – and thus, being manly – or as the candidate

²⁴ Kunin 2008.

²⁵ Tucker Carlson, "Tucker," *MSNBC*, March 20, 2007.²⁵

²⁶ Jamieson, as quoted in Jocelyn Noveck, "Clinton's Task: Being Likable AND Tough," *USA Today*, January 10, 2008.

who is properly feminine – and thus, being unqualified.”²⁷ According to linguistics professor Deborah Tannen, this dynamic is caused by gendered expectations: “Our image of a politician, a leader, a manager, anyone in authority, is still at odds with our expectations of a woman. To the extent that a woman is feminine, she’s seen as weak. To the extent that she puts it aside and is forceful, aggressive and decisive, she’s not seen as a good woman.”²⁸

Campaign professionals also often highlight the double bind. Indeed, some argue that the double bind is not simply an obstacle for female candidates, but that it is the single *greatest* challenge for female candidates. Pollster Celinda Lake claims that the greatest challenge for women candidates is demonstrating toughness in a way that does not alienate voters.²⁹ To emphasize that point, Lake quotes a woman candidate whom she had interviewed as saying, “If you’re too strong, you’re labeled a bad word. If you’re not strong enough, you get run over.”³⁰

With respect to politics, many tie the existence of the double bind specifically to national security, an area that is thought to be particularly relevant in the post-9/11 era. For example, Dee Dee Meyers, former Press Secretary for President Bill Clinton, notes that “when women in positions of authority conform to traditional stereotypes, they are perceived as ‘too soft’ to be effective (especially on issues of national security). And when

²⁷ Rede, George, “Women’s ‘double bind’: Competence, femininity collide in candidates’ paths.” *The Oregonian*, 6 September 2008.

²⁸ Tannen as quoted in Ellen Goodman, “Rules of the game stacked against women candidates,” *The Daily Herald*, December 11, 2007.

²⁹ *USA Today*, “Women running for offices face many obstacles,” March 19, 2001.

³⁰ *USA Today*, “Women running for offices face many obstacles,” March 19, 2001.

they defy those norms, they are considered ‘too tough,’ too masculine, downright bitchy.³¹

Others argue that the double bind is especially difficult for women to manage as presidential candidates: “Female candidates for all elective offices face the conundrum of having to appear strong and confident without looking unfeminine, according to specialists on women and politics. But the dilemma is more pronounced at the presidential election level, they say, because voters are more likely to be guided by their gut reactions to candidates rather than comparisons of the contenders’ records.”³²

In short, a wide variety of analysts see female candidates as being greatly constrained because they are stuck between a proverbial rock and a hard place: they need to be tough enough to convince the public they have what it takes to get the job done, but acting tough may inherently alienate people because it violates people’s expectations of appropriate feminine behavior. And yet, there are also certainly plenty of examples where female politicians have been unabashedly tough and have seemingly paid few penalties for that “unfeminine” approach. From Bella Abzug to Golda Meir to Margaret Thatcher to Diane Feinstein to Nancy Pelosi, tough women have been running and winning in politics for a very long time. As suggested earlier, the “b” word often follows them around, and yet, plenty of tough women have been elected and reelected in spite of it, or perhaps even because of it.

This chapter will carefully evaluate whether women do, in fact, face a double bind regarding toughness and is organized as follows. I first outline how much of the argument regarding how women are differentially penalized for toughness relies upon an assumed

³¹ Myers 2008.

³² Milligan, Susan, “Clinton's struggle vexes feminists: To some, her skills losing out to style,” *The Boston Globe*, February 19, 2008, Section A1.

relationship between toughness and empathy, which explains why empathy is a twin focus of this chapter alongside toughness. The next section then briefly discusses the existing research that is most relevant to the question at hand. I then turn to analyze the matter of toughness: I first outline hypotheses regarding how the public is likely to react to tough behavior by female candidates and then present the findings that bear on them. The last section then examines lack of empathy; again, I delineate hypotheses and the findings from the analysis are then outlined.

The Significance of Empathy

Toughness is generally assumed to negatively affect the perceptions of women either directly or indirectly through empathy-related measures like caring and compassion. However, the double bind could operate in a couple of different ways. It might be that a tough female candidate will be perceived to be less empathetic than a similarly tough male candidate – in other words, toughness may take a disproportionate toll on favorability for female candidates at least partly by making them seem more uncaring than comparably-tough male candidates. Conversely, it may be that a tough man and a tough woman will be perceived to be similarly uncaring; however, caring/empathy may simply be more important to assessments of favorability for women candidates than men candidates.

In addition to examining how the public reacts to tough candidates, an examination of how the public reacts to uncaring candidates can thus help us to evaluate whether the double-bind exists. After all, if people are penalizing women for either seeming less caring and/or for not being as caring as women are expected to be when they act tough, we should see similar dynamics when women candidates simply act in an uncaring manner.

And even if we do not see a similar relationship for non-empathetic behavior as we see for tough behavior, this will still help us to identify the mechanisms through which toughness might actually affect female candidates.

Related Empirical Research

We currently lack an empirical basis for determining whether female candidates actually do face a toughness double bind. However, that is *not* to say that political scientists have failed to explore issues related to candidate gender and toughness. In particular, many scholars have studied whether the public holds descriptive stereotypes that female leaders are less tough or less capable of handling “tough issues” like crime or the military. A number of studies have found that people are more likely to project “feminine” traits (compassion, caring, honesty) onto female candidates while people are more likely to project “masculine” traits (strength, resolve, toughness, etc.) onto male candidates (see, e.g., Brown et al. 1993; Leeper 1991; Rosenwasser and Seale 1988; Rosenwasser and Dean 1989; Sapiro 1983.) These trait stereotypes have been linked to perceived issue competencies, such that men tend to be perceived to be superior on foreign policy and defense issues and women tend to be perceived as being better on domestic issues (see, e.g., Alexander and Andersen 1993; Falk and Kenski 2006; Koch 1999; Lawless 2004; Huddy and Terkildsen 1993; Sanbonmatsu 2002; Sapiro 1981).³³

³³ These issue-based gender stereotypes may have more power at some times than others: for example, Lawless 2004 argues that these stereotypes disproportionately advantage male candidates during times of heightened security concerns. Moreover, the advantages that male candidates have on strength and security issues might have relatively minimal effects on candidates for legislative office but such differences may hurt women in their quest for

At the same time, some other studies have failed to find that male candidates or politicians benefit from strength-related or other stereotypes. In particular, Kahn finds that fictional male and female candidates were not perceived to be significantly different on traits like the ability to handle leadership or military issues.³⁴ A recent study by Kim Fridkin and Patrick Kenney (2009) that examines perceptions of actual Senate candidates in the 2006 elections also confirms that same general pattern: no beneficial stereotypes for male candidates on any attributes, including leadership-related traits.

In short, people may have some stereotypes about male and female politicians, but the evidence is mixed for agentic traits. This evidence has also been drawn from many different decades, and yet gender stereotypes may have shifted significantly over time. Most importantly, there has been no attempt to quantify whether acting tough can change any of these priors and differentially affect preference for candidates. Thus, although an understanding of baseline stereotypes about candidates is relevant as a starting point, it does not directly address whether the double bind exists because it cannot tell us if women are disproportionately penalized for acting tough if they choose to do so.

A few studies have come closer to the question at hand by examining public perceptions of tough female versus tough male politicians, but none of those studies discusses the double bind and none of the study designs permit an assessment of it. Virginia Sapiro and Mark Stephen Leeper analyze how people react to tough male and female candidates but their studies both lack a control group for non-tough candidates; as a result, they cannot determine whether their results reflect the effects of reactions to tough

the presidency in light of the latter institution's focus on agentic leadership and defense-related issues (Dolan 1997; Lawless 2004; Paul and Smith 2008).

³⁴ Kahn 1992, 506; 1994, 183; 1996.

candidate behavior or simply the effects of standard descriptive gender stereotypes that may be applied to candidates.³⁵ Leonie Huddy and Nayda Terkildsen examine how people react to male and female candidates who are described in masculine versus feminine terms, and find that the trait descriptions largely override the effects of gender stereotypes.³⁶

However, they focus only on changing perceptions of a particular trait or issue competencies rather than on the kinds of overall candidate assessments that would allow us to determine whether tough female candidates are likely to face disproportionate penalties on Election Day.

In the end, it remains unclear whether female candidates face a double bind for acting tough that may harm their electoral prospects. It is a remarkable oversight by our field, especially given the intensity of public attention focused on the issue.

Hypotheses Regarding a Double Bind for Toughness

In the case of toughness, double standards theory predicts that female candidates will face a double bind. Yet, as with the other behaviors, there are also good reasons to

³⁵ Sapiro 1981/1982 and Leeper 1981.

³⁶ Huddy and Terkildsen 1993a and 1993b. The “typically-feminine” trait treatment described the candidate as “intelligent, compassionate, trustworthy and family-oriented opponent with proven leadership skills and strong people skills”, whereas the “typically-masculine” trait treatment described the candidate as “intelligent, tough, articulate and ambitious and as having strong leadership and administrative skills (1993b, 127). They find that “it was relatively easy to reverse trait stereotypes of both male and female candidates by describing them in counterstereotypic terms. For most respondents, information about the candidate’s traits—not gender—shaped inferences about their gender-linked personality traits” (1993b, 128).

believe that female candidates will not face a double bind for toughness. The basis for these competing hypotheses is established below.

The Hypothesis Emerging from the Double Standards Theory

With reference to toughness-related attributes, people hold strong descriptive stereotypes about men and women. Prentice and Carranza 2002 have the most comprehensive data on this topic, in which they measured both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes for ordinary men and women across 100 widely ranging traits.³⁷ As compared to women, men were assumed to be far more aggressive, more forceful, less yielding, more assertive, more competitive, and more decisive (out of the 100 measured traits, those six characteristics were all in the top 15 largest gender differences). Men were also thought to have more business sense, be less weak, be less naïve, more controlling, more ambitious, and have more leadership ability than women.

With reference to prescriptions about toughness-related behaviors, the gender differences are even more notable than the descriptive stereotypes. In terms of the ranking of the magnitude of gender differences on the desirability of each trait for men and women, all twelve of the toughness-related traits rank within the top 16 out of 100; moreover, “aggressive,” “weak,” and “assertive,” capture the #1, #2, and #3 spots, respectively. In other words, there tend to be much stronger gender prescriptions for toughness-related traits than for other kinds of traits.

Thus, at least for ordinary men and women, the psychology literature shows that fairly strong descriptive stereotypes are in place for many toughness-related traits and

³⁷ Thanks are due to Prentice and Carranza for generously sharing their data with me.

extremely strongly gendered normative expectations exist for toughness-related behavior. But is the same true for leaders? As compared to female leaders, ordinary women would not necessarily be expected to face a double bind because they may not need to demonstrate toughness in order to be seen as a good person. To the extent that toughness by women is penalized, it is likely that ordinary women will simply try to avoid that behavior. But for female leaders, such conformance to expectations may not be possible, because toughness may be required for success in leadership roles.

While political scientists have not empirically examined the double bind regarding political leaders, business scholars have addressed the question by examining how people react to the tough behavior of male and female business leaders. The business scholarship focuses on “agentic” traits by leaders, such as ambition, self-reliance, competition, aggression, force, and decisiveness. As mentioned in Chapter 3, research has shown that idealized leadership is generally conceptualized in agentic “Think Leader, Think Male” terms, while female business leaders are assumed to be more “communal.”³⁸

Drawing upon role congruity theory, Eagly and Karau 2002 argue that male business leaders do not face a problem because male stereotypes overlap with the prescriptions of good leadership: they act in an agentic manner, and they get rewarded for it. The difficulty faced by female business leaders is that negative consequences known as “backlash effects” can result from women’s attempts to counter gender stereotypes in the workplace by acting in an agentic manner. The literature shows that women in the business realm who establish themselves as agentic tend to face sanctions in terms of

³⁸ Sczensny 2003; Catalyst Report 2007.

favorability/likeability.³⁹ This can have tangible consequences for agentic women, such as a lower likelihood of getting hired, promoted, fairly compensated, or favorably evaluated on the job.⁴⁰ Women who act in an agentic manner while also displaying communal characteristics like warmth and niceness can minimize backlash.⁴¹ However, Rudman and Glick 2001 argue that those findings only apply to competence-related agentic behavior while backlash from dominance-related agentic behavior may be impossible for women to avoid because dominance by women inherently lowers perceptions that they are nice (758). In their review of the literature to date on the topic, Rudman and Phelan ultimately conclude that “ambitious women may have to choose between being liked but not respected (by displaying communal qualities) or being respected but not liked (by displaying agentic qualities), a dilemma not faced by men.”⁴²

The double standards theory would expect the overall findings from the line of research to also carry over to the political realm:

H1_{tough}: Acting in a tough manner will disproportionately hurt the female candidate.

³⁹ See, for example, Rudman and Glick 2001.

⁴⁰ See, for example, Rudman 1998 on hiring, Babcock and Laschever 2003 on salary negotiations, Heilman et al. 2004 on promotion, Eagly et al. 1992, and Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani 1995 on leadership evaluations.

⁴¹ See, for example, Carli, 2001; Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard 2008.

⁴² Rudman and Phelan 2008, 65.

The Hypothesis Emerging from the Leaders-not-Ladies Theory

There is thus a fair amount of evidence that demonstrates that women face a double bind in the business world: women have to prove that they are tough enough to lead a business, but then are disproportionately penalized when they do so. Although the world of politics has some similarities to the business sphere – leading groups, a premium placed on agentic traits, and so on – there are also many important differences. We cannot, therefore, just assume that constraints found in the business world for female leaders will carry over to political leaders.

For one thing, the samples of reference are entirely different: the typical sample for a business study is comprised of business school students (that is, a male-skewed population of individuals who possess various characteristics that have caused them to self-select into business careers) rather than the general population. Of course, business leaders do not answer to the general public while political leaders do not only answer to business-based employees; for this reason alone, it is important to test whether the business-based findings on leaders do, in fact, carry over to political candidates.

On top of this, it is crucial to bear in mind that the expectations of leaders in business and politics may be very different. In politics, politicians regularly get opportunities to express their communal strengths, and men and women candidates regularly avail themselves of those opportunities. Good politicians, rather than just good female politicians, work hard to make sure that their potential constituents feel cared for and understood. Moreover, occasional displays of toughness rather than regular displays of toughness may be sufficient to establish agency in the political realm, whereas toughness may possibly be required much more often in the business realm to be seen as credible. In

short, the standards for effective business leaders may be different, and less favorable, for women business leaders than women politicians.

An additional consideration is that Chapter 4 showed no descriptive stereotypes about female candidates and strength-related measures. All indications from this study are that women politicians are on equal footing with male politicians (or even better footing, in the case of low-experience female candidates) in strength-related domains from the start. This does not eliminate the possibility that women candidates will be subject to prescriptive stereotypes about feminine behavior – it is possible, after all, that tough behavior could activate gendered expectations – but it does make it far less likely, given that female candidates do not start out at a disadvantage on the relevant measures.

Ultimately, the prediction of the leaders-not-ladies theory is that tough behavior by female candidates will not face a greater penalty from the public:

H2_{tough}: Female candidates who act in a tough manner will not be disproportionately penalized by the public

Study Design for Toughness Experiment

The overall experimental design I employ was described in Chapter 3. As such, I will only address the issues here that are specific to the toughness experiment. As with the crying and anger experiments, the treatment articles varied from the control group article with the addition of two paragraphs that described two incidents of tough behavior, a different headline, different sub-headline, and a different pull quote (the N-sizes for each cell are listed in **Appendix 1** and the full text of each of the newspaper treatments is included in **Appendix 2**).

A choice existed as to what kind of tough behavior to use for the treatment. In their studies of perceptions of male and female business leaders, Rudman and Glick 2001 specifically identified dominance – not competence – as being the agentic trait that puts businesswomen in the double bind (since dominance inherently lowers perceptions of niceness for women). As such, behaviors related to dominance were selected. The headline for the toughness treatment was “Congresswoman Karen Bailey threatens to hold up bills: ‘I will be heard,’ Bailey says,” while the pull quote was “I won’t let anyone stand in my way.” The treatment situations involved refusing to yield the floor and continuing to give a speech when leaders asked the politician to stop. Bailey’s response to the situation was “I don’t take ‘no’ for an answer, and I won’t let anyone stand in my way. I will be heard.” The article also reports that an email was anonymously leaked in which Bailey threatened to “hold up the House leaders’ favored bills in committee unless they agreed to hold hearings to consider the provisions [he/she] was demanding.”

The hypotheses derived from the theories are generalizable and thus should apply to a wide variety of toughness-related scenarios, including the one I selected. Regardless, this scenario is a fair representation of the kinds of rough-and-tumble legislative situations that policymakers may often have to navigate. It is behavior that is neither entirely admirable nor entirely appalling, which is a realistic representation of the kind of toughness often displayed in politics. In short, this scenario is useful for evaluating whether the double bind exists.

Beyond the standard outcome measures that are of key interest for this topic, there are a few traits and issues that are especially interesting for the study of this topic (see **Appendix 3** for exact question wording). I included several complementary measures of strength in the survey. One is the standard “provides strong leadership” measure that is

included in many surveys of candidate traits, including the NES, and has been found to correlate highly with outcome measures. Because “provides strong leadership” is as much a measure of good leadership as it is of “strength,” per se, I also measured “strong” (vs. “weak”) as a separate measure. Additionally, since strength-related traits are likely to have issue-based implications, I included a measure of “ability to handle an international crisis.”

In order to test whether toughness takes a disproportionate toll on communal measures for women, it is the caring and compassion measures that are particularly relevant. First, I included the standard NES “really cares about people like you” measure that captures a combination of empathy and personal identification with the candidate. I also included “compassionate” and “caring” (vs. “uncaring”) as measures since they remove the personal identification element to focus more precisely on perceived warmth and empathy-related communal values.

Additionally, I used two measures to capture assessments of the appropriateness of the behavior and attributions for that behavior. I asked about whether the candidate’s behavior was “appropriate” or “inappropriate.” For the treatment group only, I also asked whether the candidate’s behavior could best be explained by “the nature of the situation” (“7”) or with “the personal characteristics of the candidate” (“1”), since behavior that is associated with the personal characteristics of the candidate is likely to have a larger effect on overall candidate assessments. Finally, I measured the degree to which candidates were thought to be “assertive” (vs. “unassertive”) as a manipulation check for the toughness treatment, but also as a check to see if tough women are perceived to be more assertive than tough men.

Analysis of Toughness Results

The first question is whether the experimental design worked; that is, did respondents react to the toughness treatment? The answer is yes (for full results and all of the associated means for each behavior as compared to the control group, holding candidate gender constant – more precisely, while averaging the responses for male and female candidates – see **Appendix 3**). Setting candidate gender aside (that is, assessing the overall means based on half of respondents randomly viewing a male candidate and half viewing a female candidate), acting tough significantly increased the degree to which a candidate is viewed as being assertive (a 1-point difference on a 7-point scale). Tough-acting candidates were also viewed as being “stronger” (.5 difference) as compared to the control group.

Overall, tough behavior is seen as being significantly less “appropriate” than the ordinary behavior of the control group candidates (a difference of .3). There was a significant difference between the control group candidates and the treatment candidates for “compassionate” (the measure that most directly taps into the feminine trait of empathy). Toughness takes a significant toll on perceptions of candidate compassion, with a .3 difference between the tough and control group candidates.

Given the push/pull effects operating under the surface (with toughness increasing perceptions of candidate strength but decreasing perceptions of compassion) it is perhaps not surprising that there is no overall effect of tough behavior on the three outcome measures (favorability, likely effectiveness in the Senate, or likely presidential effectiveness 10 years in the future). Although these results are interesting, the real question at issue is whether there is an interaction between the “tough” condition and candidate gender. I find

no interactions between candidate gender and toughness that indicate damage to female candidates (relative to male candidates) for acting in a tough manner, which is consistent with the expectations of the leaders-not-ladies theory (see **Table 6.1** for a summary of the results, and see **Appendix 4** for the ANOVA results and associated means).

Indeed, whereas double standards theory predicts that women would be penalized more than men for toughness, on several measures the opposite is actually the case. Whereas there is no interaction between candidate gender and toughness regarding likely effectiveness in the Senate, on likely presidential effectiveness – an especially key measure because of the assumed linkage between perceived strength and executive leadership – women who acted in a tough manner were actually viewed more favorably than women who did not act in a tough manner, while the opposite was true for men. In short, women improved their prospects of being viewed favorably for the presidency by acting tough, while men hurt their prospects with the same behavior. On favorability itself – a key measure given that violations of prescriptions have so often been thought to result in being “disliked” – there is a suggestive effect ($p=.08$) that men are viewed less favorably if they act tough, but not women (who remain unchanged on favorability regardless of their behavior).

**Table 6.1
Summary of Toughness Results**

Do displays of TOUGHNESS affect perceptions of male and female candidates differently on the overall outcome measures?	
WOMEN who act tough are disproportionately HIGHER on	favorability
<i>no significant difference</i> on	likely Senate effectiveness
WOMEN who act tough are disproportionately HIGHER on	likely presidential effectiveness
Do displays of TOUGHNESS affect perceptions of male and female candidates differently on other measures?	
<i>no significant difference</i> on	ability to handle domestic issues
<i>no significant difference</i> on	ability to handle the economy
<i>no significant difference</i> on	ability to handle an international crisis
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"honest"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"knowledgeable"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"intelligent"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"strong leader"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"gets things done"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"cares about people like you"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"compassionate"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"important person"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"would enjoy talking to"
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"unemotional" (vs. "emotional")
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"calm" (vs. "angry")
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"assertive" (vs. "unassertive")
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"caring" (vs. "uncaring")
WOMEN who act tough INCREASE disproportionately	"strong" (vs. "weak")
<i>no significant difference</i> on	"acts appropriately" (vs. "Acts inappropriately")
Tough WOMEN are disproportionately HIGHER on	situational attribution (vs. behavioral)

*Summary results are based on two-way ANOVA models where the significance of the interaction (candidate gender * behavior) is assessed for each of the individual dependent variables (note that the last measure is based on one-way ANOVA; see the appendix for details). The significance of the associated F-test and the means for each experimental cell can be found in the appendix. Differences with a p-value of .10 or better are noted.*

Strength appears to be responsible for some of these differences in the outcome measures. “Strong” (vs. “weak”) was the only individual trait to approach significance for the gender interaction ($p=.07$). Male candidates increase on perceived strength when they act tough (+.3), but female candidates increase to an even greater degree (+.7).⁴³ There is not a significant interaction effect for ability to handle an international crisis.

The conventional wisdom was predicated, in part, on the idea that toughness would specifically cause scores for feminine traits such as compassion to fall, and that they would fall farther for women. This was also the dynamic predicted and found by Rudman and Glick with reference to business leaders.⁴⁴ However, in my analysis of political candidates, I find no evidence of a backlash effect occurring at all. Perceptions of compassion are compromised somewhat by toughness for all candidates, but not disproportionately more for women. And women were obviously not penalized more than men on the overall outcome measures either, which rules out the alternative possibility that empathy is simply more important for female candidates than for male candidates.

A final interesting result concerns the attributions that people make for the causes of tough behavior. People are more likely to attribute the behavior to situational factors for women and dispositional factors for men (a difference of .4). In other words, when men act tough, it is assumed to be due to their personal characteristics, whereas when women act tough, it is assumed to be in response to a difficult situation. While the implications of situational attributions for wholly negative behaviors are fairly clear – a candidate should be better off if a negative behavior is attributed to the situation rather

⁴³ There is not a significant gender interaction for leadership strength, although the means are directionally consistent with those of the “strong” vs. “weak” measures.

⁴⁴ Rudman and Glick 2001, 753.

than to his/her personality – the implications for a trait that is neither wholly positive nor wholly negative are less clear. It may be that being tough mainly when a situation demands it is beneficial for a candidate – and that women benefit from the assumption that they were being tough in response to a difficult situation – which could help to partially explain the positive results for women on the favorability and likely presidential effectiveness measures.

Hypotheses Regarding Lack of Empathy

As stressed previously, the conventional wisdom is that toughness negatively affects the perceptions of female candidates either directly or indirectly through empathy-related measures. In this view, an underlying tradeoff exists between agentic and communal traits: to signal toughness is to deemphasize caring/empathy traits. This could potentially be harmful to female candidates in one of two ways: toughness could lower perceptions of empathy more for women than men, or, alternatively, it could lower perceptions of empathy similarly for women and men in an environment in which empathetic traits are more critical to overall evaluations of women. The previous analysis demonstrated that neither was accurate.

However, it may be that the kind of agentic, legislatively-oriented toughness that was measured was not the kind of behavior that leads some female candidates to be seen as an “ice queen,” or the equivalent. Maybe people expect candidates – male and female – to be legislatively tough, but when candidates seem interpersonally cold, then that produces gender differences in terms of how people evaluate candidates. Toughness might be fine

for politicians, but coldness may produce the kind of assessments that could put female candidates at a disadvantage as compared to their male counterparts.

In sum, it is useful to evaluate the two theories under consideration specifically with respect to empathy. As applied to empathy, the prediction from double standards theory is that female candidates will be penalized disproportionately for displaying a lack of empathy. In this view, women are expected to be especially caring and empathetic, so if they fail to display those traits, they will be disproportionately penalized for it:

H1_{empathy}: Acting in a non-empathetic manner will disproportionately hurt the female candidate.

It should be noted that that H1_{empathy} could be validated in two different ways. As with toughness, it is possible that we could find that empathy-related scores will be lower for non-empathetic female candidates than non-empathetic male candidates; such differences should, in turn, produce disproportionately lower scores on the outcome measures for female candidates who act in a non-empathetic manner. That pattern of results would suggest that a lack of empathy disproportionately affects female candidates by making them seem less caring and compassionate than identical male candidates. Alternatively, the outcome measures could be lower for non-empathetic female candidates than non-empathetic male candidates without differential scores on empathy-related items. That pattern of results would suggest that empathy is simply more important for female candidates than for male candidates.

However, as with other behaviors, the leaders-not-ladies theory would expect that female candidates will not face disproportionate penalties for acting in a non-empathetic manner. Candidates are likely to face major penalties for acting in non-empathetic

manner, but to the extent that female candidates are regarded as leaders and not as women, they are likely to be held to the same standards as male candidates:

H2_{empathy}: Female candidates who act in a non-empathetic manner will not disproportionately punished by the public

Study Design for Lack of Empathy Experiment

The underlying design for this experiment is identical to the toughness study and the other experiments in the rest of this book (see **Appendix 1** for N-sizes). For the treatment groups, the news article for the lack of empathy treatment has a headline reading, “Congresswoman(man) Karen(Kevin) Bailey is curt with constituents in recent encounters,” a subheadline, “Cuts off parent of a disabled child: “Is there a question here?,” and a pull quote, “I just wanted to know that she cared,’ says disappointed elderly man.” The first incident described in the article involves Bailey’s response to a constituent who recounted the challenges facing parents of developmentally disabled children. Bailey is described as checking his/her watch during the constituent’s story and interrupting to say, “I’m sorry to cut you off – and I don’t doubt the extent of your hardships – but is there a question here?” and then moving onto the next question. The other situation described in the news article involves moving quickly through the hallways of a nursing home and brushing past an elderly man who was trying to show her a family photo.

As with all of the experiments, different examples of lack of empathy could have been provided to respondents. Yet as with the other experiments, the hypotheses under consideration are generalizable and the treatment would be expected to tap into gendered expectations if people do, in fact, apply them to their candidate evaluations. In this case,

these are examples of interpersonal coldness that should translate to expectations that people might have about the empathy of female candidates.

The key dependent variables of interest – the overall outcome measures, agentic measures (strength, ability to handle an international crisis, etc.) and communal measures (cares about people like me, compassionate, caring vs. uncaring) – are the same as for the toughness experiment.

Results for Lack of Empathy

The treatment clearly worked in a general sense: as expected, non-empathetic candidates were viewed much less favorably by voters. While the drops were most dramatic on the empathy-related measures, scores dropped on all of the relevant measures. On the empathy related measures, candidate scores fell precipitously, on the order of 2-2.5 points on a 7-point scale. Overall candidate evaluations fell dramatically, too, by approximately 1-1.5 points. Regardless of gender prescriptions, the non-empathetic candidate was clearly failing a prescription for political leaders that they be kind and compassionate.

Despite the importance of lack of empathy to feelings about the candidate, it did not have a gendered effect on overall candidate evaluations (see **Table 6.2** for a summary of the results, and **Appendix 5** for the ANOVA results and associated means). People heavily penalized candidates, male or female, for acting in an uncaring manner, but they did not penalize women more than men on the outcome measures. This finding rules out H1_{empathy}, the hypothesis associated with double standards theory.

Table 6.2
Summary of Lack of Empathy Results

Does LACK OF EMPATHY affect perceptions of male and female candidates differently on the overall outcome measures?	
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> favorability
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> likely Senate effectiveness
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> likely presidential effectiveness
Does LACK OF EMPATHY affect perceptions of male and female candidates differently on other measures?	
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> ability to handle domestic issues
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> ability to handle the economy
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> ability to handle an international crisis
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "honest"
WOMEN who act non-empathetically DECREASE disproportionately	<i>on</i> "knowledgeable"
WOMEN who act non-empathetically DECREASE disproportionately	<i>on</i> "intelligent"
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "strong leader"
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "gets things done"
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "cares about people like you"
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "compassionate"
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "important person"
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "would enjoy talking to"
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "unemotional" (vs. "emotional")
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "calm" (vs. "angry")
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "assertive" (vs. "unassertive")
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "caring" (vs. "uncaring")
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "strong" (vs. "weak")
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> "acts appropriately" (vs. "Acts Inappropriately")
<i>no significant difference</i>	<i>on</i> situational attribution (vs. behavioral)

Summary results are based on two-way ANOVA models where the significance of the interaction (candidate gender * behavior) is assessed for each of the individual dependent variables (note that the last measure is based on one-way ANOVA; see the appendix for details). The significance of the associated F-test and the means for each experimental cell can be found in the appendix. Differences with a p-value of .10 or better are noted.

Lack of empathy did, however, differentially influence perceptions of men and women candidates regarding two subsidiary measures: intelligence and knowledge. Recall from Chapter 4 that intelligence is the only measure on which descriptive gender stereotypes existed for the control group candidate (with female candidates being viewed as more intelligent than male candidates). My analysis shows that when a female candidate is non-empathetic, her underlying advantage on intelligence disappears. Moreover, she ends up falling behind the male candidate on the “knowledgeable” measure after displaying a lack of empathy (even though she started just slightly – but not significantly – above the male candidate in the control group on that measure). It may well have been a “she should know better than that” kind of reaction.

Regardless, it does not amount to anything consequential in light of the overall lack of gendered effects on the outcome measures. In short, candidates should be empathetic – if they are not, they will be strongly punished by the public – but female candidates are not penalized more for lacking empathy than male candidates. As with the analysis of toughness, these results run contrary to double standards theory and are consistent with the expectations of the leaders-not-ladies theory.

Discussion

The key conclusion from this analysis is that the conventional wisdom about a double bind for female candidates is wrong. People do not seem to hold an unwinnable combination of mutually-exclusive expectations for female candidates that they simultaneously act in a non-dominant and leader-like manner. My results show that women can be tough in a highly “unfeminine,” dominant and forceful manner, and not get

penalized for it by the public. And the empathy results indicate that although all candidates should be in touch with their empathetic, “feminine” side, that women do not have to be more attuned to it than men – at least as far as overall public opinion is concerned.

These findings diverge from those in the business literature, where research indicates that women do face a double bind in the corporate world. Evidence exists that female leaders in non-business realms also face a double bind. In higher education, female instructors have been found to be subject to greater penalties for being tough (i.e. tough graders) than male instructors on teaching evaluations and overall perceptions of competence.⁴⁵ In short, there seem to be many examples of disproportionate penalties for tough behavior by women in the world at large, yet this dynamic does not operate in the sphere of politics. Why the difference?

There are important distinctions between the other literatures and the present study. The sample for business and education studies is typically comprised of either business school students or undergraduates, all of whom may very well have different expectations of women than the U.S. population as a whole. Moreover, many of the most relevant business studies were conducted in the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s, and that data may no longer reflect the state of gender stereotypes at the present time.

⁴⁵ Sinclair and Kunda 2000. For example, using both evaluations of actual professors and an experimental design using actors acting as management instructors, Sinclair and Kunda found that undergraduates who received negative feedback from instructors derogate the competence of female instructors but not male instructors. In turn, the final evaluation scores of female instructors were found to be far more dependent upon the amount of positive feedback they give to students than those of male instructors.

But there may also be a more fundamental difference at the root of the apparent discrepancy between the findings in this study and those in non-political realms: female politicians may simply be subject to different expectations than ordinary women, business women, and female educators. Setting aside the matter of gender, each of those roles involves different overall prescriptions: business executives “should be” agentic nearly all the time in order to lead their companies, while professors “should be” tough only when absolutely necessary (at least in the eyes of our students). As for ordinary people, they rarely need to be agentic in everyday life. In contrast, politicians – male and female – have always faced the need to act tough when necessary while being caring and compassionate nearly all the time. They need to feel your pain *and* be able to stand up to those who would try to cause you pain. Male politicians are expected to display communal traits and female politicians are expected to display agentic traits; such expectations may not similarly apply with respect to business leadership.

Moreover, the ascendance of women as political leaders in recent years has been far more rapid than within the business world. If one considers U.S. legislators to be roughly equivalent to corporate CEOs in terms of status, then the gender imbalance is over six times greater in the business world than in U.S. national politics: in 2009, 18% of members of the U.S. House and Senate were female, while only 2.8% of CEOs of Fortune 1000 companies were women. As a result, the average member of the public is likely to have far more exposure to executive-level political leadership by women than the average worker has to executive-level business leadership by women. As noted previously, studies have shown that gender stereotypes are exacerbated in conditions where there are relatively fewer women leaders (partly because perceptions of illegitimacy are reduced and partly because women attract less gender-based attention and are subject to fewer stereotypes

when they move from “token” status to occupy a greater proportion of leadership roles within an organization).⁴⁶ As such, gender stereotypes may now be relatively less salient in the political realm than in the business realm due to relatively more equitable gender representation in the former as compared to the latter.

Indeed, the more general point to underscore is that to be judged as a leader and not as a lady is not necessarily a wholly positive experience; it simply means that women are not judged by a different standard than men. In this regard, Madeline Kunin evocatively recounts that, for her, one representation of being judged as a leader and not a lady is simply being called a different profanity. When Kunin, later the first female governor of Vermont, first started in the state legislature, she recalls that, “Orrin Beattie [the Speaker’s right-hand man] reported that he had been asked how he liked having two women on his committee – Judy Rosenstreich, a Republican, and me. ‘Oh, they’re bastards like everyone else’ is what he said. I laughed with the others. A bastard was fine, I knew. As long as I wasn’t called a bitch.”⁴⁷

To Kunin, it represented progress for women in politics that she could be tough without being saddled with the word the word that so many strong women have been saddled with in various walks of life. For her, it was fine that she was being criticized for being

⁴⁶ See reviews by Ely 1995, Eagly and Karau 2002, Rudman and Phelan 2008. Interestingly, Ely 1994 uses 15% or more female (in that case, for the proportion of female partners in law firms) as the definition of a sex-integrated firm and finds significant differences with that distinction, which suggests that even differences between extreme underrepresentation of female leaders and better-but-still-poor representation of female leaders can be important.

⁴⁷ Kunin 1994, 119.

demanding in exactly the same way that her male colleagues were being criticized for the same behavior. Women like Bella Abzug, Nancy Pelosi, Diane Feinstein, and so many other women politicians have indeed now set a strong precedent that female leaders can be tough, powerful, and electable. Perhaps partly in response to their success, it appears that female candidates are no longer subject to a toughness double bind that constrains them on the campaign trail.

APPENDIX 1

Overall Experiment

	CHAPTER 4		CHAPTER 5		CHAPTER 6		CHAPTER 7	CONTROL GROUP (for Ch. 5-7 also analyzed separately in Ch. 4)
	EXPERIENCE - High	EXPERIENCE - Low	ANGER	CRYING	TOUGH	LACK OF EMPATHY	KNOWLEDGE GAFFE	
FEMALE CANDIDATE	COND #1 (N=191)	COND #3 (N=202)	COND #5 (N=185)	COND #7 (N=194)	COND #9 (N=188)	COND #11 (N=185)	COND #13 (N=185)	COND #15 (N=185)
MALE CANDIDATE	COND #2 (N=184)	COND #4 (N=184)	COND #6 (N=186)	COND #8 (N=190)	COND #10 (N=184)	COND #12 (N=186)	COND #14 (N=191)	COND #16 (N=180)
N=	375	386	371	384	372	371	376	365
Experiment N	761		736	749	737	736	741	

APPENDIX 2

Control Group Condition (Female)

Congresswoman Karen Bailey announces Senate bid

The Associated Press

Congresswoman Karen Bailey recently announced she will be seeking a U.S. Senate seat that will be vacated in 2010 due to a retirement.

Congresswoman Bailey is expected to be a major contender in the Senate race due to her strong appeal to voters from both political parties. “I am a solutions candidate,” Bailey says, “with a focus on bringing the parties together to solve challenges for our state and for our country.”

With a preference for moderate policies, she is “one of the few remaining politicians in the sensible center – someone who tries to find bipartisan solutions to the country’s problems,” says Martin Druckman of the non-partisan Wilson Institute of American Politics.

With one full term under her belt and now several months into her second term, Congresswoman Bailey has experienced many legislative successes as well as some legislative challenges. On the success front, the state now has one of the

highest per capita levels of road improvement spending in the country and has dramatically increased its total number of small businesses with the help of federal business improvement grants. Congresswoman Bailey has been less successful as the co-author of two bills to increase spending on safety equipment for soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan and to make federal bureaucracies more cost-efficient, both of which failed to pass in the House earlier this year.

APPENDIX 2 (cont.)

Tough Condition (Female)

Congresswoman Karen Bailey threatens to hold up bills

*“I will be heard,”
Bailey says*

The Associated Press

Congresswoman Karen Bailey recently announced she will be seeking a U.S. Senate seat that will be vacated in 2010 due to a retirement. The announcement has been overshadowed by other events, however. In an incident earlier this week, the congresswoman refused to yield time she had remaining on the House floor to a colleague and is seen on a video clip calmly but very firmly stating, “You’ve had your turn, and now it’s my turn. I will not yield the floor until I have said what I need to say,” prior to finishing the full length of her speech. And to House leaders who refused to let the congresswoman add provisions to a bill, she said “I don’t take ‘no’ for an answer, and I won’t let anyone stand in my way. I will be heard.”

Additionally, in an e-mail that was anonymously provided to the media, Representative Bailey threatened to hold up the House leaders’ favored bills in committee unless they agreed to hold hearings to consider the provisions she was demanding. The congresswoman’s office declined to comment on the incidents.

*“I won’t let anyone
stand in my way”*

Congresswoman Bailey is expected to be a major contender in the Senate race due to her strong appeal to voters from both political parties. “I am a solutions candidate,” Bailey says, “with a focus on bringing the parties together to solve challenges for our state and for our country.” With a preference for moderate policies, she is “one of the few remaining politicians in the sensible center – someone

who tries to find bipartisan solutions to the country’s problems,” says Martin Druckman of the non-partisan Wilson Institute of American Politics.

With one full term under her belt and now several months into her second term, Congresswoman Bailey has experienced many legislative successes as well as some legislative challenges. On the success front, the state now has one of the highest per capita levels of road improvement spending in the country and has dramatically increased its total number of small businesses with the help of federal business improvement grants. Congresswoman Bailey has been less successful as the co-author of two bills to increase spending on safety equipment for soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan and to make federal bureaucracies more cost-efficient, both of which failed to pass in the House earlier this year.

APPENDIX 2 (cont)

Lack of Empathy Condition

Congresswoman Karen Bailey is curt with constituents in recent encounters

Cuts off parent of a disabled child: "Is there a question here?"

The Associated Press

Congresswoman Karen Bailey recently announced she will be seeking a U.S. Senate seat that will be vacated in 2010 due to a retirement. The announcement has been overshadowed by other events, however. In an incident earlier this week, the congresswoman appeared unsympathetic to a constituent at a recent event who described the challenges facing parents of developmentally disabled children. Throughout the constituent's story, Representative Bailey repeatedly checked her watch and finally interrupted, "I'm sorry to cut you off – and I don't doubt the extent of your hardships – but is there a question here?" and moved on to the next question.

At a later visit to a small nursing home while accompanied by reporters, Representative Bailey

quickly moved through the hallways. When an elderly man approached the congresswoman and asked if she would look at a photo of his family that the man had not seen in over a year, Representative Bailey brushed past him and did not look up from a conversation with an aide. With tears in his eyes, the man told a reporter, "I just wanted

"I just wanted to know that she cared," says disappointed elderly man

to know that she cared." The congresswoman's office declined to comment on the incidents.

Congresswoman Bailey is expected to be a major contender in the Senate race due to her strong appeal to voters from both political parties. "I am a solutions candidate," Bailey says, "with a focus on bringing the parties together to solve challenges for our state and for our country." With a preference for moderate

policies, she is "one of the few remaining politicians in the sensible center – someone who tries to find bipartisan solutions to the country's problems," says Martin Druckman of the non-partisan Wilson Institute of American Politics.

With one full term under her belt and now several months into her second term, Congresswoman Bailey has experienced many legislative successes as well as some legislative challenges. On the success front, the state now has one of the highest per capita levels of road improvement spending in the country and has dramatically increased its total number of small businesses with the help of federal business improvement grants. Congresswoman Bailey has been less successful as the co-author of two bills to increase spending on safety equipment for soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan and to make federal bureaucracies more cost-efficient, both of which failed to pass in the House earlier this year.

APPENDIX 3

Question Wording

[FAVORABILITY] How favorable or unfavorable do you feel toward the candidate?

EXTREMELY UNFAVORABLE							EXTREMELY FAVORABLE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

How good of a job do you think that the candidate would probably do with the following...

A POOR JOB						AN EXCELLENT JOB
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q: [SENATE EFFECTIVENESS] Be an effective U.S. Senator

Q: [PRESIDENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS] Be an effective U.S. President
about 10 years from now

Q: [DOMESTIC ISSUES] Strengthen programs like Social Security and Medicare

Q: [ECONOMY] Help to make America strong economically

Q: [INTERNATIONAL CRISIS] Effectively handle an international crisis

How well do you think the following words or phrases describe the candidate?

Not Well at All						Extremely Well
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q: [HONEST] Honest

Q: [KNOWLEDGEABLE] Knowledgeable

Q: [INTELLIGENT] Intelligent

Q: [STRONG LEADER] Provides strong leadership

Q: [GETS THINGS DONE] Gets things done

Q: [CARES ABOUT PEOPLE LIKE YOU] Really cares about people like you

Q: [COMPASSIONATE] Compassionate

Q: [IMPORTANT PERSON] An important person

Q: [WOULD ENJOY TALKING TO] Someone you would probably enjoy talking to

Q: [WILL IMPROVE WASHINGTON] Will improve things in Washington *[asked of conditions only]* *[Asked of CONTROL GROUP + EXPERIENCE]*

Q: **Please rate the candidate on the following characteristics:**

[Asked of CONTROL GROUP + CRYING + ANGRY + TOUGH +LACK OF EMPATHY conditions only]

[UNEMOTIONAL]

Emotional							Unemotional
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

[CALM]

Angry						Calm
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[ASSERTIVE]

Unassertive						Assertive
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[CARING]

Uncaring						Caring
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[STRONG]

Weak						Strong
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[APPROPRIATE]

Acts inappropriately							Acts Appropriately
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Q: Please rate the candidate on the following characteristics:

[Asked of CONTROL GROUP + KNOWLEDGE GAFFE + EXPERIENCE conditions only]

[COMPETENT]

Incompetent							Competent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

[EXPERIENCED]

Inexperienced							Experienced
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Q: [SITUATIONAL ATTRIBUTION] I think the behavior of the candidate in the article can probably best be explained by: *(asked of all EXCEPT the Control Group and the Experience groups)*

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CANDIDATE							THE DIFFICULTY OF THE SITUATION/S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

APPENDIX 4 Toughness Results

	Control Group		TOUGH		<i>p</i> -value for F-test of gender * behavior	
	MALE candidates	FEMALE candidates	MALE candidates	FEMALE candidates		
Favorability	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	*	<i>p</i> =.08
Senate Effectiveness	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7		<i>p</i> =.34
Pres Effectiveness	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.9	**	<i>p</i> =.03
Social Security	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2		<i>p</i> =.66
Economy	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3		<i>p</i> =.51
International Crisis	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0		<i>p</i> =.25
Honest	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.7		<i>p</i> =.29
Knowledgeable	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7		<i>p</i> =.83
Intelligent	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.8		<i>p</i> =.57
Strong Leadership	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.9		<i>p</i> =.39
Gets things done	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.8		<i>p</i> =.66
Cares about people like you	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3		<i>p</i> =.68
Compassionate	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.3		<i>p</i> =.56
Important Person	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2		<i>p</i> =.60
Would Enjoy Talking to	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.3		<i>p</i> =.19
Unemotional (vs. Emotional)	3.9	4.0	3.4	3.4		<i>p</i> =.77
Calm (vs. Angry)	4.4	4.4	3.5	3.5		<i>p</i> =.67
Assertive (vs. Unassertive)	4.5	4.6	5.5	5.5		<i>p</i> =.91
Caring (vs. Uncaring)	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.6		<i>p</i> =.47
Strong (vs. Weak)	4.4	4.4	4.7	5.1	*	<i>p</i> =.07
Acts Appropriately (vs. Acts Inappropriately)	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.3		<i>p</i> =.27
Situational Attribution (vs. Personal Attribution)	NA	NA	3.4	3.8	**	<i>p</i> =.03

*** *p* ≤ .01, ** *p* ≤ .05, * *p* ≤ .10

For all but the final measure, results are based on a series of two-way ANOVA models where the significance of the interaction (candidate gender * behavior) is the focus of the analysis for each dependent variable. The *p*-value indicates the significance of the associated F-test for the interaction. For the attribution measure, the *p*-value indicates the significance of the F-test for gender alone, because the question was not asked of the control group.

APPENDIX 5 Lack of Empathy Results

	Control Group		LACK OF EMPATHY		<i>p</i> - value for <i>F</i> -test of gender * behavior	
	MALE candidates	FEMALE candidates	MALE candidates	FEMALE candidates		
Favorability	4.5	4.5	2.7	2.8		<i>p</i> =.46
Senate Effectiveness	4.5	4.6	3.5	3.3		<i>p</i> =.23
Pres Effectiveness	3.9	3.7	2.5	2.3		<i>p</i> =.59
Social Security	4.2	4.3	2.7	2.7		<i>p</i> =.73
Economy	4.4	4.4	3.4	3.3		<i>p</i> =.49
International Crisis	4.1	3.9	3.1	2.8		<i>p</i> =.37
Honest	4.4	4.5	3.2	3.1		<i>p</i> =.34
Knowledgeable	4.5	4.6	3.7	3.4	**	<i>p</i> =.05
Intelligent	4.6	4.9	3.5	3.4	**	<i>p</i> =.04
Strong Leadership	4.4	4.5	3.2	3.2		<i>p</i> =.69
Gets things done	4.5	4.6	3.6	3.6		<i>p</i> =.60
Cares about people like you	4.2	4.3	2.0	2.0		<i>p</i> =.82
Compassionate	4.3	4.4	1.9	2.0		<i>p</i> =.96
Important Person	4.1	4.3	3.0	2.9		<i>p</i> =.40
Would Enjoy Talking to	4.2	4.3	2.1	2.2		<i>p</i> =.78
Unemotional (vs. Emotional)	3.9	4.0	5.6	5.7		<i>p</i> =.86
Calm (vs. Angry)	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.1		<i>p</i> =.72
Assertive (vs. Unassertive)	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6		<i>p</i> =.97
Caring (vs. Uncaring)	4.6	4.7	2.1	2.2		<i>p</i> =.85
Strong (vs. Weak)	4.4	4.4	3.6	3.9		<i>p</i> =.32
Acts Appropriately (vs. Acts Inappropriately)	4.5	4.5	3.0	2.9		<i>p</i> =.67
Situational Attribution (vs. Personal Attribution)	NA	NA	2.5	2.7		<i>p</i> =.24

*** *p* ≤ .01, ** *p* ≤ .05, * *p* ≤ .10

For all but the final measure, results are based on a series of two-way ANOVA models where significance of the interaction (candidate gender * behavior) is the focus of the analysis for each dependent variable. The *p*-value indicates the significance of the associated *F*-test for the interaction. For the attribution measure, the *p*-value indicates the significance of the *F*-test for gender alone, because the question was not asked of the control group