



Leading with their hearts? How gender stereotypes of emotion lead to biased evaluations of female leaders

Victoria L. Brescoll

Department of Organizational Behavior, Yale School of Management, Yale University, P.O. Box 208205, New Haven, CT 06520-8205, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 14 April 2015

Received in revised form 9 February 2016

Accepted 10 February 2016

Available online 28 April 2016

Editors: Madeline Heilman and Alice Eagly

Keywords:

Leadership

Gender

Gender stereotypes

Emotion

Prejudice

ABSTRACT

The belief that women are more emotional than men is one of the strongest gender stereotypes held in Western cultures (Shields, 2002). And yet, gender stereotypes of emotion have received little attention from gender and leadership scholars. In this paper, I review the existing research on gender and emotions and propose that gender stereotypes of emotion present a fundamental barrier to women's ability to ascend to and succeed in leadership roles. I first define the nature of people's gender-emotion stereotypes and outline why perceptions of emotionality may be particularly detrimental to women when they are in high-status positions in work contexts. I then suggest that gender-emotion stereotypes create two complex minefields that female, but not male, leaders have to navigate in order to be successful: (1) identifying *how much* emotion should be displayed and (2) identifying *what kind* of emotions should be displayed. Specifically, female leaders can be penalized for even minor or moderate displays of emotion, especially when the emotion conveys dominance (e.g., anger or pride), but being emotionally *unexpressive* may also result in penalties because unemotional women are seen as failing to fulfill their warm, communal role as women. I conclude by considering the interactive role of race and ethnicity with regards to gender stereotypes of emotion and proposing avenues for future research.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier Inc.

"I don't think a woman should be in any government job whatever. I mean, I really don't. The reason why I do is mainly because they are erratic. And emotional. Men are erratic and emotional, too, but the point is a woman is more likely to be"—President Richard Nixon (Clymer, 2001)

"Here is my dilemma...as a woman in a high public position or seeking the presidency as I am, you have to be aware of how people will judge you for being, quote, 'emotional.' And so it's a really delicate balancing act—how you navigate what is still a relatively narrow path—to be yourself, to express yourself, to let your feelings show, but not in a way that triggers all of the negative stereotypes."—Hillary Rodham Clinton (Clinton, 2016)

The belief that women are more emotional than men is one of the strongest gender stereotypes held in Western cultures (Shields, 2002). Nationally representative American polls conducted over the last three decades have repeatedly found that both men and women strongly endorse the idea that women are the more emotional sex. For example, one recent poll found that over 90% of people said that women were more emotional than men (Gallup, 2000). Indeed, people believe that women express all emotions more than men, with the exception of anger and pride, which are seen as uniquely masculine emotions

E-mail address: victoria.brescoll@yale.edu.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.005>

1048-9843/© 2016 Published by Elsevier Inc.

(Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000). A comparison of effect sizes reveals that beliefs about women's greater emotional expressiveness are oftentimes two to four times as large as other commonly held beliefs about gender differences in personality traits and cognitive abilities.¹ Shields (2002) has even labeled the belief in women's greater emotionality the “master stereotype” (p. 11) not only because of its prevalence and relative magnitude, but also because “it serves as an overarching organizing principle for other related beliefs” (p. 3).

Substantial headway has been made in understanding the structural and psychological barriers that women face in achieving and retaining leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Eagly, 2008; Ridgeway, 2001). However, when one consults the academic literature on gender and leadership, the role of emotionality per se has received relatively little attention. This fact is even more puzzling given that among the general public, the link between emotionality and the lack of women in leadership roles is readily acknowledged. Polls repeatedly find that the majority of American men, and one-third of American women, believe the primary reason why women occupy disproportionately fewer key leadership roles in business and politics is that they are “too emotional” (Dolan, 2014). A recent poll also found that 25% of Americans agree with the statement that “most men are better suited emotionally for politics than most women” (National Opinion Research Center, 2008). Even popular press outlets acknowledge the role emotion stereotypes play in hindering female leaders. For example, the September 2013 cover of *Harvard Business Review* featured a story on the “biases that hold female leaders back” with a silhouette of a woman and only three phrases in large, boldface type: “Too Nice” “Bossy” “Emotional” (Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013).

Here I review the existing research on gender and emotions and propose that gender stereotypes about emotion present a fundamental barrier to women's ability to attain and succeed in leadership roles. I first define the nature of people's gender-emotion stereotypes and outline why perceptions of emotionality may be particularly detrimental to women when they occupy high-status positions in work contexts. Specifically, I argue that because women are less likely to control their outward display of emotion, people infer that women are less able to control the extent to which their emotions influence their thoughts and behaviors. In turn, this belief may foster the perception that, compared to men, women are less rational and objective, less able to cope with critical feedback, and are inappropriately soft in their dealings with subordinates. I then suggest that gender-emotion stereotypes create two complex minefields that female, but not male, leaders have to navigate in order to be successful: (1) identifying *how much* emotion should be displayed and (2) identifying *what kinds* of emotion to display. I also outline the psychological costs that female leaders may incur for chronically having to navigate these two minefields and conclude by considering the interactive role of race and ethnicity with regards to gender stereotypes of emotion.

Gender stereotypes of emotion and prejudice toward female leaders

The most influential psychological theories of gender and power have all emphasized the central role of gender stereotypes in explaining the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2001; Heilman & Eagly, 2008; Ridgeway, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012). For example, three of the most prominent theories—Heilman's lack of fit model (1989), Rudman's status incongruity hypothesis (2012), and Eagly and Karau's role incongruity theory of prejudice against female leaders (2002)—all emphasize that beliefs about what men and women are like cause people to see women, in general, as less qualified for leadership roles than men. Moreover, people's beliefs about what men and women *should* be like further cause them to evaluate women who behave contrary to feminine stereotypes as unlikable, undeserving of organizational rewards, and even subject to social and economic penalties (i.e., backlash effects).

Research on the role of gender stereotypes in evaluations of female leaders has identified two broad clusters of gender stereotypes: communality and agency. Compared to men, women are seen as more communal (i.e., warm, kind, nurturing, etc.) but less agentic (i.e., aggressive, ambitious, dominant, independent, etc.). However, leadership roles require agency. Thus, there is a perceived lack of fit between the traits seen as typical of women (including even women managers) and the traits required of successful leaders (Heilman, 2001). However, the belief that women lack agency is not easily discarded by simply observing women behaving more agentially. Indeed, when women do engage in agentic behaviors, they often experience backlash effects because they are also seen as insufficiently communal (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Okimoto & Brescoll, 2010). Further, agentic women may be seen as violating a proscription against enacting dominance due to their lower status as women (Rudman et al., 2012). For example, Rudman and her colleagues have consistently shown that when women engage in self-promotion at work (an agentic behavior and a violation of feminine norms of modesty and self-effacement), others view them as too dominant (Rudman et al., 2012) which, ironically, results in them being *less* likely to be chosen for leadership roles than women who fail to self-promote (Rudman & Glick, 1999).

Although there is substantial evidence that women leaders are penalized when they behave agentially (i.e., by being dominant) or *fail* to behave communally (i.e., by not being “nice enough”), I argue here that communality and agency may not fully explain why women face barriers in attaining and retaining leadership positions. Indeed, a review of the existing literature on leadership reveals that (for both genders) being seen as a good leader does not just require agency, but also another suite of

¹ This estimate is based on computing effect sizes (Cohen's *d*) from major published papers that report data on people's beliefs about gender differences in emotional displays (Plant et al., 2000), cognitive abilities, and personality traits (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000). For example, the effect size for the belief that women display more sadness than men is 2.74, whereas the effect size for the belief that men are more aggressive than women is -.20.

characteristics which all center on emotional control—being stable, level-headed, rational, consistent, tough-minded, and not taking things personally (Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011).

For example, a careful examination of one influential study on workplace gender stereotypes (Heilman, Block, & Martell, 1995) reveals the centrality of emotion stereotypes, in particular, to understanding prejudice toward female leaders. In this study, Heilman et al. (1995) created six subscales from the classic Think Manager, Think Male 92-item inventory (Schein, 2001). Four subscales were related to agentic behaviors and two subscales were directly about emotion: *emotional stability* (i.e., high self-regard, feelings not easily hurt, emotionally stable, consistent, calm², speedy recovery from emotional disturbance, and steady) and *rationality* (or, emotional control) (i.e., logical, able to separate feelings from ideas, unsentimental, self-controlled, and objective). When participants rated the traits of a successful female manager, she was seen as possessing all of the same traits as a successful male manager with the exception of the emotion-related items. Thus, even explicitly informing participants that a particular female leader was objectively successful did not change the perception that she was more emotional than an equally successful male manager, and therefore not as stable or rational as he was.

Consistent with these findings, I recently conducted an experiment which demonstrated that when women leaders were described as making a decision and her emotional state was *not* mentioned, participants nonetheless spontaneously inferred that her decision was driven by emotion but did not make the same inference for the male leaders described as making the identical decision. As a consequence of the belief that her emotions influenced her decision-making process, participants viewed the female leader's (identical) decision as fundamentally worse than her male counterpart's decision and were also less willing to hire her. This initial evidence suggests that the widely held belief that women are more emotional than men may have important downstream consequences for how female leaders are evaluated.

Thus far, to my knowledge, only one study has examined perceptions of specific emotion displays (e.g., anger, sadness, etc.) of male and female leaders (Fischbach, Lichtenthaler, & Horstmann, 2015). Using the Think Manager, Think Male paradigm described previously, Fischbach et al. (2015) had German participants report their beliefs about the extent to which one of seven groups of people—men, women, male managers, female managers, successful managers, successful male managers, and successful female managers—expressed seventeen different emotions. Overall, participants viewed the emotions expressed by successful managers as more similar to the emotions expressed by men (in general) than the emotions expressed by women (in general). Furthermore, male participants in this study believed that the kinds of emotions that successful managers typically display are more closely aligned with the emotions that men (in general) typically display than the emotions that *successful* female managers typically display. Thus, even when women leaders were portrayed as objectively successful, their emotion displays were still viewed as significantly *less* aligned with successful managers than the emotion displays of men who were not even described as occupying a leadership role, let alone being successful in such a role.

Being emotional means lacking emotional control

In order to understand why gender stereotypes about emotion present a fundamental barrier to women's ability to obtain and succeed in leadership roles, it is important to understand the nature of gender–emotion stereotypes. Put simply, what exactly does it mean that women are viewed as more emotional than men and why does it matter?

Examination of the research on people's gendered beliefs about emotion reveals that although people believe that women are more emotional than men, they nonetheless believe that men and women *feel* the same type and amount of emotions (LaFrance & Banaji, 1992). In other words, men and women are not thought to greatly differ in the extent to which they experience different emotions—just in the extent to which they outwardly express those emotions to others. This belief reflects reality to a certain extent. Recent meta-analyses have found no gender differences in the degree to which men and women report *feeling* certain emotions, such as guilt, shame, pride, and embarrassment (Else-Quest, Higgins, Allison, & Morton, 2012), but relatively large differences in the actual amount that men and women are *observed to express* these same emotions (Durik et al., 2006; Plant et al., 2000). Furthermore, research using daily diary methodologies in which participants record their emotions in real-time also has found that men and women report feeling the same types and amount of emotion as one another (Barrett, Robin, Pietromonaco, & Eysell, 1998; Van Boven & Robinson, 2012).

Thus, the common belief that women are the more emotional sex may be due to the fact that people are simply observing women displaying more emotions than men, and not because they believe that women are necessarily feeling a wider range and greater intensity of emotion underneath it all. In other words, women may be labeled as more emotional than men in large part because they are seen as less able to *control the outward display* of their emotions compared to men. Although this perception reflects reality to a certain extent, it nonetheless is likely to have a variety of negative consequences for female leaders.

First, this perception is consequential for female leaders because people infer a tradeoff between the ability to control outward emotional display and the ability to make rational, objective decisions (Shields, 2002). If an individual is able to hide her emotions, people infer that she is also able to prevent those emotions from biasing her thoughts and

² In the original study, two items (calm and unsentimental) were actually “nervous” and “sentimental” and were reverse-scored.

behaviors. People thus conflate control over emotional display with control over the “biasing” influence of emotions on thoughts and behaviors.

The idea that an individual should control whether, and to what extent, her emotions influence her decisions is rooted in the long-standing lay belief that emotion detracts from rational thought. This notion has been prominent in Western cultures for centuries, likely originating in Aristotelian philosophy (Shields, 2007). But in spite of its long-standing prominence, the belief that emotions detract from reason has not been supported by recent research in cognitive neuroscience. First, this research has found that it may not even be possible to willfully block the influence of emotions on thoughts, as affective and cognitive processes have been found to be inherently interdependent (Damasio, 2005). More to the point, this research has also demonstrated that certain emotions often *aid* in sound reasoning and effective decision-making rather than detracting from it (Bliss-Moreau & Barrett, 2009; Damasio, 2005; Seo & Barrett, 2007).

For example, using a classic gambling paradigm wherein people repeatedly select cards from different decks rigged with different payoffs (either having a high payoff, but very low odds of winning or having a low payoff but consistently high odds of winning), one study found that experiencing negative emotions that typically accompany large losses (i.e., sadness, disappointment) caused people to make *more* logical decisions (i.e., over time learning to increasingly choose the low-risk, low payoff deck that, in the long run, yields higher returns) (Shiv, Loewenstein, Bechara, Damasio, & Damasio, 2005). Furthermore, other work using this task has found that, over repeated trials, individuals with damage to a specific brain region associated with emotional sensitivity to reward and punishment (i.e., the orbitofrontal cortex) were unable to learn to stop disproportionately choosing the irrational, high-risk deck (Bechara, Damasio, Damasio, & Anderson, 1994). Although their cognitive abilities were otherwise unimpaired, these individuals could not adjust their behavior in line with the more rational strategy because they could not experience the negative emotions that accompany large losses. As a whole, these studies suggest that the lay belief that emotions introduce irrational biases into decision-making processes is unfounded.

Since people conflate control over emotional display with control over the “biasing” influence of emotions on thoughts and behavior, and women are less likely than men to control the outward display of their emotions, then people may view women's decisions and behaviors as more influenced by their emotions. Furthermore, since there is a strong lay belief that emotions detract from effective decision making and behavior, then women, as a result, may also be seen as irrational, lacking objectivity, biased, unstable, unpredictable, and sentimental (Citrin & Roberts, 2004). Supporting this argument, one study found that when people were asked to predict men's and women's responses to emotion-eliciting events, they believed that only women would react in an incompetent and irrational manner because of their inability to handle their emotions (Zammuner, 2000). Specifically, while people believed that men would control their emotions and “intervene in the situation,” they believed that women would be unable to “keep calm” and would thereby be “confused” and “bewildered” by the events. Thus, women's (anticipated) inability to control the expression of their emotion was linked to their irrational and incompetent response to such events.

Furthermore, even in situations where women display the exact same type and intensity of emotion as men, they may be seen as less capable of controlling how those emotions influence them—which may, in turn, lead to negative consequences. For example, Brescoll and Uhlmann (2008) found that female, but not male, leaders who expressed anger were seen as being out of control and this attribution was used as a justification for paying the female leader less and granting her less power and status at work. Likewise, Timmers, Fischer, and Manstead (2003) found that people believed that women's expression of emotion at work was seen as more dysfunctional and out of control than men's emotion expression, with participants endorsing statements such as “When women become emotional easily, they are not suitable for management positions,” and “Emotional women are not functional in industrial life.”

A second consequence of women's perceived lack of control over the influence of their emotions on their behavior is that women are often viewed as overly sensitive (Fischer, 1993)—as not being able to effectively respond to and learn from critical feedback and failures. In order to be an effective leader, people believe that, besides strategically controlling the display of emotions to others, it is important to not allow emotions influence judgments of oneself. Put simply, an effective leader does not “take things personally” (Shields, 2002). Thus, when a leader receives negative self-relevant information (e.g., criticism from others), she is expected to recognize that there is a clear and necessary separation between business and personal life and thus not allow that information to cause her to lose focus on achieving important organizational goals. Indeed, at least in part because women are more likely to openly express sadness and are more likely to openly discuss their emotions at work (Tannen, 1994), people generally believe female leaders are more likely to take criticisms and failures personally compared to their male counterparts (Feldhahn, 2011). Thus, the belief that women lack the ability to control the influence of their emotions may not only affect whether they are seen as rational and competent, but it may also affect judgments about women's ability to integrate critical feedback and improve over time. Furthermore, being perceived as uniformly deficient in these abilities likely diminishes people's confidence in women's overall leadership ability.

A third consequence of the belief that women are not skilled at controlling the extent to which their emotions impact their behaviors centers on the belief that women are more sentimental and soft than men in their dealings with others at work. Although caring about others and empathizing with another's pain or difficult circumstance is generally seen as a positive trait for leaders, it is commonly believed that empathy should not impair one's ability to make tough decisions (Bar-On & Parker, 2000). So even though an effective leader can *feel* pity for a disadvantaged colleague or competitor, she is not supposed to let those emotions hamper her ability to make objective decisions, as her responsibility is to put the interests of the organization first. In short, women often are not seen as possessing a sufficient amount of “emotional toughness” (i.e., the ability to control how much feelings of pity, care or sadness for another person influences decision-making) to effectively lead others (Heilman, 2001). Indeed, a recent nationally representative poll of working Americans found that, among those who report preferring having

a male boss at work, 45% say that the primary reason for this preference is that male bosses don't let "emotions get in the way of work" (Greenberg Quinlan Rosner, 2005).³

A final consequence of women being perceived as lacking the ability to control the influence of their emotions on their thoughts and behaviors is that while men are typically thought to *have* emotion, women are thought to *be* emotional (Shields, 2002). The perception that women are lacking in this kind of emotional control may readily lead to the belief that women's emotionality is due to something about who they are deep-down. Indeed, women's emotional displays are more likely to be attributed to something internal to them, such as their personality, rather than due to some feature of the external environment or the situation (Barrett & Bliss-Moreau, 2009). For example, one experiment found that people were more likely to say that a female target became angry because "*She is just an angry person*" while a male target got angry because "*The situation caused his anger*" (Brescoll, 2006). In another experiment, participants viewed male and female faces expressing a range of emotions (i.e., either fear, sadness, anger, or disgust) and were asked to make either dispositional (e.g., "He's emotional") or situational (e.g., "He's having a bad day") attributions for the targets' emotion (Barrett & Bliss-Moreau, 2009). As expected, people were more likely to make situational attributions for the male targets' emotion and dispositional attributions for the female targets' emotion. Likewise, Shields (1987) found that when people read about either men or women who were described as emotional, they were more likely to view the female targets as overreacting and having less control because of something about the female target's personality. In contrast, people believed that some external, situational factor was to blame for why men acted in an emotional manner rather than the fact that they lacked the ability to control their emotions in a deeper sense.

The fact that people tend to make internal, rather than external, attributions for women's emotional displays may ultimately strengthen people's belief in, and reliance on, gender-emotion stereotypes. This is because when people attribute gender differences to internal factors (e.g., differences in hormones, genes, personality, etc.), they view those differences as fixed and immutable, likely persisting over time and across situations (Brescoll, Uhlmann, & Newman, 2013; Martin & Parker, 1995). Thus, when observing men and women behaving differently, people are more likely to discount or ignore the situational and contextual factors that may be causing the gender stereotypical behavior, instead viewing such behavior as reflecting an essential, deep-seated feature of the true nature of men and women. In turn, this essentialist attributional process results in people exaggerating the magnitude and importance of the observed gender differences (Brescoll & LaFrance, 2004; Levy, Stroessner, & Dweck, 1998).

In sum, because women are less likely than men to control their outward display of emotion, people may infer that women are thereby also less able to control the extent to which their emotions influence their thoughts and behaviors. Simply because men display less emotion than women, people incorrectly infer that the emotions men feel have little to no sway over their decisions, thoughts, or behaviors. Thus, compared to men, women are likely to be seen as less rational and objective, less able to cope with critical feedback, and inappropriately soft in their dealings with subordinates. Such inferences are likely to significantly undermine perceptions of women leaders' competence.

Emotional display rules vary by social context

To understand how and why gender stereotypes of emotion may harm women leaders it is important to consider that, in general, men and women are subject to different emotional display rules (Citrin & Roberts, 2004). Display rules consist of a set of expectations about the specific kinds of emotions an individual should or should not display, as well as when, to what extent, and to whom they should be displayed (Brody, 1997). Gendered display rules can be inferred both from research that asks people to rate the extent to which men and women *should* display certain emotions and experiments that assess people's reactions (whether positive or negative) to men's and women's emotion expression (e.g., Lewis, 2000).

Additionally, one can examine the basic requirements of the different social roles that men and women occupy to infer the emotional displays (if any) that would help men and women successfully fulfill their roles. Women in general are more likely to occupy domestic, care-taking roles (Eagly & Wood, 2012) that also tend to require a certain degree of emotional expressiveness. Actively showing one's feelings and being willing to talk about others' feelings demonstrates a capacity to care for the emotional needs of family members (Clark, Fitness, & Brissette, 2004; Kelly & Hutson-Comeaux, 2000). This includes not just positive feelings, such as happiness, excitement, awe, interest, love, amusement, surprise, and sympathy, but also negative emotions that belie one's own vulnerability or weakness, such as distress, worry, guilt, fear, shame, jealousy, or sadness. Indeed, research has found that people believe that women should both express positive emotions towards others (LaFrance, Hecht, & Paluck, 2003; Stoppard & Gruchy, 1993), and also share their negative emotions with others in order to convey their vulnerability (Gaia, 2013; Timmers et al., 2003). But negative emotions that communicate dominance or one's own sense of power, such as anger, contempt, or pride are not prescribed for women (Plant et al., 2000) and in fact tend to elicit negative reactions from others when women do express them (Lewis, 2000).

In contrast, because men are more likely to occupy provider roles, they tend to display (and in some cases are expected to display) a different set of behaviors. In line with the demands of providing for others, men are expected to be competent, strong,

³ This 2005 poll found that, overall, 31% of Americans said that they preferred having a male boss at work, 27% preferred a female boss, and 40% expressed no preference. The people who stated a preference for a male boss were then given six possible reasons for this preference and were asked to choose one of six possibilities (the percentage of poll-takers who chose each respective option is listed after the choice): "He doesn't let emotions get in the way of work" (45%); "He is a more direct communicator" (27%); "He is less likely to stab me in the back" (22%); "He gives me independence" (18%); "He is more understanding" (13%); "He is a better mentor" (5%). Over the years, Gallup has polled Americans on their preference for male vs. female bosses and has found similar patterns. The most recent poll (in 2014) found that 33% of Americans stated a preference for a male boss, 20% preferred a female boss, and 46% expressed no particular preference (Gallup, 2014).

invulnerable, and in control (Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, & Weaver, 2008). And the emotional display rules for men communicate these traits to others: men can explicitly show emotions that are associated with power and status (e.g., anger) (Tiedens, 2001; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000), or achievement and personal accomplishment (e.g., pride) (Brody, 1997). But since showing vulnerability, weakness, or powerlessness is strongly discouraged for men (Kimmel, 2012), displaying emotions that convey this to others (e.g., fear, distress, shame) is stigmatized (Gaia, 2013).

Shields (2002) argues that the ideal emotional display style for men is what she terms “passionate restraint” (or “manly” emotion), in which an individual subtly lets others know he is feeling emotions but is mostly holding them in. An example of this would be when an individual is describing a difficult circumstance but one can see that, although he is not outwardly crying, he still has a “moist eye.” This subtle emotion display indicates that he has the strength and self-control to not let that deeply felt emotion overtake him. In support of this hypothesis, one study found that displaying this kind of passionate restraint led people to view the target as more competent than if he actively displayed emotion or never felt the emotion in the first place (Zawadzki, Warner, & Shields, 2013). More recently, another experiment revealed that men were seen as more intelligent and more emotionally competent when they displayed sadness or anger in a restrained manner compared to when they displayed these emotions in an unrestrained manner (Hess, David, & Hareli, 2015). Women, however, did not benefit from displaying emotion in this restrained manner, supporting the basic contention that passionate restraint may be the ideal emotion display for men, but not for women.

Different social contexts, however, may require men and women to display emotions that are not necessarily congruent with the display rules associated with their gender (Fischer, Eagly, & Oosterwijk, 2013). When a woman is in an employment context—and particularly when she occupies a leadership role within that context—she may experience a mismatch in the emotional displays expected of her as a woman and those expected of her as a leader. Leadership roles carry with them not only a heightened expectation of emotional control but also an expectation that a leader will display emotions that reflect a belief in her own competence (e.g., displaying pride over her personal accomplishments), and her deservingness to exercise power and control over others (e.g., displaying anger toward negligent subordinates) (Ridgeway, 2001). Importantly, leaders are not expected to exhibit a lack of emotion. Rather, leaders are expected to show that they *have control over the display of their emotions* (Shields, 2005). For men, these display rules align with the display rules for their gender. For women, however, this is not the case. This lack of congruence likely creates a suite of problems for women leaders as they attempt to navigate the conflicting rules for their emotional displays.

It is important to note, however, that men also may have to deal with a mismatch in the emotions they are expected to display in work vs. non-work contexts (i.e., intimate relationship contexts) (Kimmel, 2012). In a relationship context, it is important for individuals to show emotions that demonstrate compassion, concern, sensitivity, interest, worry, and vulnerability (Clark et al., 2004). Although these emotions closely align with the emotional display rules for women as caretakers, they conflict with the display rules imposed on men. Indeed, much has been written about the difficulty that men experience in intimate relationships with women because their default style as men is to not show emotions that communicate their vulnerability or powerlessness, making it difficult to establish closeness and intimacy with women (Robertson, Lin, Woodford, Danos, & Hurst, 2001). Thus, in relationship contexts (and particularly in intimate heterosexual relationships with women), men may experience similar emotional minefields that women leaders experience in the workplace, in that men may have difficulty identifying not only the kinds of emotions they should be expressing, but also the appropriate amount of emotion they should be displaying.

Emotional minefields for female leaders

The emotional display rules for leaders are aligned with the display rules for men in general, but are incongruent with the display rules for women in general. Further, when women are in leadership roles, there is a mismatch between the warm and effusive emotional displays expected of them as women (by dint of their social role as caretakers) and the emotional control that is expected of them as leaders. This mismatch in display rules may set the stage for women leaders to experience difficulties in decoding the appropriate way to communicate emotion at work. Specifically, I argue that it poses two fundamental challenges that female, but not male, leaders have to navigate: (1) identifying the appropriate *amount* of emotion to display and (2) identifying the appropriate *kind* of emotion to display—i.e., identifying ways to exercise power without displaying emotions that convey power.

Identifying how much emotion should be displayed

Although both men and women are held to normative standards for emotion expression (Butler et al., 2003; Shields, 2005), what is considered the appropriate amount of emotion expression for female leaders is oftentimes much less clear than it is for male leaders. In general, male leaders are expected to either hold in their emotions or show very small amounts of emotion in a controlled manner (Shields, 2002). Because male leaders' display rules are so well aligned with the display rules for men in general, they are not difficult for male leaders to comprehend and follow (Birnbau & Croll, 1984; Birnbau, Nosanchuk, & Croll, 1980; Fabes & Martin, 1991).

For female leaders, however, the boundaries of appropriate workplace emotion expression are considerably more confusing. In general, in work contexts, women can be penalized for even minor or moderate displays of emotion (Shields, 2002), especially when the emotion displayed conveys dominance, such as with anger (Lewis, 2000) or pride (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010). But even when women display very small amounts of emotion (such as showing a moist eye in a situation that would normally

call for tears), they oftentimes are not seen as positively as men are for engaging in the identical behavior (Warner & Shields, 2007). Specifically, while men are seen as *more* intelligent and emotionally competent when showing emotion in a restrained manner compared to an unrestrained manner, women are viewed as less intelligent and emotionally competent when restraining themselves (Hess et al., 2015). This may be due to the perception that because women are less able to control the influence of their emotions on their behavior, perceivers may infer that they are either on the verge of “losing it,” or that they may do so at some unpredictable moment in the future. Thus, women do not benefit from adopting the passionate restraint style of emotion display to the same extent as men (Shields, 2013).

Given that displaying minor amounts of emotion or displaying emotion in a restrained manner are unlikely to be effective impression management strategies for women leaders, one may be tempted to believe that women leaders should adopt a strategy where they do not display any emotion at all. Consistent with this hypothesis, two separate experiments found that female leaders who expressed no emotion (by adopting a neutral tone, body posture, and facial expression) were rated higher on leader efficacy (Lewis, 2000) and were seen as more hireable and deserving of a higher yearly salary (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008) than women leaders who expressed anger or sadness.

However, being emotionally unexpressive is not necessarily going to be an effective strategy for female leaders because women who are unemotional risk being seen as cold, unfeeling, and unfeminine as they are fundamentally failing to fulfill their warm, communal role as women (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Indeed, the research on smiling behavior clearly shows that there is a strong expectation that women will express positive emotion (LaFrance et al., 2003). But even when women do display these positive, feminine emotions, others view their displays as overreactions compared to men's identical displays of these feminine emotions (Kelly & Hutson-Comeaux, 2000). Thus, for women leaders, it is not clear when their display of even positive, feminine emotions will be viewed by others as either excessive (i.e., too much) or insufficient (i.e., not enough).

Although passionate restraint is perceived as the ideal form of emotion display for men (Zawadzki, Warner, & Shields, 2013), male leaders will *not* be punished if they *fail* to engage in this restrained form of emotional display (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). Thus, male leaders have a very straightforward default strategy for navigating display rules; they can choose to not express emotion and they will still be seen favorably. In contrast, female leaders do not have the luxury of such a straightforward default strategy; if they fail to express emotion, they risk being seen as cold and unlikable. Thus, women leaders may find themselves in a double-bind when it comes to emotion displays—they can be “damned if they do (express emotion)” and “damned if they don't (express emotion)” (Shields, 2002).

Furthermore, because gender-emotion stereotypes are so large and pervasive (Plant et al., 2000) and because they are the foundation on which people categorize and interpret women's behavior (Shields, 2002), it is possible that even in situations where women leaders are *not* explicitly expressing emotion, people may *nonetheless* interpret their behavior as “emotional” and thereby see them as irrational and incompetent leaders. Recently, I conducted a series of studies that support this idea. Specifically, when people read about either a male or female leader making a decision, they spontaneously inferred that the female leader's decision was driven by emotion but did not do this for male leaders making the identical decision, in spite of the fact that emotion (whether expressed or felt) was not mentioned at all in the study stimuli. Furthermore, as a consequence of believing that emotion was driving the female leader's decision, participants in these studies viewed her decision as fundamentally worse than her male counterpart's decision and were also less willing to hire her. Thus, the belief that women are more emotional than men may lead people to read emotion into a woman leader's behavior even when no such emotion is described, observed, or displayed. This perceptual bias could have important downstream consequences for how even unemotional female leaders are evaluated.

Compounding women leaders' difficulty in navigating the boundaries of appropriate emotion expression is the fact that women's emotion expression is often *perceived* as more intense than it really is. This is due to the strong belief (or stereotype) that women are more emotionally expressive than men. A core feature of stereotypes is that they cause people to notice and even exaggerate stereotype-consistent information (e.g., a woman expressing mild dejection) but ignore and even miss entirely stereotype-inconsistent information (e.g., a man expressing mild dejection) (Biernat, 2012; Trope & Thompson, 1997). For example, when someone sees a female leader expressing mild dejection, they may see her being much more sad than she really feels, whereas mild dejection on the part of a male leader may not even be noticed. Indeed, people rate pictures of happy female faces as containing more emotion (i.e., being significantly “happier”) than identically happy⁴ male faces across all levels of intensity of expression (from very mild to extreme) (Hess, Blairy, & Kleck, 1997).

Because of the tendency to notice and exaggerate stereotype-congruent information, in instances in which an individual's gender is not clear (either via computer-mediated communication or for some other reason), people will nonetheless “fill in the blanks” and infer gender onto the target. Any behavior consistent with gender stereotypes will likely be used as clues as to the gender of the individual in the interaction. For example, Hess and her colleagues have shown that even when faces are digitally altered to appear androgynous, people will label the angry androgynous faces as male, and the happy and fearful androgynous faces as clearly female (Hess, Adams, Grammer, & Kleck, 2009).

Though much of the work on gender-emotion stereotypes has not specifically focused on women in leadership roles, some evidence suggests that women leaders may actually have a more difficult time determining the right amount of emotion to display than women in non-leadership employment roles. Because they are in high-power, high-status roles, women leaders' behavior,

⁴ In this research paradigm, the intensity of the emotion expression on the target's faces is determined by computer software that ensures that the underlying facial muscles involved in the emotional displays are altered in exactly the same way for male and female faces. This is how it is possible to determine that the male and female faces are “identically” happy, for example.

including their emotion expression, may be more visible to others, and perhaps even scrutinized to a greater extent than the emotion displays of women in low-power roles. Further, if they are in a leadership role that has historically been filled by men, or if they are the only woman in a key leadership position in an organization (Sekaquaptewa & Thompson, 2002), their emotion displays may receive increased scrutiny.

Indeed, there are countless examples from women in various kinds of leadership positions who can attest to the fact that their high status did not protect them from backlash effects after they expressed emotion, and that they may have even received more scrutiny than their male counterparts. For example, after Pat Schroeder shed tears during her withdrawal speech of her candidacy for president in 1987, she was pilloried by the media and political analysts for showing that kind of emotion. Although it may not be difficult to recall individual instances in which the media has penalized male politicians for inappropriate emotion displays, female politicians may receive more attention for the same behavior in part because their gender is highly salient.⁵ Hence, when female politicians behave in gender stereotypic ways (e.g., expressing emotion), the media may be especially likely to make a story out of it. Indeed, Schroeder kept a file of other male politicians who cried in similar circumstances and did not receive similar levels of attention but eventually got rid of the file because it got too big. Additionally, an analysis of the 1984 televised vice presidential debate revealed that even though Geraldine Ferraro was less emotionally expressive in the debate than her opponent George H. W. Bush, the media nonetheless made significantly more references to Ferraro's emotions than to Bush's emotions (Shields & MacDowell, 1987).

Another reason women leaders may have a more difficult time striking just the right emotional tone than women in other employment roles is because the mere presence of a woman in a high-status leadership position threatens the status quo whereby men, as a group, have more power and status than women (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Rudman et al., 2012). In support of this idea, Rudman and her colleagues (2012) found that although people penalized women who displayed dominant, agentic behaviors, they did not penalize them when they were described in a manner that did not threaten the status quo. This finding suggests that women who merely occupy roles that violate the gender hierarchy (such as women leaders) may be particularly likely to suffer penalties when they display too much, too little, or the wrong kind of emotion.

Thus, even though both male and female leaders are subject to emotional display rules, female leaders are likely have a more difficult time achieving a balance between expressing enough emotion and avoiding the perception that they are expressing too much emotion. Whereas male leaders can almost always simply not express emotion and avoid negative evaluations, female leaders do not have the luxury of such a straightforward default strategy—if they fail to express emotion, they risk being seen as “cold” and unlikable. Furthermore, because of people's tendency to vigilantly attend to stereotype-consistent behavior, any amount of emotion displayed by women leaders can be misperceived as overly intense.

Penalties for expressing powerful emotions

A second way in which gendered beliefs about emotion expression can be a minefield for women leaders centers on the kinds of emotions that are appropriate for women leaders to express. In general, women (including women leaders) are proscribed from displaying high-status, masculine emotions that convey dominance, such as anger (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008) and pride (Cheng et al., 2010). Displaying anger communicates that an individual has been wronged in some way, or that he has been threatened with the possibility of losing something he believes is rightfully his. In this sense, anger is seen as an emotion of entitlement and is therefore reserved for those with high status (Tiedens, 2001). Indeed, Tiedens and her colleagues (2000) found that individuals who were simply described as angry were assumed to have higher status than those who were described as sad. In another study, Tiedens (2001) further found that men who expressed anger were given more power, status, and independence at work compared to men who expressed sadness.

However, Brescoll and Uhlmann (2008) found that anger did not yield increases in status for women as it did for men. Specifically, a series of experiments revealed that female targets who displayed even very mild amounts of anger were seen as less competent, hireable, and deserving of power, status, and independence in their jobs compared to male targets displaying the identical amount of anger.

But since anger is seen as more appropriate for high-status individuals (Tiedens et al., 2000), and women leaders occupy high-status positions, then perhaps women leaders are licensed to express anger to the same extent as men, or at least have more license to do so than women who are not in these high-status roles. However, this does not appear to be the case. For example, in one laboratory experiment participants viewed videos of men and women in an ostensive job interview recounting a past incident at work that made them angry, in response to the interviewer's request to describe “a time when something went wrong at work” and how it made them feel (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). The male and female interviewees were presented as either occupying a high-status role (CEO of a major, multinational corporation) or a low-status role (assistant trainee). Participants viewed the angry female targets as less competent, hireable, and deserving of status, independence, and power in their jobs than the angry male targets. More to the point, it appeared that occupying a high-status role did not shield the angry female leader from negative evaluations. In fact, the angry female CEO was judged to be the least competent of all the targets, including not just the high- and low-status angry men, but also the *low-status* angry female target.

However, in contexts where it is acceptable for women to hold power, such as in interpersonal relationships (i.e., contexts that have nothing to do with work or achievement), women may not necessarily be penalized for anger expression. For example, one

⁵ Female politicians' gender may be highly salient because women are still much less likely than men to seek political office at all levels—local, state, and national (Carli, 2011).

experiment found that even though in achievement contexts (i.e., the workplace), women expressing anger were more likely to be seen as overreacting compared with men displaying anger in these same contexts, in relationship contexts (i.e., intimate partner relationships), the opposite effect occurred (Hutson-Comeaux & Kelly, 2002). Men's angry overreactions in these kinds of feminine contexts were viewed as more inappropriate than women's angry overreactions.

Besides anger, pride is the other primary emotion typically associated with high-status individuals and with men, in particular (Plant et al., 2000). Although there is much less research on how people react to displays of pride by men and women, existing work has clearly shown that people believe men should express pride to a greater extent than women (Timmers et al., 2003). Related research has further found that male faces displaying pride were seen as significantly more attractive than male faces displaying happiness whereas happy female faces were seen as significantly more attractive than prideful female faces (Tracy & Beall, 2011).

More importantly, research documenting backlash effects against women who violate feminine norms of modesty (Rudman & Glick, 1999) strongly suggests that women leaders may not have the same license to blatantly express pride as male leaders. These experiments have consistently found that people are more likely to penalize self-promoting women than self-promoting male counterparts (Rudman et al., 2012). Given that women who self-promote at work are in some sense conveying pride in their accomplishments, then women who specifically display pride will likely suffer the same backlash effects in response to that specific display of emotion.

Both anger and pride are important emotions for leaders to express as they communicate important information to others (Tiedens, 2001). For example, displaying anger may be necessary to get uncooperative subordinates to comply with an important request whereas displaying pride in one's accomplishments or skills is an important signal to others of one's worth. The fact that women leaders cannot express these emotions without penalty illustrates another way in which gender stereotypes of emotion can impede women's ability to attain and retain leadership positions. In essence, women leaders may have difficulty exercising power in that they cannot display the primary emotions that convey power (i.e., anger and pride) without incurring penalties.

Emerging issues in gender stereotypes of emotion and leadership

Compared to gender stereotypes centering on communality and agency, gender stereotypes of emotion have received relatively little attention in the understanding of the biases that lead to prejudice against female leaders. Nonetheless, as I have argued thus far, gender stereotypes of emotion present a fundamental barrier to women's ability to obtain and succeed in leadership roles. Here I outline two promising areas for future research on gender stereotypes of emotion in leadership contexts: (1) whether a *chronic fear* of violating emotion display rules detracts from women's ability to effectively lead others, and (2) whether race and ethnicity interact with gender to produce a different set of beliefs, expectations, and evaluative standards for racial and ethnic minority women in leadership roles.

Concern over violating emotion display rules reduces leader effectiveness

Recent work on backlash effects suggest that women leaders are well aware of the potential for experiencing negative consequences for violating prescriptive and proscriptive gender stereotypes (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010). Furthermore, women's fear of backlash and their desire to avoid being penalized for gender nonconforming behavior has been found to explain why they frequently behave in line with gender stereotypes. For example, one study found that even women in explicitly powerful positions (i.e., the leader of their team) were less likely than their powerful male counterparts to take the floor in a work meeting specifically because they did not want to be disliked or seen as too pushy (Brescoll, 2011).

Although researchers have not yet investigated whether women worry that they will experience backlash effects for displaying (or failing to display) particular kinds of emotions, there is reason to believe that this fear exists and that it may help explain many of the observed gender differences in emotional display. Given that women are apt to encounter backlash effects for expressing emotion at work (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008) and that they are acutely aware of the possibility that backlash effects for other types of gender stereotype violations may occur (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Brescoll, 2011; Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010), women may end up behaving in such a way as to reinforce certain gender-emotion stereotypes. For example, a common subtype of working women known as "ice queens" are perceived as being emotionally cold because they tend to display very little (feminine) emotion at work (Heilman, 2001). However, it may be the case that some of the women labeled ice queens may be behaving this way specifically to avoid negative reactions from expressing too much emotion and thereby being labeled emotional (and ultimately being seen as incompetent as well). But their efforts to avoid backlash effects from appearing overly emotional may backfire in that they are likely to experience penalties for not being emotional *enough* (as the unflattering label "ice queen" attests). Thus, like other gender stereotypes, gender-emotion stereotypes may create a Catch-22 for women leaders in which they find themselves trying to strike a difficult balance between expressing enough emotion in order to be seen as sufficiently communal, and not too much emotion so that they avoid the perception that they are overly emotional (and thereby cannot control the influence of their emotions on their thoughts and behaviors).

If women leaders chronically find themselves in emotional double binds—i.e., walking a precarious line between expressing enough, but not too much, emotion—it is important to investigate the costs they experience from trying to conform to such display rules. For one, navigating these emotional double binds could quickly deplete women leaders' cognitive resources and self-regulatory ability, which may lead to them underperforming in their jobs. Second, navigating emotional double binds necessarily means that women leaders will need to suppress their emotions—whether that be in kind or degree. Thus, it is possible that they

may also experience the same psychological costs that people experience when engaging in emotion suppression, such as impaired memory, and even negative health consequences (Richards & Gross, 1999). Finally, having to alter one's emotion expression at work may be akin to engaging in emotional labor, the consequences of which include impaired well-being, a sense of disconnection from one's work, and a chronic feeling of inauthenticity (Hulsheger & Schewe, 2011).

Intersections of race, emotion expression, and gender

Only a handful of studies on gender–emotion stereotypes have explicitly investigated people's beliefs about the emotional displays and experience of men and women of color. In much of the research on gender–emotion stereotypes, participants either read scenarios describing a fictional male or female target or view images (via video or still photographs) of male or female targets displaying emotion. Unless the researchers specifically were investigating beliefs about the emotion displays of people of color, the names chosen for the fictional targets in the scenarios have been stereotypically White (e.g., Mary vs. John; Hutson-Comeaux & Kelly, 2002), and the actors and models in the videos and photographs have appeared to be White as well⁶ (e.g., Tracy & Beall, 2011). Thus, it remains unclear whether people's beliefs about gender and emotion also apply to women of color, or if race and ethnicity interact with gender to produce a different set of beliefs, expectations, and evaluative standards for racial and ethnic minority women in leadership roles. For example, even the basic issue of whether Black, Asian American, and Latina women are viewed as more emotional than their male counterparts is largely unknown. Though one study found that undergraduates rated Black women as being less emotional than White women (Landrine, 1999), a nationally representative poll found that 19% agreed with the idea that Black women were less emotionally well-suited to politics than Black men (Simien, 2006).

To date, one study has systematically compared the descriptive stereotypes of emotion expression for African American, Asian American, Hispanic American, and White American men and women (Durik et al., 2006). Overall, this study found that people hold relatively similar patterns of gender–emotion stereotypes for all ethnic groups, although the beliefs about gender differences in emotion displays were slightly larger for Whites compared to the three other ethnic groups. The one exception was that African American women were not seen as expressing less pride than African American men and, in fact, people believed Black women expressed similar levels of pride as men from all of the ethnic groups studied. Documenting the extent to which men and women from different ethnic groups are thought to express emotions is important, but descriptive gender stereotypes do not always map onto the prescriptions that people draw from these beliefs (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Future research should examine whether the emotional display rules vary for men and women in different ethnic groups, and further whether those expectations for emotion expression also apply to men and women in leadership positions.

Although little is known about the emotion display rules for women of color, related work examining stereotype-based backlash effects against agentic Black women has begun to shed light on whether Black women would be prohibited from expressing emotions that convey dominance, such as anger and pride. The *double jeopardy hypothesis* suggests that the backlash effects experienced by White women for expressing these emotions will be amplified for minority women because they experience both sexism and racism, the consequences of which are perceived to be greater than any one type of discrimination alone (Beale, 1970; Reid & Comas-Diaz, 1990; Settles, 2006).

However, recent work in a related domain has failed to find support for the double jeopardy hypothesis (Hall & Livingston, 2012; Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012). In fact, people were *less* likely to penalize Black female leaders for displaying agentic, dominant behaviors than White female leaders engaging in the identical behavior (Livingston et al., 2012). This may be, in part, because Black women are perceived as significantly more masculine than White women and thus may be seen as possessing traits that are more consistent with people's beliefs about the traits leaders tend to possess—which also tend to be masculine (Koenig et al., 2011). Furthermore, Durik et al. (2006) found that people believed Black women were more likely to express stereotypically masculine emotions (i.e., anger and pride) than White women. Thus, at least compared to White women, Black women who express these emotions may incur weaker penalties and so may have not have to navigate this particular emotional double bind as White women do.

It is possible, however, that Black women could experience a different kind of emotional double bind when it comes to displaying stereotypically masculine emotions. For example, in America, people not only believe that Black women display more anger than White women (Durik et al., 2006), but also that, in general, Black women are simply “angry” (i.e., the “angry Black woman” stereotype) (Harris-Perry, 2011). Because of the way that stereotypes cause people to attend to and exaggerate stereotype-consistent information (Biernat, 2012; Trope & Thompson, 1997), this could mean that when a Black woman shows even mild amounts of anger, others could view her as being much angrier than she actually is. This could set the stage for viewing her anger as an overreaction, and thereby as unjustified.

Even less research has been conducted on gender–emotion stereotypes for women from other ethnic groups (e.g., Asian American women, Arab American women, and Hispanic women). Work on the perception of threat from out-group targets has found that even though Black women were not seen as threatening to the same extent as were Black men (Plant, Goplen, & Kunstman, 2011; Thomas, Dovidio, & West, 2014), Arab women were perceived to be just as threatening as Arab men (Maner

⁶ In my comprehensive review of the literature, I found a few instances where, in the published manuscript, the authors did not specify the race or ethnicity of the actors in the videos that participants viewed. Where possible, I have contacted these study authors to find out this information and/or obtain the original copies of the video stimuli. Thus far, the actors in these videos have all appeared to be White (e.g., Tiedens, 2001).

et al., 2005). Thus, people may penalize Arab women for displaying anger to a similar extent as they penalize White women, albeit for different reasons.

Similarly, Asian American women may not escape penalties for expressing dominant emotions in the workplace, such as anger and pride. In fact, related work suggests that Asian American women may experience backlash for engaging in gender atypical behaviors to even greater extent than White women. In contrast to Black women, Asian American women were stereotyped as more *feminine* than White women (Berdahl & Min, 2012) and, consistent with this belief, one study found that Asian American women were the *least* likely to be selected for a masculine leadership position, followed by White women, and then by Black women (Galinsky, Hall, & Cuddy, 2013). Furthermore, both Asian American men and women are seen as less dominant than Whites and may even be proscribed from displaying dominance. A recent study found that when both male and female Asian American targets were described as dominant, people liked them less than their dominant White peers and non-dominant peers of either ethnicity (Berdahl & Min, 2012). Thus, although there is *some* evidence to suggest that Black women may be able to express dominant emotions at work without penalty, Asian American and Arab women are unlikely to escape these penalties. Future research should explore these ideas directly and also investigate whether, and to what extent, the other gendered beliefs about emotionality set forth here constrain the behavior of women of color in leadership roles.

Conclusion

The belief that women are more emotional than men has unique potential to unfairly bias the selection and assessment of women leaders. Compared to men, women are oftentimes viewed as less able to control whether their emotions influence their thoughts and behavior (Shields, 1985, 2013; Shields & Koster, 1989) and as displaying either too much, or not enough, emotion (Kelly & Hutson-Comeaux, 2000). Furthermore, women are also more likely than men to be penalized for expressing emotions that convey power (e.g., anger and pride) (Lewis, 2000). In this way, gender-emotion stereotypes present a set of challenges that are unique from the difficulties women face from navigating other double binds rooted in stereotypes of communality and agency.

Even though they occupy high-status roles, women leaders are not immune to the display rules that result from gender-emotion stereotypes. In fact, being in a leadership position may actually make it harder for women to navigate these display rules because their position makes them highly visible and subject to additional scrutiny. Also, although Black women *may* be less subject to some of the penalties that occur as a result of violating proscriptions against expressing masculine emotions, Asian American women and other women of color may not be. Finally, it is possible that women leaders experience psychological consequences akin to those experienced by people engaging in emotional labor and other self-regulatory strategies as a result of chronically trying to navigate emotional double binds at work.

In sum, beliefs about gender and emotion directly harm women leaders' chances of success but also harm organizations because, by allowing these stereotypes to bias the selection and assessment of women leaders, organizations are not effectively leveraging their entire pool of talent. Thus, organizations should consider expanding the scope of their bias awareness training programs (Moss-Racusin et al., 2014) to include information and discussions about the ways that gender-emotion stereotypes hinder women's ability to succeed in leadership roles within the organization.

References

- Amanatullah, E. T., & Morris, M. W. (2010). Negotiating gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women's fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 256–267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017094>.
- Bar-On, R., & Parker, J. D. A. (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896\(01\)00084-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896(01)00084-8).
- Barrett, L. F., & Bliss-Moreau, E. (2009). She's emotional. He's having a bad day: Attributional explanations for emotion stereotypes. *Emotion*, 9(5), 827–836. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016821> 19803587.
- Barrett, L. F., Robin, L., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Eyssele, K. M. (1998). Are women the "more emotional" sex? Evidence from emotional experiences in social context. *Cognition and Emotion*, 12(4), 76–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/026999398379565>.
- Beale, F. (1970). Double jeopardy: To be Black and female. In T. Cade (Ed.), *The Black woman: An anthology* (pp. 53–75). New York: New American Library.
- Bechara, A., Damasio, A. R., Damasio, H., & Anderson, S. W. (1994). Insensitivity to future consequences following damage to human prefrontal cortex. *Cognition*, 50, 7–15. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(94\)90018-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(94)90018-3).
- Berdahl, J. L., & Min, J. A. (2012). Prescriptive stereotypes and workplace consequences for East Asians in North America. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18(2), 141–152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/A0027692>.
- Biernat, M. (2012). Stereotypes and shifting standards: Forming, communicating, and translating person impressions. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 1–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394286-9.00001-9>.
- Birnbaum, D. W., & Croll, W. L. (1984). The etiology of children's stereotypes about sex differences in emotionality. *Sex Roles*, 10, 677–691. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00287379>.
- Birnbaum, D. W., Nosanchuk, T. A., & Croll, W. L. (1980). Children's stereotypes about sex differences in emotionality. *Sex Roles*, 6(3), 435–443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf00287363>.
- Bliss-Moreau, E., & Barrett, L. F. (2009). What's reason got to do with it? Affect as the foundation of learning. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(2), 887–891. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X09000892>.
- Brescoll, V. L. (2006). Can angry women get ahead? Anger, gender, and status conferral. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 67(4-B). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/e514412014-379>.
- Brescoll, V. L. (2011). Who takes the floor and why: Gender, power, and volubility in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(4), 622–641. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0001839212439994>.
- Brescoll, V. L., & LaFrance, M. (2004). The correlates and consequences of newspaper reports of research on sex differences. *Psychological Science*, 15(8), 515–520. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00712.x>.

- Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science*, 19(3), 268–275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02079.x>.
- Brescoll, V. L., Uhlmann, E. L., & Newman, G. E. (2013). The effects of system-justifying motives on endorsement of essentialist explanations for gender differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(6), 891–908. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/A0034701>.
- Brody, L. R. (1997). Gender and emotion: Beyond stereotypes. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(2), 369–393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00022>.
- Butler, E. A., Egloff, B., Wilhelm, F. H., Smith, N. C., Erickson, E. A., & Gross, J. J. (2003). The social consequences of expressive suppression. *Emotion*, 3(1), 48–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.3.1.48>.
- Carli, L. (2011). It still takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(3), 483–484. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684311410543>.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31(5), 334–347. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.004>.
- Citrin, L. B., & Roberts, T. A. (2004). A feminist psychological perspective on gendered affect. In L. Z. Tiedens, & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 203–223). New York: Cambridge Press.
- Clark, M. S., Fitness, J., & Brissette, I. (2004). Understanding people's perceptions of relationships is crucial to understanding their emotional lives. In G. J. O. Fletcher, & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology* (pp. 21–46). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Clinton, H. R. (2016). *Hillary Clinton Interview/Interviewer: A. de Cadenet. The conversation with Amanda de Cadenet*. Los Angeles, CA: Lifetime Network Television January 12.
- Clymer, A. (2001). Book says Nixon considered a woman for the Supreme Court. *New York Times*, A16 September 27. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/27/us/book-says-nixon-considered-a-woman-for-supreme-court.html>.
- Damasio, A. R. (2005). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain*. London: Penguin.
- Diekmann, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(10), 1171–1188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167200262001>.
- Dolan, Kathleen A. (2014). *When does gender matter? Women candidates and gender stereotypes in American elections*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Durik, A. M., Hyde, J. S., Marks, A. C., Roy, A. L., Anaya, D., & Schultz, G. (2006). Ethnicity and gender stereotypes of emotion. *Sex Roles*, 54(7–8), 429–445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s1199-006-9020-4>.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(9), 62–67.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573–598. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.109.3.573>.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2012). Social role theory. In P. van Lange, A. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories in social psychology*. 2. (pp. 458–476). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Else-Quest, N. M., Higgins, A., Allison, C., & Morton, L. C. (2012). Gender differences in self-conscious emotional experience: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(5), 947–981. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/A0027930>.
- Fabes, R. A., & Martin, C. L. (1991). Gender and age stereotypes of emotionality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5), 532–540. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167291175008>.
- Feldhahn, S. (2011). *For women only in the workplace: What you need to know about how men think at work*. Colorado Springs, CO: Multnomah Books.
- Fischbach, A., Lichtenhaler, P. W., & Horstmann, N. (2015). Leadership and gender stereotyping of emotions: Think manager – think male? *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 14, 153–162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000136>.
- Fischer, A. H. (1993). Sex differences in emotionality: Fact or stereotype? *Feminism & Psychology*, 3(3), 303–318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959353593033002>.
- Fischer, A. H., Eagly, A. H., & Oosterwijk, S. (2013). The meaning of tears: Which sex seems emotional depends on the social context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(6), 505–515. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/Ejsp.1974>.
- Gaia, A. C. (2013). The role of gender stereotypes in the social acceptability of the expression of intimacy. *The Social Science Journal*, 50(4), 591–602. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2013.08.006>.
- Galinsky, A. D., Hall, E. V., & Cuddy, A. J. C. (2013). Gendered races: Implications for interracial marriage, leadership selection, and athletic participation. *Psychological Science*, 24(4), 498–506. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797612457783>.
- Gallup (2000). *Gallup Poll, December 2000, #USAIPOGNS2000-53*. Retrieved from: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/9898/2000>
- Gallup (2014). *Americans still prefer a male boss over a female boss*.
- Greenberg Quinlan Rosner (2005). *Voice of Mom Survey*. from Roper Center for Public Opinion Research <http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/CFIDE/cf/action/ipoll/ipollBasket.cfm>.
- Hall, E. V., & Livingston, R. W. (2012). The hubris penalty: Biased responses to "Celebration" displays of Black football players. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.004>.
- Harris-Perry, M. V. (2011). *Sister citizen: Shame, stereotypes, and black women in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 657–674. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00234>.
- Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., & Martell, R. F. (1995). Sex stereotypes: Do they influence perceptions of managers? *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10(6), 237–252 doi: WOS:A1995TL02100016.
- Heilman, M. E., & Eagly, A. H. (2008). Gender stereotypes are alive, well, and busy producing workplace discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(4), 393–398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00072.x>.
- Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks? The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 81–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.81>.
- Hess, U., Adams, R. B., Grammer, K., & Kleck, R. E. (2009). Face gender and emotion expression: Are angry women more like men? *Journal of Vision*, 9(12), 456–471 doi: WOS:000273281300019.
- Hess, U., Blairy, S., & Kleck, R. E. (1997). The intensity of emotional facial expressions and decoding accuracy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 21(4), 241–257 doi: WOS:000071144400001.
- Hess, U., David, S., & Hareli, S. (2015). Emotional restraint is good for men only: The influence of emotional restraint on perceptions of competence. *Emotion, Advance online publication*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000125>.
- Hulsheger, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(3), 361–389. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022876>.
- Hutson-Comeaux, S. L., & Kelly, J. R. (2002). Gender stereotypes of emotional reactions: How we judge an emotion as valid. *Sex Roles*, 47(1–2), 1–10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1020657301981>.
- Ibarra, H., Ely, R., & Kolb, D. (2013). Women rising: The unseen barriers. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(9), 60–74.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x>.
- Kelly, J. R., & Hutson-Comeaux, S. L. (2000). The appropriateness of emotional expression in women and men: The double-bind of emotion. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 15(4), 515–528 doi: WOS:000178240900005.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2012). *Manhood in America: A cultural history* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(4), 616–642. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/A0023557>.
- LaFrance, M., & Banaji, M. R. (1992). Toward a reconsideration of the gender-emotion relationship. In H. S. Clark (Ed.), *Emotion and social behavior* (pp. 178–201). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- LaFrance, M., Hecht, M. A., & Paluck, E. L. (2003). The contingent smile: A meta-analysis of sex differences in smiling. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(2), 305–334.

- Landrine, H. (1999). Race x class stereotypes of women. In H. S. Clark (Ed.), *Gender, culture, and ethnicity: Current research about women and men* (pp. 38–61). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Levy, S. R., Stroessner, S. J., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Stereotype formation and endorsement: The role of implicit theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1421–1436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1421>.
- Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 221–234. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(Sici\)1099-1379\(200003\)21:2<221::Aid-Job36>3.0.Co;2-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(Sici)1099-1379(200003)21:2<221::Aid-Job36>3.0.Co;2-0).
- Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). Can an agentic black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science*, 23(4), 354–358. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797611428079>.
- Maner, J. K., Kenrick, D. T., Becker, D. V., Robertson, T. E., Hofer, B., Neuberg, S. L., ... Schaller, M. (2005). Functional projection: How fundamental social motives can bias interpersonal perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 63–78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.63>.
- Martin, C. L., & Parker, S. (1995). Folk theories about sex and race differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 45–57.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). Disruptions in women's self-promotion: The backlash avoidance model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34(2), 186–202.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., van der Toorn, J., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2014). Scientific diversity interventions. *Science*, 343(6171), 615–616. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/Science.1245936>.
- National Opinion Research Center (2008). General Social Survey USNORCGSS08C.Q0202A. <http://ropercenter.cornell.edu>
- Okimoto, T. G., & Brescoll, V. L. (2010). The price of power: Power seeking and backlash against female politicians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(7), 923–936. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167210371949>.
- Plant, E. A., Goplen, J., & Kunstman, J. W. (2011). Selective responses to threat: The roles of race and gender in decisions to shoot. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(9), 1274–1281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167211408617>.
- Plant, E. A., Hyde, J. S., Keltner, D., & Devine, P. G. (2000). The gender stereotyping of emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24(1), 81–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/J.1471-6402.2000.Tb01024.X>.
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 269–281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.T01-1-00066>.
- Reid, P. T., & Comas-Diaz, L. (1990). Gender and ethnicity: Perspectives on dual status. *Sex Roles*, 22(7), 653–678. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00288160>.
- Richards, J. M., & Gross, J. J. (1999). Composure at any cost? The cognitive consequences of emotion suppression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(8), 768–798. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/01461672992511010>.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 637–655. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00233>.
- Robertson, J. M., Lin, C. W., Woodford, J., Danos, K. K., & Hurst, M. A. (2001). The (un) emotional male: Physiological, verbal, and written correlates of expressiveness. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 9, 393–412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.0903.393>.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 77(5), 1004–1010. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.1004>.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743–762. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00239>.
- Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(1), 165–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008>.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 675–688. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00235>.
- Sekaquaptewa, D., & Thompson, M. (2002). The differential effects of solo status on members of high- and low-status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(5), 694–707. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167202288013>.
- Seo, M. G., & Barrett, L. F. (2007). Being emotional during decision making—Good or bad? An empirical investigation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 436–456. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.26279217.18449361>.
- Settles, I. H. (2006). Use of an intersectional framework to understand black women's racial and gender identities. *Sex Roles*, 54(9–10), 589–601. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/S11199-006-9029-8>.
- Shields, S. A. (1985). Managing emotional development: Advice from child-rearing manuals, 1915–1980. *Current Psychology of Cognition*, 5(3–4), 372–373.
- Shields, S. A. (1987). Women, men, and the dilemma of emotion. In P. Shaver, & C. Hendrick (Eds.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 229–250). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Shields, S. A. (2002). *Speaking from the heart: Gender and the social meaning of emotion*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Shields, S. A. (2005). The politics of emotion in everyday life: “Appropriate” emotion and claims on identity. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(1), 3–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.1.3>.
- Shields, S. A. (2007). Passionate men, emotional women: Psychology constructs gender difference in the late 19th century. *History of Psychology*, 10(2), 92–110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1093-4510.10.2.92>.
- Shields, S. A. (2013). Gender and emotion: What we think we know, what we need to know, and why it matters. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(4), 423–435. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684313502312>.
- Shields, S. A., & Koster, B. A. (1989). Emotional stereotyping of parents in child-rearing manuals, 1915–1980. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 52(1), 44–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2786903>.
- Shields, S. A., & MacDowell, K. A. (1987). Appropriate emotion in politics: Judgments of a televised debate. *Journal of Communication*, 37(2), 78–89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1987.tb00984.x>.
- Shiv, B., Loewenstein, G., Bechara, A., Damasio, H., & Damasio, A. R. (2005). Investment behavior and the negative side of emotion. *Psychological Science*, 16(6), 435–439. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.01553.x>.
- Simien, E. (2006). CSRA/UCONN Poll # 2004-FEM: 2004-2005 National Black Feminist Study. Retrieved from: <https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/CFIDE/cf/action/catalog/abstract.cfm?type=&start=&id=&archno=USCSRA2004-FEM&abstract=>
- Stoppard, J. M., & Gruchy, C. D. G. (1993). Gender, context, and expression of positive emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(2), 143–150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167293192002>.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: How women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work* (1st ed.). New York: W. Morrow.
- Thomas, E. L., Dovidio, J. F., & West, T. V. (2014). Lost in the categorical shuffle: Evidence for the social non-prototypicality of black women. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 20(3), 370–376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/A0035096>.
- Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: The effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(1), 86–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.1.86>.
- Tiedens, L. Z., Ellsworth, P. C., & Mesquita, B. (2000). Stereotypes about sentiments and status: Emotional expectations for high- and low-status group members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(5), 560–574.
- Timmers, M., Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2003). Ability versus vulnerability: Beliefs about men's and women's emotional behaviour. *Cognition & Emotion*, 17(1), 41–63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699930143000653>.
- Tracy, J. L., & Beall, A. T. (2011). Happy guys finish last: The impact of emotion expressions on sexual attraction. *Emotion*, 11(6), 1379–1387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/A0022902>.
- Trope, Y., & Thompson, E. P. (1997). Looking for truth in all the wrong places? Asymmetric search of individuating information about stereotyped group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(2), 229–241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.2.229>.
- Van Boven, L., & Robinson, M. D. (2012). Boys don't cry: Cognitive load and priming increase stereotypic sex differences in emotion memory. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(1), 303–309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.005>.

- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1325–1339. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012453>.
- Warner, L. R., & Shields, S. A. (2007). The perception of crying in women and men: Angry tears, sad tears, and the “right way” to cry. *Group Dynamics and Emotional Expression*, 92–117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/Cbo9780511499838.006>.
- Zammuner, V. L. (2000). Men's and women's lay theories of emotion. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 48–70). Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press.
- Zawadzki, M. J., Warner, L. R., & Shields, S. A. (2013). Sadness is believed to signal competence when displayed with passionate restraint. *Social Psychology*, 44(3), 219–230. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000106>.