Turning bias into opportunity: Applying research on gender and leadership to women’s health endowed chairs
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14 of first 160 images on Google Scholar is a woman
Endowed Chairs in Women’s Health

135 of first 160 images on Google Scholar is a woman
Role Congruity for male leaders

Men
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Independent
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Nice
Delicate
Sympathetic
Supportive

“Think-manager-think-male phenomenon”
Gender and Leadership IAT Scores
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Gender stereotype-based assumptions are relevant

- **Double jeopardy for women leaders** (e.g., works of Eagly; Foschi; Heilman; Rudman)
  - Act too much in concert with feminine gender norms $\rightarrow$ triggers assumption of lesser competence $\rightarrow$ lower evaluation
  - Act too much in concert with masculine gender norms $\rightarrow$ triggers assumption of being unlikeable and hard to work for $\rightarrow$ lower evaluation

- **Conceptualization of successful leadership changing**
  - Transformational leadership more communal
  - Some research suggests a female advantage
Research on gender is relevant to endowed chairs in women’s health

- Getting the position
- Enacting leadership
- Keeping the position
Relevant to *getting* the position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Think manager think male phenomenon <em>Schein, 2001</em></td>
<td>• Women top (but not middle) leaders viewed as more agentic, communal and effective than men – mediated by belief that they had to be better to get there <em>Rosette &amp; Tost, 2010</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-promotion viewed negatively <em>Rudman &amp; Glick, 2001</em></td>
<td>• More effective negotiating on behalf of another <em>Amanatullah &amp; Morris, 2010</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Men’s but not women’s leadership role acknowledged in team effort <em>Heilman &amp; Haynes, 2005</em></td>
<td>• Specific acknowledgment of women’s expertise in team gained recognition of leadership role <em>Heilman &amp; Haynes, 2005</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Women appointed to precarious leadership positions (“glass cliff”) <em>Ryan et al., 2007</em></td>
<td>• Men but NOT women leaders penalized in perception of competence when they ask for help <em>Rosette et al., 2015</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevant to *enacting leadership* in the position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Men and male-associated activities and attributes imbued with higher status, importance, competence – women’s health none of these</td>
<td>• Conferral of high status increased perceived leadership &amp; competence, desire to interact with, and negotiation success for women but not men <em>Amanatullah &amp; Tinsley, 2013</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ridgeway, 2001</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Women leaders with autocratic, directive style suffered in evaluation <em>Eagly et al., 1992</em></td>
<td>• Women more likely to lead with reduction of hierarchy, a coaching and democratic approach and be more transformational <em>Eagly et al., 2003</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Combining assertive (agentic) actions with communal (warm, relational) actions eliminated negative bias <em>Heilman &amp; Okimoto, 2007</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevant to *keeping* the position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Emotions are gendered – bias against men who show sadness and women who show anger  <em>Brescoll &amp; Uhlmann, 2008</em></td>
<td>• Do not show anger! But if you do get angry find an external attribution <em>Brescoll &amp; Uhlmann, 2008</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Powerful women but not men incurred backlash as a result of talking more than others <em>Brescoll, 2012</em></td>
<td>• Self-monitoring is beneficial <em>Flynn et al., 2006; O’Neill &amp; O’Reilly 2011</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leaders in gender-stereotype-incongruent occupations suffered more damage after a mistake <em>Brescoll et al., 2010</em></td>
<td>• Increase your base of support so lots of people rush to your defense – especially high status men who can vouch for your competence and status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Women are socialized to have different communication styles than men and these have been viewed negatively <em>e.g. Heim, 2015</em></td>
<td>• Strategic display of positive emotion (friendly, smiling) significantly improved negotiation outcomes <em>Kopelman et al., 2006</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary & Conclusions

Women can be caring, communal, and nice while they effectively lead, mentor, build great programs

AND

ask for money to develop an endowed chair in women’s health