

## Power, Leadership, and Politics

Virginia Valian

Department of Psychology

Hunter College and CUNY Graduate Center, New York, NY

- leadership domains
  - administration
  - discipline
- leadership types
  - positional – having a formal position, such as chair, division head, or provost; top-down
  - informal – influencing decisions among peers; lateral
- advantages and disadvantages (sometimes both simultaneously) of leadership
  - power
    - to benefit oneself
    - to benefit and develop others
    - to improve the organization
    - to start innovative projects
    - to create other leaders
  - view of how pieces of organization fit together
  - resources and position to find solutions
  - challenge
  - opportunity to be effective
- types of leadership and gender differences (45 studies Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003)
  - transformational – linked to effectiveness; slight advantage in favor of women
    - charisma – idealized influence as attribute (demonstrates qualities that motivate respect and pride from association with person) or behavior (communicates values, purpose, and importance of organization's mission)
    - inspirational motivation – exhibits optimism and excitement about goals and future states)
    - intellectual stimulation – examines new perspectives for solving problems and completing tasks
    - individualized consideration – focuses on development and mentoring of followers and attends to their individual needs
    - all *ds* in favor of women, though only slightly: highest is .19 for individualized consideration; next highest is .12 for idealized influence – attribute
  - transactional
    - contingent reward – provides rewards for satisfactory performance by followers – effective
    - management by exception
      - active: attends to followers' mistakes and failures to meet standards – effective
      - passive: waits until problems become severe before attending to them and intervening – ineffective
    - contingent reward *d* in favor of women, other 2 in favor of men
  - laissez-faire

- exhibits frequent absence and lack of involvement during critical junctures – least effective
  - *d* in favor of men
- Women leaders are in a similar but not identical position to women professionals generally
- Women professionals generally (Valian, 1998, and references therein)
  - up against gender schemas and their consequences for perceptions and evaluations
    - schema for men: agentic, task-oriented, instrumental (Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Spence & Sawin, 1985)
    - schema for women: nurturant, communal, expressive (Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Spence & Sawin, 1985)
  - schemas for success in traditionally male-dominated jobs
    - fit better with schema for men than for women
    - typically, no differences between male and female evaluations
  - ratings of competence and likability of people in male-described profession (Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004)
    - lower competence for women unless clear performance rating
    - lower likability for women if clear performance rating
      - relevant to women in leadership position
    - consequence of lower perks if less likable
  - non-verbal reactions to men's and women's attempts at being leader (Butler & Geis, 1990)
    - both get more negative reactions if leader than follower
    - men get offsetting positive reactions for net gain that women don't get
  - effectiveness of leader in legitimizing others as leaders (Brown & Geis, 1984; Geis, Boston, & Hoffman, 1985; Geis, Brown, & Wolfe, 1990)
    - relevant to effect women can have on others
    - relevant to effect others can have on aspiring women leaders
  - consequences of expressing anger (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008) → angry woman seen as out of control; angry man seen as in control
    - summary: anger works for men, though no emotion can also work; anger which is not clearly justified does not work for women and even justified anger is no better than no emotion
    - Exp 1: interview simulation; person describes reaction when co-worker ruined a project; 2 variables: gender; reaction expressed either of anger or sadness
      - status conferred: angry men (6.47 on 11 point scale), sad women (5.02), sad man (4.05), angry women (3.75)
      - yearly salary observers would pay: angry men (37.8 K), sad man (30), sad woman (29), angry woman (23)
      - competence: angry man (7.55), sad woman (6.17), sad man (5.79), angry woman (5.44)
      - external attribution (situation vs personality): angry man (7.72), sad woman (6.94), sad man (6.57), angry woman (5.8)

- Exp 2: 3 variables: gender; low vs high rank; anger vs no emotion
  - status conferred: main effect only of rank; interaction between gender and emotion; for women only, emotion effect but no rank effect; for men only, rank effect
  - salary: similar to rank (salary for women not based on rank but on whether angry or no emotion; salary for men higher for high rank, regardless of expression)
  - competence: more complicated, with particularly negative response to high-rank angry woman, who was rated as less competent than all other targets
  - external attribution: interaction between gender and type of emotion
  - mediational regression analyses: internal attribution that woman was out of control fully mediated relation between her expressing anger and the status she got
- Exp 3: 2 variables: gender; type of reaction – unexplained anger, explained anger (objective, external reason – co-worker lied to target and lie caused loss of account), no emotion
  - status: interaction between gender and type of emotion; angry male gets highest status *without* giving external attribution; angry female gets high status if external attribution or no emotion and is not different from men in that condition (though means look different)
  - salary: similar to status and thus for men different from Exp 2: highest salary when angry; for women, lowest salary when angry without external attribution, no difference between justified anger and no emotion
  - competence: no effect
- Women unlikely to get credit in mixed teams unless they clearly contributed, as by making unique contribution (such as speaking language or having some other skill) that other team members didn't make (Heilman & Haynes, 2005)
- People encode leadership behavior differently for men and women (Scott & Brown, 2006)
  - participants (undergraduates) read a sentence that was either associated with the male gender schema ("displays extraordinary talent and competence in every project"; "argues until co-workers see the ideas"; "works on projects outside of working hours") or the female gender schema ("always shows concern for the well being of the team"; "is accommodating when family emergencies arise"; "expresses concern with subordinates that are going through difficult times")
  - saw each sentence twice, once with a female name as the subject and once with a male name as the subject [they also saw neutral sentences and non-words were paired with them]
  - after reading the sentence, participants performed a lexical decision task with words that were related to the trait in the sentence, such as "intelligent", "aggressive", "dedicated", "caring", and "sympathetic"
  - participants were slower to recognize "male" words when they came after a sentence with a female subject than when they came after a sentence with a male subject (no difference for "female" words)
  - no difference by sex of subject
  - no difference as a function of score on an ambivalent sexism scale

- Autocratic women perceived extremely negatively ( $d = .30$ ; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992); many studies show women being responded to negatively when they show dominance, express disagreement, or are highly assertive
- Solution for women is to combine agency with warm, communal behavior (Eagly & Carli, 2003)
- Effectiveness depends on context – role incongruity (Eagly & Carli, 2003)
  - women less effective than men when leadership positions male dominated
  - women less effective than men as proportion of male subordinates increased
  - women less effective than men if high proportion of men among raters of leader effectiveness
  - less effective in military
  - did very well in middle management compared to line or supervisory position
- Women's representation increasing (Eagly & Carli, 2003); 4 hypotheses about why
  - women have changed and become more similar to men
  - leadership roles have changed to become more androgynous
  - organizational practices have changed
  - culture has changed
- Effectiveness as leader = transformational style + demonstrated competence + lack of anger

### **Effectiveness in influencing decisions**

- be prepared
  - even minimal preparation is better than none: sometimes only a few minutes of preparation are required (most other people will have done no preparation)
  - read the relevant materials – knowledge is power
  - develop your point of view
  - articulate to yourself the most important rationale(s) behind your view
  - be prepared with comprehensive, authoritative, even-handed arguments
    - comprehensiveness can help preempt certain objections
    - authoritativeness will lend legitimacy
    - even-handedness will help you be perceived as neutral
  - put your favored action in the best possible light – do your best for your ideas
  - practice presenting your view and the rationale(s) for it succinctly and calmly
- lay a groundwork of alliances
- marshal support before important decisions are made
  - identify and speak with likely allies, especially those who are highly respected
    - ask allies for advice about how to proceed
    - ask allies to do some of the work
  - anticipate what resistance there might be
    - evaluate objective merits of resistance
    - evaluate reasons for subjective resistance
- bargain ahead of time

- X wants you to support proposal A or person B; you want them to support proposal D or person E – negotiate

### Negotiation

- at least moderate feelings of entitlement are necessary to negotiate effectively
  - understand how entitlement works and how it interacts with gender
  - women and men differ in how entitled they feel and behave
    - women perform equal or better work for less pay
  - women have negative attitudes toward affirmative action for themselves
    - women chosen on the basis of their sex have more negative self-evaluations than do men chosen on the basis of their sex
  - women and men may differ in attributions for success and failure
  - women deny personal disadvantage
- learn how to negotiate
  - role-play before an important negotiation
  - demonstrate how department, school, or institution will benefit from what you want; this is particularly important for women
    - example: you want an assistant; show how that assistant will make you or your section more productive and allow you to add a needed function or improve an existing function
    - example: you want a course release or other time release; show that you will use the time to apply for a grant in a new area or embark on some other new activity that will benefit the institution
  - women who are perceived as self-aggrandizing are viewed particularly negatively
    - example: you want a considerable salary increase; justify it by a) what the going rate seems to be, b) the extra responsibilities you have assumed, c) the benefits you have recently brought to the institution, or d) the initiatives that you are planning on undertaking
    - example: balance a request for something that appears to benefit only you (e.g., salary) with something that clearly benefits others (e.g., an upgraded facility for students)
  - if feasible, offer to share the expenses for an item you are requesting
  - negotiate on the basis of what the *job* needs more than what *you* need (it's not that you in particular need help but that the job has a certain set of requirements)
    - example: the job (chairing a committee) requires a part-time person to handle a particular set of tasks; briefly detail tasks and time; ideally, have a person in mind
- understand that everything can be negotiated
  - salary
  - resources
  - teaching
    - number of courses
    - level of course
    - labor-intensiveness of course
    - teaching assistance
    - ability to teach in one's area
  - extra compensation for performing extra institutional work
    - research assistants

- summer salary
- course reduction
- support for postdoc
- support for graduate student
- needed equipment
- extra term off
- early sabbatical

### References, partially annotated

Babcock, L. & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

One reason women do not do as well as men is that women attempt to negotiate in fewer areas than men do. Another reason is that organizations are more likely to respond well to men's attempts to negotiate than to women's, especially if women use a "masculine" negotiating style.

Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (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, 84–103.

Both males and females have a tendency to view people who negotiate for a higher salary more negatively than they perceive people who do not negotiate, but people see women who negotiate much more negatively than they see men who negotiate. In Experiment 1, participants read a fictitious resumé and fictitious interview notes for someone supposedly interviewing for a job as an intern. In one condition, the interview notes indicated that the applicant had asked about a higher salary and about other benefits. Participants were asked to imagine that they were a bank manager and to make a judgment about how hireable a candidate was. Names were gender-neutral; only the interview notes referred to the candidate's sex. The sexes were seen as equally hireable when neither asked for more money, but women's hireability score plummeted (from 6.19 to 4.63 on a scale from 1-7) and men's significantly decreased but less (from 5.94 to 5.26) when the interview notes indicated they had asked for more salary. In a variant, there were no negative effects when men asked but there were negative reactions when women asked. In all variants there were no differences between male and female evaluators' dislike of women who asked for more money, but in one variant, men and women differed in how they treated men, with only women seeing men who asked for money negatively.

Brown, V. & Geis, F. L. (1984). Turning lead into gold: Leadership by men and women and the alchemy of social consensus. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 811-824.

Geis, F. L., Boston, M. B., & Hoffman, N. (1985). Sex of authority role models and achievement by men and women: Leadership performance and recognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 636-653.

Geis, F. L., Brown, V., & Wolfe, C. (1990). Legitimizing the leader: Endorsement by male versus female authority figures. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 943-970.

Leaders legitimize other leaders. Undergraduate evaluators watched a videotape in which five graduate students had a group discussion (Brown & Geis, 1984). On the tape, a faculty member introduced one of the students as the leader. In one version of the tape the faculty member vouched for the student's expertise, mentioning the student's theoretical knowledge and performance ability. In the other version the faculty member simply said the student would be the leader. The two videotapes were otherwise identical. After watching the video, the evaluators judged the student leader on a number of dimensions, including how much leadership the leader showed, how good the leader's

contributions were, how desirable it would be to hire the leader, and how much salary the leader deserved. The leader scored higher on all those measures if the faculty member had vouched for the student's expertise. As usual, there was no difference in how male and female evaluators responded. The same effect occurred whether the student leader was male or female, and there was no difference in how positively male and female leaders were rated. The same effect occurred whether the faculty member was male or female. A credible authority figure can successfully legitimize others. Chief academic officers can create academic leaders of both sexes.

Butler, D. & Geis, F. L. (1990). Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders: Implications for leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 48-59.

Both women and men - nonconsciously but visibly - react negatively to women in a situation which is aimed at finding a group solution to a problem. People respond especially negatively to women's attempts to be assertive. Females trained to act as leaders received more negative facial reactions than positive ones. The trained males, in contrast, always received more positive reactions than negative ones.

Eagly, A. H. & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 807-834.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 569-591.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 3-22.

An autocratic style is very costly for women.

Heilman, M. E., & Haynes, M. C. (2005). No credit where credit is due: Attributional rationalization of women's success in male-female teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 905-916.

Women get credit only if their contribution is unambiguously theirs.

Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 416-427.

Investigates how males and females rate people who are described as being an Assistant Vice President in an aircraft company. The evaluators read background information about the person, the job, and the company. In half the cases, the person is described as about to have a performance review; thus, evaluators don't know how well the person is doing in the job. In the other half of the cases, the person is described as having been a stellar performer. The evaluators' job is to rate how competent the employees are and how likeable they are. When no information is given about how well people are doing in the job, evaluators rate the man as more competent [7.11/9] than the woman [5.51/9], and rate them as equally likeable [6.79, 6.94]. When the background information makes clear that the woman is extremely competent, evaluators rate the man and the woman as equally competent [8.21, 8.03], but they rate the woman as much less likeable [5.81] than the man [7.13]. They also perceive the woman as considerably more hostile [3.99/9] than the man [5.29; low score means more hostile].

Thus, in evaluating a woman in a male-dominated field, observers see her as less competent than a similarly-described man unless there is clear information that she is competent. And in that case, they see her as less likeable than a comparable man. No differences exist between male and female

subjects.

Scott, K. A. & Brown, D. J. (2006). Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101, 230–242. Participants (undergraduates) read a sentence that was either associated with the male gender schema ("displays extraordinary talent and competence in every project"; "argues until co-workers see the ideas"; "works on projects outside of working hours") or the female gender schema ("always shows concern for the well being of the team"; "is accommodating when family emergencies arise"; "expresses concern with subordinates that are going through difficult times"). They saw each sentence twice, once with a female name as the subject and once with a male name as the subject. [They also saw neutral sentences and nonwords were paired with them.] After reading the sentence, participants performed a lexical decision task with words that were related to the trait in the sentence, such as "intelligent", "aggressive", "dedicated", "caring", and "sympathetic". Participants were slower to recognize "male" words when they came after a sentence with a female subject than when they came after a sentence with a male subject. There was no difference for "female" words. There was no sex difference and no difference as a function of score on an ambivalent sexism scale.

Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Spence, J. T. & Sawin, L. L. (1985). Images of masculinity and femininity: A reconceptualization. In V.E. O'Leary, R.K. Unger, & B.S. Wallston (Eds.), *Women, gender, and social psychology* (pp. 35-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.