PALGRAVE STUDIES IN POLITICAL LEADERSHIP SERIES

Women Political Leaders and the Media

Donatella Campus

Women Political Leaders and the Media

Palgrave Studies in Political Leadership

Series editors:

Palgrave Studies in Political Leadership seeks to gather some of the best work on political leadership broadly defined, stretching from classic areas such as executive, legislative and party leadership to understudied manifestations of political leadership beyond the state. Edited by an international board of distinguished leadership scholars from the United States, Europe and Asia, the series publishes cutting-edge research that reaches out to a global readership.

Titles include:

Mark Bennister
PRIME MINISTERS IN POWER
Political Leadership in Britain and Australia

Donatella Campus
WOMEN POLITICAL LEADERS AND THE MEDIA

Ludger Helms (*editor*)
COMPARATIVE POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

Kevin Theakston and Jouke de Vries (*editors*)
FORMER LEADERS IN MODERN DEMOCRACIES
Political Sunsets

Palgrave Studies in Political Leadership
Series Standing Order ISBN 978–1–137–02484–8 (hardback) and 978–1–137–02485–5 (paperback)
(*outside North America only*)

You can receive future titles in this series as they are published by placing a standing order. Please contact your bookseller or, in case of difficulty, write to us at the address below with your name and address, the title of the series and the ISBNs quoted above.

Customer Services Department, Macmillan Distribution Ltd, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS, England

---

Women Political Leaders and the Media

Donatella Campus
Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Bologna

palgrave
macmillan

First published 2013 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978–0–230–28528–6

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

Contents

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction **1**

1 Gender and Models of Leadership **10**
Power: A male concept? 10
The female style of leadership 14
Transformational leadership 18

2 The Media and Representation of Leadership **22**
The mediatization and personalization of politics 22
Popular culture and leadership 28
New media, new leaders? 31

3 Media Coverage of Women Leaders **39**
Visibility: Quantity and quality of coverage of women leaders 39
Taking care and cleaning up: Lights and shadows of the positive stereotypes 44
Viability and the horse race: Are the media educating future female leaders? 50

4 The Double Bind **54**
The nature of the femininity-competence double bind 54
Iron Ladies and mothers of the nation 60
When women leaders are too feminine: The case of Ségolène Royal 65
When women leaders are too strong: The case of Hillary Clinton 69

5 The Appearance of Power **73**
Women leaders and the personal factor 73
The dress code of women leaders 82
Power and seduction 88

6 The Family Factor **94**
The good wife and the good mother 94
Going personal for women leaders 98
Dynastic politics: When daughters and wives enter politics 104

7 Conclusion: In Search of a New Style of Political Leadership **111**
The crisis of traditional democratic leadership 111
Time for degendering leadership 115
Media as agents of transformation 120

Notes 126

References 129

Index 142

Acknowledgments

The book has its origins in a paper I presented at the 31st Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology in July 2008 in Paris. The content of the paper, titled "Women Running for President: Female Leaders and Campaigning," is partially reproduced in chapters 3 and 4. I found the topic so interesting and stimulating that I decided to organize a seminar on female leadership and media at the University of Bologna, held on 13 November 2009 (proceedings of the conference have been published in Italian in Campus (2010c)). I am indebted to all those who presented papers, the discussants, and the participants for their invaluable contributions. This book grew out of many of the reflections and suggestions they advanced on that occasion. I would like to thank Amber Stone Galilee at Palgrave Macmillan, who worked with me on this project, and to the anonymous referee for precious comments. I also thank Tom Finnegan for editorial assistance in preparing the manuscript.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

The available literature on female political leadership shows a limited amount of research. There are a few analyses of some particular women, but, partly due to the paucity of female national leaders, gender-specific studies of political leadership are still rare, especially if we limit our focus to presidents and chief executives.[1] Moreover, it should be observed that the prevailing trend in studies of political leadership has been that of analyzing the issue without paying great attention to gender differences.[2]

Recent electoral success of women leaders such as Angela Merkel in Germany, Michelle Bachelet in Chile, Christina Kirchner in Argentina, and Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma, and the candidacies of Ségolène Royal in France and Hillary Clinton in the U.S. represent an exciting novelty. The number of women political leaders is growing on the international stage, with several examples also in developing countries. Women in power remain a small club, but they cannot any longer be regarded as true exceptions. As a consequence, the issue of female political leadership is especially topical and deserves further discussion and investigation.

If gender is an important factor in interpreting the nature and the scope of contemporary democratic leadership, a key issue is the relationship between women leaders and the media. An important source of inspiration for this book has been Kathleen Hall Jamieson, whose *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership* (1995) provides a framework for understanding how far stereotypes and the media's use of them may work against women in politics. There is a large body of literature on media treatment of women candidates' campaigns

for parliamentary and gubernatorial elections.[3] By contrast, the issue of media coverage of women political leaders has been less investigated. Among the few comprehensive analyses available, Falk (2010) examines the gender bias of American media in covering women candidates for the U.S. presidency. A seminal essay is Norris (1997) on how media cover women leaders.[4] Such contributions highlight several themes and arguments that deserve to be elaborated and further developed. This book intends to offer some further arguments to such a discussion.

Two issues are at the heart of the book. The first concerns how media coverage reinforces gender stereotyping regarding women leaders. Our aim is to review such stereotypes and explore the consequences of media coverage for the evaluation of women leaders' candidacy and performance. It is a matter of fact that women still face barriers on their path to high political office: this often depends on the disjuncture between their way of being and leading, and a predominantly masculine notion of leadership. As Rhode and Kellerman put it, "one of the most intractable obstacles for women seeking positions of influence is the mismatch between qualities traditionally associated with women and those traditionally associated with leadership" (2007, 6). The phenomenon seems to have a direct consequence in the assessment of female competence: women are subject to forms of competence testing that are much more intense than for their male counterparts. In their own words, women say that they have to prove themselves over and over (Jamieson 1995, 122ff.), Foschi (2000) reviews research on gender as the basis for double standards for competence.

Over the years, much has been done to highlight the double standard and prevent its activation. Mass media often claim they have adopted internal rules to avoid gendered coverage of candidates (Jamieson 1995, 164ff.); however, it should be stressed that such stereotypes may operate subtly and unconsciously. As Maria Braden (1996, 1) stresses in her extended analysis of the relationship between women politicians and the media, "news coverage of women politicians is not always blatantly sexist, but subtle discrimination persists." Evidence collected in this book shows that media perpetuate stereotypes in different forms; this holds not only for negative stereotyping, as in emphasizing the lack of "male traits" such as toughness and assertiveness, but also for positive stereotyping, as

in stressing women's caring attitude and honesty. There are ways of representing women that apparently do not harm them, but every attempt at polarizing the notion of leadership along gender lines may result in a disadvantage for women pursuing a political career (Pittinsky et al. 2007).

The second fundamental objective of the book is to analyze the consequences of the current transformations in political communication. The main argument is that processes such as the popularization and the spectacularization of politics have a specific impact on media coverage of female political leaders. More fundamentally, recent developments in political communication, above all those related to the new media, may change the nature and the scope of leadership in contemporary democracies. The evolution of communication systems gives way to changing relationships between leaders and citizens. I intend to discuss some of the implications of such a complex and largely unpredictable framework in terms of possible changes in the style of political leadership in general, and of women leaders in particular.

Before I proceed with the outline of the book, a methodological note is in order. The material comes from a variety of primary and secondary sources, including biographies, news stories, journal articles, academic research, and survey data. Using several kinds of sources allows us to illustrate in a comprehensive and multifaceted way the issue of gender stereotypes in terms of the discrepancy between the qualities traditionally associated with political leaders and the characteristics that media tend to emphasize in covering women politicians. Case analysis of several women occupying highly visible political roles may shed new light on the best strategies for performing effectively in positions of power. Such analysis covers cases of personal success and failure, taking into account, however, that what matters more are not personal histories but those potentially replicable patterns that may promote cultural and institutional changes.

The book is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 1 starts with a general discussion of the relationship between gender and the concept of leadership. The first observation to make is that there exists a historical disjuncture between women and the notion of power. This apparent incompatibility revolves around a number of stereotypes that attribute differing psychological traits to men and women. The chapter analyzes this issue in relation to the most developed models

of leadership and argues that, notwithstanding some encouraging findings from empirical research, the overall evidence continues to confirm that the association between successful leadership and masculine characteristics still prevails, and gender equality in this regard has yet to come in contemporary society. The chapter then deals with the issue of style of leadership, from a body of research mostly carried out in organization theory and management studies. That discussion of gender and leadership style focused on the equality-difference debate. Some scholars argue that women and men have differing styles of leadership; others support the view that existing variation within a group is more notable than differences between the two sexes. A very interesting finding, with great relevance to our analysis of women political leadership, concerns the more conspicuous gender similarities at the top, which suggests that women national political leaders could display a leadership style more similar to their male counterparts than to the average female politician. Finally, the chapter introduces the notion of transformational leadership, a concept originally elaborated by James McGregor Burns (1978, 2003), which has become the cornerstone of most scholarly discussions on female leadership. The concept of transformational leadership is gender-neutral, but empirical research has shown the many points in common between this notion and the practices adopted by women leaders. The transformational model is especially promising in the view of closing the leadership gender gap. In fact, it proposes a notion of leadership less masculine than traditional ones, but not specifically feminine. In this sense, it may be of help in "degendering" the debate on leadership, that is to say, delineating a model of leadership that may suit both men and women.

Chapter 2 deals with the role of mass media in representing political leadership in contemporary democracies. In particular, the chapter reviews some basic trends in political communication that have deeply influenced the representation of leaders both in electoral campaigns and in office. First, the chapter analyzes the interrelated phenomena of the mediatization and the personalization of politics. Given the pervasive action of the media, politics has accepted and adapted to media laws, in particular to the requirements of television, with the result that electoral campaigns have become more and more centered on candidates, especially on national leaders. This major focus on leadership has led to the rise of the "intimate

politician" (Stanyer 2007): political leaders become very familiar to voters through media disclosure of personal information, especially concerning private life. The illustration of such topics also anticipates the arguments developed in subsequent chapters about the impact of those media trends on the careers of female leaders. Second, the chapter explores the issue of the popularization of politics. Television provides not only information and entertainment separately but also infotainment, or information and entertainment together. The chapter argues that new television genres and their articulation with politics offer unexpected and interesting opportunities for women politicians. In fact, the less emphasized and more intimate style of communication of women may fit well with the requirements of infotainment. On the other hand, the process of popularization in the form of celebrity politics may have some counterproductive effects on women leaders. Third, the chapter deals with the new technology revolution and its huge impact on the practice of leadership. It is well known that the Internet favors a more horizontal interaction between leaders and supporters. It may also be argued that the Internet suits well a kind of leadership that stresses a softer style of cooperation and empowerment, one that should be closer to female nature and qualities. The chapter reviews cases of leaders such as Barack Obama and Ségolène Royal, who were especially successful online. Both were able to use the web to attract consensus and build a key constituency that allowed them to win a party nomination. Finally, the chapter speculates on the contribution of new trends in political communication in removing prejudices and revising the leadership models that media and citizens have formed over time.

Chapter 3 argues that the way in which mass media cover women leaders may be a powerful weapon either in favor of or against them. It reviews the existing research on media coverage of female political candidates and office holders. As for prejudices and sex-role stereotyping, the chapter anticipates many of the issues thoroughly detailed in subsequent chapters. More generally, the analysis highlights that women are still slightly less visible than men and receive more coverage having to do with their physical appearance, personal characteristics, and family than with, and at the expense of, other more substantial aspects. On the other hand, the chapter also explores some forms of "positive stereotyping." It illustrates three frames under which female leaders are often covered: women as

caretakers, women as outsiders, and women as those who clean up politics. These stereotypes are apparently positive but can be actually regarded as a "precarious pedestal" (Pittinsky et al. 2007) since they serve to reinforce the idea that women need special circumstances to emerge and are not able to have an "ordinary" political career. In other words, positive stereotypes, like negative ones, polarize gender differences with counterproductive consequences for female leadership. Finally, the chapter deals with the issue of viability—the assessment of women candidates' concrete chances of winning. If they are presented by media as less viable, this not only has immediate consequences for their electoral performance but also discourages other women from entering politics. By contrast, visible women running for office may become role models to elicit and reinforce female political ambition. For this reason, the media also exert a function as educators for females of younger generations.

In light of the discussion on gender stereotypes, Chapter 4 is devoted to analysis of the most serious implications of stereotyped reasoning for female leaders running for executive office. Women political leaders often face the femininity-competence double bind, a particular kind of the various social binds that have historically constrained women. The current model of leadership requires that women be able to communicate a message of strength and decisiveness. However, according to Jamieson's definition of double bind (1995), if a female aspirant to political leadership acts too assertively, she runs the risk of being criticized as too aggressive. On the other hand, women leaders who do not want to (or cannot) conform to a hard and male style of leadership run the risk of being considered too weak to assume the duties and burden of top executive offices. The chapter describes the impact of the double bind, and in particular it takes up the claim that media significantly contribute to its activation in different typologies. In some cases, for instance, women leaders are belittled because of their feminine characteristics and apparent lack of competence. A good example is the media coverage of the French presidential candidate Ségolène Royal. In other cases, by contrast, women leaders are ridiculed because of their supposed aggressive and confrontational approach, as shown by media reactions to Hillary Clinton's primary campaign.

Chapter 5 deals with the fact that media tend to give disproportionate coverage to women's appearance. The issue is particularly

pertinent at this time, as politics becomes more personalized and puts a special focus on politicians' image, whether men or women. In the case of women, however, the personalization trend has produced a negative "trivialization effect" (Stevens 2007), according to which frivolous discussion of female leaders' appearance undermines the seriousness and credibility of female candidates. Hairstyles, dressing style, age, smile: all contribute to a general objectivation of the female candidates' bodies in a way that privileges the leader's image over the substance of political action. In particular, the second section of the chapter takes up the specific issue of dressing style. Mass media seem to be obsessed by the details of women politicians' clothes. In contrast to what happens to men, dress is taken as an indicator of the woman's personality: just a detail may express an attitude and convey a political message. In general, the key question for a female leader lies in the tension between projecting images of femininity and image of power: to what extent can a powerful woman be feminine, and even frivolous, in her clothing style? This question can be expanded to consider the more general and complex interaction between power and sexuality, as addressed in the third section. The chapter discusses the impact of beauty and sexual attraction for female political leaders. Although male leaders are allowed to capitalize on their attractiveness, this may be counterproductive for women in power. This is due to the tendency of objectifying the female body as if leaders were movie or TV stars (Van Zoonen 2006). But an equally important explanation lies in the fact that a powerful woman appears to reverse the "natural order of the relationship between sex and power," as Pierre Bourdieu has well illustrated in *Masculine Domination* (2001).

Chapter 6 addresses the issue of the great visibility and attention devoted by media to the private lives of female politicians, and in particular to a leader's family. As a matter of fact, whereas a man's identity is not necessarily linked to the role of husband and father, there is a persistent habit of defining a woman's identity by marriage and motherhood. If being a wife and a mother is reassuring information (since it certifies that a woman possesses sufficient female traits), this status always raises speculation about the degree of commitment and dedication of a woman who may need some flexibility in balancing her family and career. On the other hand, unmarried or childless women experience difficulties in generating a positive impression

because not being a wife or a mother is perceived as deviant. Such women are expected to explain why they did not have children, and they are exposed to speculation that this may be a calculated career move.

If Chapter 5 was devoted to the impact of the personalization of politics on the physical image of leadership, Chapter 6 investigates the impact that celebrity politics and the "intimate politician" have on women in power. The chapter deals with how female political leaders handle the family issue—how they balance the need to disclose their private life with the desire to set some limits on privacy. One of the arguments is that, even if bringing the private self into the public domain can be seen as natural for women because of their more intimate style of speech, reduction of the privacy zone may damage women with a family, who are easily questioned about having sufficient time and dedication to devote to their public duties. Finally, the chapter also analyzes the image of women leaders in top positions who are also wives or daughters of prominent politicians. This has actually been the case with some of the most famous of all national leaders: Indira and Sonia Gandhi, Corazon Aquino, Benazir Bhutto, Christina Kirchner, and Hillary Clinton. Such an analysis offers the opportunity to discuss yet another aspect of the family influence on the career of female leaders.

Chapter 7 discusses the theme of female leadership by relating it to the crisis of representative democracy. People's growing dissatisfaction with institutions, parties, and existing political elites has produced a diffused and generalized desire for a new style of leadership. The chapter argues that women are more likely to have an attitude toward power that is in great demand in contemporary societies. Therefore, a deeper reflection on gender and leadership may be the basis for advancement toward a revision of the current notion of leadership. The chapter follows the line of those scholars, such as Pittinsky et al. (2007), who believe that the only possible departure from the traditional male concept of leadership consists of a degenderization of leadership. It is fundamental to overcome the polarization that insists on a predetermined and gender-constrained range of models of leadership. A core argument of the chapter is that media might be major agents of change. In particular, as it promotes a more horizontal interaction among leaders and citizens, the Internet has the potentiality for reframing the relationship between

leaders and followers and giving a boost to women who aspire to a top political career.

In conclusion, the interplay between new trends in political communication and women leadership is a very stimulating area for future research. Such an effort may not only enrich our scholarly understanding but also offer insight on how to make our democratic systems more flexible and capable of facing effectively the challenges in contemporary societies.

1
Gender and Models of Leadership

Power: A male concept?

In her book *Thinking about Leadership*, Nannerl Keohane writes: "throughout history, leadership has been closely associated with masculinity. The king, the father, the boss, the lord are stereotypical images of leadership" (Keohane 2010, 121). As a matter of fact, the exercise of power and authority has always been seen as a man's prerogative. Even if, as Solheim (2000, 4) observes, power is "neutral," "the characteristics that power brings to mind are usually masculine, often tinged with psychosexual connotations: strength, force and authority over the others."

Despite the persistent domination of a male image of power, in more recent times we have seen the emergence of a lively debate on gender differences in how men and women deal with power. According to James March and Thierry Weil: "The usual argument is that men are more likely than women to define relationships in terms of power, of who dominates whom—who wins, who loses. For men, it is said, being inclined to use power is more significant than using it. Women, it is said, are inclined to use power but not to claim it. Observed differences in 'assertiveness' are said to stem from the greater need of men to be publicly acknowledged as powerful rather than from any advantage explicit assertiveness provides in influencing the course of events" (2005, 73).

The association between men and power derives also from the fact that, historically, the power of men has been public and visible, whereas when women had power, it was mostly covert and

informal. This is particularly true for the field of politics and government, where until the past century women exerted their political influence only as a result of private relationships, whether as wives or mistresses. The only exception to the rule was a small group of reigning queens who inherited the crown in the absence of male heirs (Stevens 2007, 119). In the common view, power and leadership have so become the exclusive domain of men. Even if in more recent years a growing number of women have broken the glass ceiling by becoming party leaders, prime ministers, and heads of state, the assumption "think power, think male" is still manifest in politics and in society.

The relationship between gender and leadership is mostly fed by a number of well-rooted stereotypes about men and women. In the next chapter of this book, I examine in detail such positive and negative stereotypes and their implications for the success of women leaders. Here the analysis is limited to some general observations. First of all, there are very basic and widespread stereotypes that attribute different psychological traits to the two sexes. In this regard, the common view is that men are ambitious, confident, dominant, and assertive; women are kind, helpful, warm, and gentle (Carli and Eagly 2007, 127). Given that, as discussed above, power and leadership have historically been in the hands of men, it is not surprising that the qualities attributed to leadership coincide with the aforementioned traits of masculinity. Moreover, women themselves have difficulty identifying with such a notion of leadership (Solheim 2000, 4). As Cantor and Bernay (1992, 37) observed in their seminal book on women in power, "When women try to put on the mantle of male-style power—force and strength, devoid of the feminine caring aspect—they frequently feel extremely uncomfortable. They sense that power is 'not me.' "

This association between individual male personal traits and leadership might also be encouraged by the traditional approach to the study of leadership, which has long supported the belief that leadership is a matter of distinctive individual qualities. As a matter of fact, the psychology of leadership has long endorsed the view that leadership is based on the character of individual leaders: "In this way, leadership is seen to arise from a distinctive psychology that sets the mind and lives of great leaders apart from those of others—as superior, special, different" (Haslam et al. 2011, 1). It is the so-called Great Man model, which is "irredeemably masculine,

heroic, individualist and normative in orientation and nature" (Grint 2010, 40). As Duerst-Lahti and Kelly (1995, 24) also observe, the Great Man model illustrates better than any other the masculine marking of the traditional theory of leadership. Even when, after the end of the Second World War and the era of great dictatorships, the fascination with charismatic leaders lessened, the approach of mainstream leadership studies remained that of explaining leadership with reference to the character and personality of individual leaders (Haslam et al. 2011, Chapter 1). The result was that this individualistic model of leadership, on the one hand, emphasized the link between male traits and leadership traits; on the other hand, it implicitly stated that those people lacking some fixed and specific leadership traits (say, women) could not be leaders.[1] This had notable and constraining consequences for those women who wanted to pursue a political career. If the dominant model implied that the male sex was more suited to leadership than the female one, then the only strategy available to women was to emphasize personal qualities that deviated from the female stereotypes (Haslam et al. 2011, 51). As illustrated in the next chapters, this has been the case of several "Iron Ladies," that is to say, women political leaders who distanced themselves from the female sex and stressed their own character traits, usually very much in line with the masculine stereotype. Only in recent times have women politicians who aspire to leadership started thinking in terms of another strategy, changing the list of the distinctive qualities that qualify for leadership in order to make it compatible with the female sex.

If in politics the scarcity of women rulers has contributed to the persistence of a male model, it has to be underlined that leadership continues to be associated with masculinity also in those other spheres of human action, even where the number of women at the top has actually increased. In general, it is observed that organizational culture manifests an evident masculine perspective (Miller 2006, 6). In contrast to the limited literature and empirical research on female political leaders, management studies and organization theory have directed great attention to the nature of the relationship between gender and leadership, and therefore may offer insight also to those interested in the political field. In fact, those disciplines have developed a flourishing literature on the gendered perceptions of who can be regarded as a "successful top manager": "A consistent

finding is that the 'successful leader' is perceived to behave and act in ways associated with masculine traits . . . Therefore, the 'think manager, think male' phenomenon prevails in organization studies" (Collins and Singh 2006, 17).

Such findings seem consistent over time and across space. Some studies carried out in the 1970s revealed the existence of a notable relationship between sex-role stereotypes and the characteristics perceived as necessary for success in management. As a matter of fact, both male and female managers perceived that the traits associated with managerial success were more likely to be held by men than by women (Schein 1973, 1975). Subsequent comparative research, carried out in a number of countries and reviewed in Schein et al. (1996), has shown that the situation remains more or less the same for males, who continue to perceive the managerial position as requiring masculine characteristics. By contrast, among females, findings vary with the country: in the U.S., men and women are seen as equally likely to possess requisite management characteristics, while "think manager, think male" is still in place in Britain, Germany, China, and Japan (Schein and Mueller 1992; Schein et al. 1996). So the authors conclude that "despite the many historical, political and cultural differences that exist among these five countries, the view of women as less likely than men to possess requisite management characteristics is a commonly held belief among male management students worldwide" (Schein et al. 1996, 39).

In contrast to this well-established view, some studies applying a semantic approach to investigate the perception and conceptualization of leadership, and in particular the compatibility between women and leadership roles, offer more encouraging evidence. According to Koch et al. (2005), with respect to the pioneering studies of the 1980s, some changes have taken place in the concepts of woman and man in relation to leadership. In their study, the word "businesswoman" forms a cluster with those of "manager" and "leadership"; that is to say, the three concepts are seen as somehow linked. The authors stress that the concept of man has been replaced by that of businesswoman, while in the previous studies it was in the same cluster as manager and leadership. This finding points to the advancement toward separation of gender concepts and leadership-related concepts; in fact, the concepts of man and woman have both remained external to the cluster of leadership. Therefore, Koch

et al. conclude that "societal gender roles seem to be changing in the direction of more representational and also more factual gender equality" (9). Since mental representations of concept and language have an important influence on behavior, no doubt the way leadership is conceived may become a major factor of change. In the end, what matters is formulated this way by Collins and Singh (2006, 27): " 'Think manager, think male' needs to translated into think leader, think the best person possible: male or female."

The female style of leadership

If these accounts on leadership and gender focus on the notion of leadership and on the controversy over whether women are more or less suitable to the exercise of power, another subsequent issue is how women and men use power. Do the two sexes share the same style of leadership, or do they differ noticeably? In this regard, it should be observed that "assumptions about gender differences in leadership styles and effectiveness are widespread, although the evidence for such assumptions is weaker than commonly supposed" (Kellerman and Rhodes 2007, 16). Empirical research in the field has advanced two alternative perspectives that may be regarded as a direct expression of the so-called equality-difference debate (Stevens 2007, 136). On the one hand, it is assumed that women have a style of leadership reflecting different skills and psychological predispositions; on the other hand, women and men are supposed to lead in the same way.

According to the first line of reasoning, the underlying belief is that gender exerts a huge impact on how people lead. This view may take two forms. March and Weil (2005, 75) illustrate the point: "In the first form, it is argued that there are inherent gender differences traceable to biology and that these differences are, in fact, more important than such things as economic position, etc. in explaining male-female differences in leadership . . . In the second form, it is argued that sexual differentiation is a fundamental feature of human existence (or the ideological interpretation of that experience) around which human organization is built." Or, to use Solheim's words, "beyond biological differences, some theorists point out that people themselves produce and construct differences (psychologically, socially and culturally) between men and women" (2000, 9). In this line of thinking,

differences are created and can potentially be modified, but they are nevertheless very influential in determining human behavior.

Acknowledgment of gender differences does not mean all women in power share the same distinctive style of leadership. But as Keohane writes (2010, 128), "It is not implausible to claim that being a person of one sex or the other often has observable implications for how one uses power. The claim that sex (or gender) matters for leadership could be put in terms of probabilities: the chances that a woman will lead in a way we might characterize as notably feminine are greater than the probability that a male leader will behave in such a way."

All this said, what are the distinctive features of the feminine style of leadership? The core of the difference argument revolves around the opposition between competition and collaboration. Men are supposed to "opt more willingly than women for strategies of competition and confrontation" and, "unlike women, are stimulated by a competitive situation" (March and Weil 2005, 62). Moreover, socialization and education play a major role: "While men are better prepared by their education for competitive strategies, women are better prepared for *liaison* strategy" (63). In general terms, Kellerman and Rhodes (2007, 16–17) synthesize the "conventional wisdom" in this way: "Female leaders are more participatory and interpersonally oriented than male leaders and are more likely to adopt empathetic, supportive, and collaborative approaches."

To what extent is this view of the feminine style of leadership consistent with empirical evidence? For several authors, the difference between male and female leaders is very clear. It consists in the "female advantage," as Hegelsen (1990) calls it,[2] and includes the tendency to share power and encourage participation and consensual decision-making. In her seminal article, Judy Rosener found that women could succeed "because of—not in spite of—certain characteristics generally considered to be feminine and inappropriate in leaders" (1990, 120). Basing her research on a survey sponsored by the International Women's Forum and a number of interviews with some of the women respondents, Rosener advanced the argument that women actually lead in a different way and called this style "interactive leadership" in the sense that "women actively work to make their interactions with subordinates positive for everyone involved. More specifically, the women encourage participation, share power

and information, enhance other people's self-worth, and get others excited about their work" (120). Rosener's insight has been further explored by several other studies. Stanford et al. (1995), for instance, developed a heuristic model of female leadership that they describe as follows: "This model characterizes a woman leader as one who prefers to operate from a *reward* or *referent* power base. She possesses a high degree of employee involvement that typically results in a team-based management approach. Additionally, this woman has entrepreneurial vision, which she is able to communicate effectively to her employees; this in turn serves as an extraordinary motivating force to achieve the organization's mission. Lastly, this female leader fosters mutual trust and respect between herself and her employees" (15). Along the same lines, Alimo-Metcalfe (1995) has shown that female and male managers' perceptions of the qualities required for leadership are very different from one another and consistent with the findings discussed above. In sum, management studies offer an extended literature that stresses the existence of a "gendered leadership style in which male managers are more likely to be autocratic and employ a command and control style of leadership, whereas women prefer to lead in ways that are consensual, empowering, encourage participation and team-work" (Collins and Singh 2006, 15).

Although substantially in line with such findings about the greater predisposition of women to use democratic and consensual strategies, some authors are more skeptical that gender plays a central role at the top level. They observe that differences between male and female leaders are fewer. Women who gain high-level authority tend to resemble their male counterparts (Nicolau-Smokoviti 2004). According to Vianello and Moore, "Position in hierarchy discriminates equally among women in the sense that those who are in a lower position appear to share the aforementioned characteristics (be more inclined to share power, try to promote consensus and participation, etc.) to a higher degree. In other words, high levels of authority are related to a competitive, directive and risky leadership in the case of women also" (2004, 184). The same argument is advanced by Peters and Kabacoff (2002); although in previous research they found a number of differences between the leadership style of men and women, such dissimilarities appeared notably reduced in a study focused only on leaders at the very top. At the

top level, "executive women were seen to be as strategic and willing to take risks as men" (4). Therefore, the authors conclude that those are "the two big differences between the average female manager and those women who have broken through the glass ceiling" (5).

Other studies are even more radical in their rejection of the existence of substantial differences between men and women leaders. For instance, Oshagbemi and Gill (2003) found that women managers do not differ from their male colleagues in their directive, consultative, and participative leadership styles. Also, a number of studies reviewed by Collins and Singh (2006, 16) point to no large difference in leadership style and behavior. The acknowledgment of such a fact does not necessarily mean that all women in power act in a typically masculine way. It is true that, in the effort to adapt to a prevalently male environment, women leaders can behave like men; for instance, female leaders could approve of tough behavior more than ordinary women, as reported by Clift and Brazaitis (2000), who interviewed a group of leading female politicians on Thatcher's decision to fight the Falklands war.[3] However, according to other studies, it may well be that female and male leaders appear similar since both groups are equally inclined to a collaborative style (Collins and Singh 2006, 15). More generally, following the advocates of the no-difference approach, one may advance that in-group variability is the true determinant of styles of leadership, while gender appears to be a secondary factor.

In conclusion, although evidence does not unanimously support the difference thesis, if we look at the whole body of empirical research, the balance is in favor of the idea that women possess a somewhat distinctive leadership style, in the sense that they are more inclined to adopt more democratic decision-making and give more value to persuasion strategies. Also, the limited research focused on political contexts has confirmed that women politicians see themselves as different from their male colleagues in how they carry out their jobs. Available studies, however, focus on representatives in the British Parliament (Childs 2004); as for party leadership and higher executive offices, such as those of the prime minister or the president, the role requirements could partially shape leadership style. Therefore, the findings of the aforementioned research on leaders at the very top are likely to interpret female political leadership in a more plausible way. To explain why top-level women managers

adopt behavior considered as typically masculine, such as taking risks and thinking strategically, Peters and Kabacoff (2002, 3) invoke two arguments: first, the role requirements for top-level positions imply a more limited range of behavior to be successful, and second, the selection process for these offices tends to identify people who are more like one another, whether men or women. These two lines of explanation may hold for political leadership as well. In politics, top positions certainly demand a degree of directive behavior because of the hierarchical structure of power and the many situations that require decisive action. Moreover, the selection process of political leaders is highly competitive, and only candidates (either men or women) who have a predisposition to compete may succeed. For all these reasons, even though the average female politician may display a very different approach to the job, we may expect the leadership styles of our female political rulers to be more similar to men's.

Transformational leadership

In discussing the issue of female leadership, a special role is allocated to the notion of transformational leadership advanced by James MacGregor Burns in *Leadership* (1978) and subsequently developed in *Transforming Leadership* (2003). Transformational leaders are those able to communicate a vision to their followers, forcing them to rise above self-interest. MacGregor Burns writes: "Leaders take the initiative in mobilizing people for participation in the processes of change, encouraging a sense of collective identity and collective efficacy, which in turn brings stronger feelings of self-worth and self-efficacy . . . The word for this process is *empowerment*. Instead of exercising power over people, transforming leaders champion and inspire followers" (25–26). Transformational leadership is developed in opposition to so-called transactional leadership, which is based on an exchange of social or economic resources between the leader and the followers.

The concept elaborated by MacGregor Burns has attracted the interest of scholars in the field of management and organization theory. It was subsequently detailed and operationalized for empirical research: "Transformational leadership involves establishing oneself as a role model by gaining followers' trust and confidence. Such leaders delineate future goals, develop plans to achieve those goals,

and innovate even when their organization is already successful. By mentoring and empowering their subordinates, such leaders encourage them to develop their potential and thus to contribute more effectively to their organization . . . Leadership researchers contrasted transformational leaders with transactional research, appealing to subordinates' self-interest by establishing exchange relationships with them. This type of leadership involves clarifying subordinates' responsibilities, rewarding them for meeting objectives, and correcting them for failing to meet objectives" (Carli and Eagly 2007, 136).

The concept of transformational leadership may be regarded as gender-neutral since it is elaborated without any reference to gender roles or stereotypes. MacGregor Burns does not seem to see women as more suitable to fit the model; for instance, he took Queen Elizabeth I of England as a paradigmatic example of a transactional leader since she did not cause "permanent changes in English institutions and policies" (2003, 39), but "to achieve stabilizing changes she sought she used a survivor's careful, transactional strategies, a low-risk pursuit of limited, but clear goals" (2003, 41).[4] Although transformational leadership transcends gender differences, this model has assumed a key role in discussions on the specific features of female leadership. As a matter of fact, several studies stress the many points in common between how women lead and the notion of transformational leadership (Rosener 1990; Bass et al. 1996). Also, studies that found small differences in leadership styles agree that women tend to behave consistently with the transformational style (Eagly et al. 2003). The basic idea is that transformational leadership is more congenial to women for two main reasons: first, it is closer to the standard behavior stereotypically associated with their role, and second, women are trained to employ consensual and empowering methods through their socialization (Collins and Singh 2006, 14). This does not necessarily imply that the totality of women leaders adopt that model. As another advocate of the difference acknowledges, "We know that women are capable of making their way through corporations by adhering to a traditional corporate model and that they can yield power in ways similar to men" (Rosener 1990, 125). To sum up, one may argue that women are predisposed to transformational leadership, but nothing prevents them from adopting a complete different style of leadership.

Transformational leadership is related to previous traditions of political leadership, in particular *charismatic* leadership (Weber 1978; Willner 1984). As Mumford (2006, 6) observes: "Although theories of charismatic and transformational leadership differ from each other in some notable ways, they are based on a similar proposition. Both theories hold that the market impact of outstanding leaders on followers can be attributed to the leaders' effective articulation of a vision—an emotionally evocative image of an idealized future." What differs is the greater focus of transformational theories on interaction with followers: "Thus transformational theories stress the importance of intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation as well as vision." In some ways, it could be said that the notion of transformational leadership consists of a step toward closing the gap between male and female styles of leadership. In fact, since charismatic leadership appears in times of social crisis and concerns the capability of "mobilizing followers in some magical way," "charismatic leaders are predominantly men—because times of crisis, often associated with a war of some kind, usually favour those in command of the military, who have been and still are predominantly men" (Grint 2010, 93). However, we could also conceive of charismatic leadership in a "weak" form according to which the relationship between the leader and the followers "is based upon deeply and shared ideological (not material) values where the charismatics accomplish unusual (rather than miraculous) feats through followers who are exceptionally loyal to, and have a high degree of trust in their leader . . . This bears an uncanny resemblance to transformational leadership" (Grint 2010, 96).

To conclude, the notion of transformational leadership may be regarded as a bridge between the traditional view of a good leader as one whose primary impact lies in elaborating a vision and a view of a good leader as one who, starting from a vision, is also able to work on the aspirations and motivations of the followers. Solheim writes: "The objective is to go beyond power and include mutual needs, aspirations and values. By turning followers into leaders, the transformational leader becomes a better leader" (2000, 6). But transformational leadership may also be considered a tool for closing the leadership gender gap. As discussed in more detail in the concluding chapter, it facilitates inclusion of women in the club of outstanding and effective political leaders without singling out

a notion of female leadership as very different from a male one. Such a perspective promises to be especially significant for political leadership for which, as observed before, the functions of leaders and the role requirements imply a more limited range of behavior to be successful. Therefore, as argued by Pittinsky et al. (2007, 97), the best strategy to increase the number of women at the top could not be to label women leaders as "necessarily and disproportionally possessing" distinctive traits, but rather *degender* leadership models in order to better accommodate both men and women in power.

2
The Media and Representation of Leadership

The mediatization and personalization of politics

The expanded role of the media in the political arena has produced many changes in the political process. Even those who do not hold radical views regarding the intrusion of the media into the political field recognize that politics has become "mediatized" in the sense that it "has lost its autonomy, has become dependent in its central functions on mass media, and it is continuously shaped by interactions with mass media" (Mazzoleni and Shulz 1999, 250). The power of the media lies in the fact that they "construct the public sphere of information" (Mazzoleni and Shulz 1999, 250). Decisions on whether to cover candidates and events depend on their suitability and adaptability to the rules of the media system. For political actors, access to the media stage and therefore to the public sphere is conditional on the acceptance of the "laws" of the media. As Meyer (2002, 46) wrote, "the media have an extremely limited capacity to transmit a full and complete picture of the nearly limitless wealth of events that comprise political reality so they have to pick and choose what they will feature and how they will present it." Therefore, the media focus on those aspects that can attract the audience's attention. In this regard, the personal factor can appear more appealing than all the other more abstract elements of politics.

TV plays a crucial role: "More than printed media, television automatically focuses on persons and personalities: 'television turns faces into arguments' " (Karvonen 2010, 4; citing Hart 1999). Following its emergence as the most popular source of political information,

candidates and parties have been relying on this medium as the primary tool of communication. As Newman says, "Visual aids allowed candidates to craft careful images of themselves that would sell their ideas to the electorate" (1999, 21). The complex process commonly referred to as the "personalization" of politics involves crafting both the candidates' images and how those images are decoded by the recipients of the communication, namely the media and ultimately the citizens. As a consequence, today "electoral campaigns and propaganda may centre increasingly on individual candidates instead of parties, their platforms and the collective interests they claim to represent" (Karvonen 2010, 5).

Maarek (2011, 47) observes that "more and more these days, as campaign personalization grows in importance, the politician's image is a key factor in the electoral process. In some cases, the politician's image has even been credited as one of the major factors of victory." It is not surprising, therefore, that a large part of political marketing research focuses on the strategies a leader may employ to positively impress the public (Newman 1999; Kotler and Kotler 1999; Louw 2005). Because an image is created through the use of visual impressions, a "script" that may appeal to the voters (Louw 2005, 179) implies not only personality traits, qualifications, and previous experience but also body appearance, hairstyle, and clothing. As highlighted in the following chapters, the process of crafting and "selling" a candidate's image and the way that the media and the public perceive it cannot be considered gender-neutral. In particular, the media tend to overemphasize female politicians' looks and attire at the expense of more substantial aspects of their political identity and character.

A key facet of the personalization of politics is the fact that the media tend to frame elections not as a competition between ideas or ideologies but as a sort of horse race between candidates. According to some studies, the state of the horse race now accounts for news coverage more than any other category of news (Iyengar and McGrady 2007, 69) while "coverage of issues has receded into the background" (70). A very competitive frame, such as the horse race, is usually not much appreciated by women politicians; according to Braden (1996, 16), they usually complain about TV news "because it tends to oversimplify issues and overemphasize conflict." Women politicians may feel threatened by a high degree of conflict for multiple reasons.

First, as we have seen in the previous chapter, women are supposed to prefer fair play and softer leadership. Second, as the tone of the campaign becomes aggressive, women are more vulnerable: if they do not react, they are regarded as too weak, and if they react, they violate the unwritten rules of femininity. In this regard, it has often been observed that negative attacks by women may be counterproductive because they are seen as deviant from standards of kindness and understanding (Braden 1996, 142).[1]

In principle, due to its high degree of "spectacularization" and conflict, one may think that a high degree of personalization of politics is not really an advantage for women political leaders. Indeed, the way the mediatization of politics has supported and partly exalted the personal factor in politics has often been coherent with a substantially masculine notion of leadership, according to which some aggressiveness is not only tolerated but also appreciated. Should one deduce that mediatized leadership—seen as a condition for which leaders have adapted to changes in the communication strategies and subordinated their message and style to fit the TV format—is an exclusively male domain? Despite the fact that in the last 50 years all women leaders have appeared on TV and have used TV propaganda such as advertisements, there are not enough of them who can be considered leaders "born" on TV. Just to give some recent examples: in the 2007 French presidential contest between Nicolas Sarkozy and Ségolène Royal, the former was regarded as the true TV star while Royal was associated with new media. Neither the German Chancellor Angela Merkel nor Hillary Clinton has ever been considered especially proficient in promoting herself on TV. More generally, no woman has been remembered for introducing new practices in televised political communication, unlike Charles de Gaulle and Ronald Reagan with their speeches (Campus 2010b), and Tony Blair with his press conferences (Seymour-Ure 2003). Similarly, no woman has appeared on the list of telepopulist leaders (in Taguieff's definition of 2002, those who establish their leadership on TV, like Silvio Berlusconi, by proclaiming themselves defenders of the people). In other words, although some women leaders are good communicators and employ political marketing techniques, it is more difficult to identify a woman who has exploited TV as her primary and almost exclusive channel to project her image and vision.

In contrast to what these arguments seem to suggest, some scholars are more positive about the relationship between female leadership and TV. For instance, Jamieson (1988, 81) has advanced the thesis that TV is an "intimate medium" and therefore well suited to women politicians. According to her, TV must by necessity transform complex political issues into dramatic narratives. It is commonly accepted that women are more talented storytellers than men. The core of Jamieson's argument looks similar to that of Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles (2002): "political intimacy often occurs within the context of 'feminine' symbolism because television requires that political speakers assume a more womanly, or feminine style of communication" (quoted by Negrine and Stanyer 2007, 252). Another advantage for women on TV is that they are more expressive and use more facial expressions. For instance, research found that in candidates' advertisements women make more eye contact (Bystrom 1995)[2] and smile more than men (Bystrom et al. 2004, 37). In other words, women's body language seems more consistent with the dramatic style of political TV.

On the other hand, it should be considered that the "increasingly intimate nature of mediated politics" (Negrine and Stanyer 2007, 237) is another consequence of the process of personalization. Stanyer (2007, 79) describes the rise of the so-called intimate politician this way: "Over time, citizens, through expanding media outlets, have been provided with detailed information about the persona of leading political actors. An important point needs to be made: not only has the rise of electronic media rendered various political actors visible—leading to their growing familiarity—but it has also led to a more intimate relationship between prominent political actors and citizens." Stanyer bases his argument on Thompson's notion of non-reciprocal intimacy according to which the personal relationship that can be formed through the media creates a sort of "intimacy at a distance" that "does not involve reciprocity and mutuality characteristic of face-to-face interaction" (1995, 219).

An important part of this intimate relationship between political leaders and ordinary citizens stems from disclosure of personal information, especially concerning private lives. This body of information has the aim of providing citizens with a basis for making inferences about the character of leaders and then defining the terms of their

attraction and attention toward them. The most interesting aspect of this nonreciprocal intimacy is the fact that "individuals can conceive of the others they come to know through the media in a way that is relatively unconstrained by the reality-defining features of face-to-face interaction" (Thompson 1995, 220). This means candidates and politicians have room for maneuvering to project a positive image of themselves that does not necessarily correspond to their true self.

Disclosure of personal information is the outcome of the interplay between media and politicians. If, on the one hand, the media have promoted celebrity politics by covering politicians in the same way as actors or sports and TV stars, on the other hand, politicians voluntarily reveal aspects of their personal lives, as their predecessors would never have done a few decades ago. Therefore, the process of adaptation to the media logic as it is required by this mediatization of politics necessarily implies acceptance of "going personal." This becomes inescapable because, as Thompson has stressed, "mediated visibility is difficult to control" and "the new and changing technologies make it more and more difficult to throw a veil of secrecy" (2000, quoted by Negrine and Stanyer 2007, 262). Today, media intrusion into politicians' personal lives is a feature of the political context of most Western democracies.[3]

The phenomenon of character assassination of candidates, using damaging information about private lives, has become so widespread and recurrent that "more often than not, it is not difficult to find wrongdoing and damaging material for most parties and candidates. Since it is rare that personal lives are without shadows, and given the tendency of many people, particularly men, to brag and be indiscreet, personal sins and political corruption brew a powerful cocktail of intrigues and gossip that become the daily staple of media politics" (Castells 2007, 243).[4] Thanks to this overexposition, it is useless and even counterproductive to try to keep private many aspects of personal life. Rather, sometimes revealing an embarrassing episode in advance may be a strategy for preventing being brought down by a subsequent scandal.

To a certain extent, however, going personal may have positive consequences as well. As Stanyer (2007, 81) observes, "leading politicians publicize information to help construct a favourable impression of themselves." Since it is impossible to establish a separation between the public and private spheres, a massive effort is made to

project a positive image. In some ways, what can be said for the general process of mediatization of politics applies here as well: the more that political actors submit themselves to the rules governing access to media, the more they regain autonomy and control over the way the media present them to the public (Meyer 2002, 52). Aware of the fact that, in any case, the media will provide citizens with a flow of personal information, leaders try to package their own public persona, starting with at least some particulars of their private life. To this aim, they often use their biography and family life for publicity purposes; they are "willing to allow cameras inside their homes, even their wardrobes" (Stanyer 2007, 83).

In the end, as Deacon (2004, 22) observes, it is not appropriate to attribute the primary responsibility of media emphasis on the private life only to the press—forcing politicians to go personal—or to accuse the politicians themselves, who are ready to exploit personal lives when it serves their purposes. The truth is that "there are competing dynamics evident within media and political systems as well as between them, and it is the combination of these factors that is fuelling media intrusiveness." In any case, the boundaries of the "zone of privacy"—that is to say, an area of issues that are taboo subjects for the press—have become very controversial. Conflict around the privacy of politicians is destined to remain a key feature of contemporary mediated political communication (Stanyer 2007, 91).

To what extent can this phenomenon of going personal be gender-specific? According to Van Zoonen (2005, 2006), the evolution of political communication can be more controversial for women leaders than for men. As discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, the private life of men is subject to discussion only in case of troubles, such as infidelity or difficult relationships among family members. By contrast, a female leader can be criticized in any event. Women in power are compelled to show themselves to be able to perform their duties without sacrificing their husband and children. And if they are not married, they are scrutinized as not "normal." To avoid these sorts of undesired inquiries and speculations, some women leaders can choose to protect their privacy zone and not be keen to share details of their private life or show their sentiments in public. Because they feel more vulnerable and subject to potential criticism than their male colleagues, they may opt for a general strategy of rejecting

personalization of politics that is too extreme. This is the case, for instance, with leaders such as Merkel and the Finnish President Tarja Halonen (Van Zoonen 2006). At the same time, however, we may find examples of others who, seeing the advantages of going personal, are interested in having any "conversation" with their supporters—to borrow a term from the campaign of Hillary Clinton, who, by contrast, employed this slogan precisely to stress her openness and accessibility.

Popular culture and leadership

Some recent developments, and in particular the emergence of new TV genres, are producing remarkable and probably irreversible transformations in contemporary political communication. Therefore, analysis cannot be confined to the traditional tools of political propaganda but needs to explore the new frontiers of the mediatization of politics. First of all, TV as a political resource is no longer represented only by TV news, press conferences, and advertising. The scenario is now much more complex. Dahlgren writes: "As we move beyond news programs and look at television in broader terms, and at popular culture more generally, we find degrees of political relevance emerging in ways quite at variance with conventional conceptions of political communication" (2009, 141). In other words, we have entered the era of the popularization of politics (Street 1997, 2003; Van Zoonen 2005; Jones 2005; Riegert 2007a; Dahlgren 2009; Mazzoleni and Sfardini 2009).

As emphasized by Dahlgren (2009, 141), some of the key elements of the popularization of politics are first, a blurring of borders between politics and political culture; second, a mix of rational and affective responses; and third, a hybridization of program genres. That is, we register an increasing convergence between politics and entertainment that is actually reconceptualizing the meaning and scope of the relationship between citizens and politics. As Mazzoleni and Sfardini (2009, 11) call it, here is "pop politics," a "new form of politics and political communication." In this framework, the role of politicians and of political leaders is changing as well.

In the previous section, I discussed the effects of the personalization of politics. From the perspective of popularization of politics, there is a close connection between emphasis on politicians' personal

traits and the process of celebrity building: "Politicians can take on an aura of celebrity, equivalent to the stars of popular culture. In the shift away from emphasizing party ideology, the political style of individual politicians becomes central to how audiences experience them and evaluate their performance, authenticity, and political capabilities" (Dahlgren 2009, 137). But the phenomenon goes beyond the simple prominence of individual politicians. Above all, it concerns the notion of citizenship. Traditionally, the ideal citizen is a well-informed individual who is engaged in a variety of civic activities. In fact, this is a very elitist picture that may accommodate only a minority of citizens. From this point of view, Van Zoonen observes, popular culture—including participatory entertainment like *Big Brother* and so on—helps to "open up the political field":

> There are more fundamental and helpful similarities between the active fans of participatory multimedia entertainment and the committed citizen . . . The way fans are positioned, the activities they undertake, and the relation they have with their objects is not fundamentally different from what expected by good citizens. [For this reason,] It becomes justifiable to examine whether and how the defining paradigmatic and syntagmatic features of popular culture—a focus of individual and a preference for narrative—are present in politics and how they entertain the citizen; in other words, how they make it pleasurable to engage in politics, and how they maintain the idea that politics is important . . . To be successful in the entertainment of citizenship, the politician has to operate with equal accomplishment in the field of politics and popular culture.
>
> (2005, 145)

In this evolving context, one may wonder how the relationship between leaders and citizens is in some ways conditioned by gender. In the previous section, I stressed that the personalization of politics and going personal can be problematic for women leaders for several reasons, especially for the overemphasis on appearance and body language, and too-close scrutiny of female leaders' private lives. However, there are also aspects of the popularization of politics that may advantage the political career of women. The key point is

that popular culture has produced some changes in the perceptions of leadership. For instance, soap operas on the American presidency have produced a sort of humanization of the office (Van Zoonen 2005). Think of the very popular *The West Wing*. Riegert (2007a, 15) observes that "it represents a wish fulfillment for the need to reconnect to the political sphere and to the way political leaders should behave." In some ways, *The West Wing* projects a more multifaceted image of leadership: the president is seen as a human being with feelings, weaknesses, doubts (Van Zoonen 2005; Riegert 2007b). It is an image less consistent with the typically masculine stereotype that sees the leader as a strong, willful man, with clear ideas and no uncertainties.

Politics has started to assume the traits of a soap opera. In Street's opinion (2003, 86), "not just politics is *like* a soap opera, but it is a soap opera." This can be more evident in some countries than others, but the trend is almost irreversible: leaders are perceived as actors performing a role. Also, a researcher like Karvonen, who is among the most skeptical toward the process of personalization of politics and who considers it largely overestimated, has to acknowledge that how politics is presented by the media has been changing remarkably: "Coverage of political leaders centres on them as individuals more than in the past. They are presented in more familiar terms, their leadership qualities are discussed more and they are seen as players in a political game more than in the past. Candidates not only appear more than the parties in political advertising. Advertising has also become more personal when several candidates share advertising space. It is more important than in the past to present oneself in terms of image rather than collective social bonds" (2010, 99). But the most salient element is that this personal coverage concerns "the embodiment not only of political histories, issues, interests and communities but also of the ingredients of celebrity culture" (Van Zoonen 2005, 72).

Popular culture and entertainment are "able to use dramatic conflict and narrative, character and action, not least via celebrity-personifications, to get very close indeed to fundamental human, social, cultural (and political) dilemmas in ways that may capture and fire the popular imagination for straightforwardly political purposes" (Hartley 2007, 23–24). For instance, reality-TV formats have led to new discussion of the notion of representation. As Coleman

(2003, 751) observes, "politics has become more like a game, . . . and games have become more like politics." He takes *Big Brother* as a good example, with its protagonists scrutinized and rewarded or punished by a popular vote as well as by political candidates. *Big Brother* also offers the opportunity to reflect on the authenticity of individuals through a psychological mechanism that is supposed to be the same one employed in assessing political leaders. Judging authenticity means judging integrity of the self. How people look at *Big Brother* housemates is probably not so different from how they form their impressions of politicians.

In concluding this section, I suggest, in agreement with Riegert, that how the political is represented by such entertainment formats as soap operas, TV series, and reality shows can exert an impact on the audience's understanding of politics (2007a, 4–5). For women leaders, in particular, the consequence of all this depends on how far the popularization of politics is able to generate a broader notion of leadership, one that may make room also for stereotypically female traits and predispositions. In principle the new focus on politicians' emotional states and on their capacity for being authentic should advantage women, who are supposed to be more at ease with the realm of emotions and feelings. For this reason, although the popularization of politics has notable counterindications for female leaders, in the medium and long run changes in the perceptions of salient features of democratic process, and particularly in how citizens look at their representatives and rulers, may offer an opportunity to tip the balance in favor of the benefits.

New media, new leaders?

The flow of information in traditional mass communication—newspapers, TV, and radio—is typically one-way, with "messages produced by one set of individuals and transmitted to others . . . who are not partners in a reciprocal process of communicative exchanges but rather participants in a structured process of symbolic transmission" (Thompson 1995, 25). By contrast, the advent of the Internet and in particular its evolution to Web 2.0 has multiplied the forms of communicative exchanges. Together with the one-to-one communication of email and chat, and the one-to-many of webpages and online documents, other ways of communication have come

to the surface: "many-to-many" and "many-to-one." "Through technologies like Usenet, discussion boards, mailing list, weblogs (blogs) and peer-to-peer networks," says Chadwick, "the Net facilitates the 'many-to-many' communication in which large numbers of people simultaneously produce and receive information. Email, feedback forms and online polls allow 'many-to-one' communication by giving many users the chance to send information directly to the producer of a website, the author of a message on a discussion board, or a politician" (Chadwick 2006, 5). As Castells (2007, 246) writes, "The communication foundation of the network society is the global web of horizontal communication networks that include the multimodal exchange of interactive messages from many to many both synchronous and asynchronous . . . Appropriating the new forms of communication, people have built their own system of mass communication, via SMS, blogs, vlogs, podcasts, wikis, and the like."

Although in the modern era proficient leaders could excel just in typical one-to-many communications (as has been the case with several leaders who were born in the era of TV and flourished on it), the Internet forces politicians to use the many-to-many and many-to-one forms. Moreover, the web promotes the sort of appeal that crosses the usual divide between the elite and the people. According to Chadwick: "Online forms of interaction have an intrinsically egalitarian quality usually absent from the real world. This is due to the fact that traditional signs of social inequality—particularly gender, ethnicity, and age, but also regional accents and physical disabilities—are hidden from participants in a predominantly textual environment. Cyberspace, it is maintained, is not tarnished by the forms of prejudice that proliferate in visual culture" (2006, 26).

In light of all this, it can be argued that the web is well suited to accommodate a "feminine" approach to leadership. In his analysis of styles of power, James Hillman (2009, 22) underlines the dichotomy between the rigid hierarchy characterizing the traditional notion of power and the horizontal dimension of the organization model promoted by the feminist movements. In the feminist approach, there is plenty of room for groups, assemblies, and teams employing collegial decision-making instead of proper leadership. Therefore, if there exists an intrinsic element of horizontality in the way women approach power, or at least if they are really more inclined to

accommodate a nonhierarchical model of organization, then it is likely that women leaders have more inclination to use the web as a tool for communication, in the sense of either sharing views with other people (many-to-many communication) or receiving and using feedback (many-to-one).

Concerning the interaction between leaders and supporters on the web, in particular, the apparent horizontal dimension of feminine power is particularly fit for promoting an efficient communicative exchange, where the one-to-many communication of the leader to the followers and to voters interplays with the many-to-one communication of Internet users to the politician. Though in the traditional style of mediatized leadership, almost entirely focused on TV and old media, leaders exploit only the first side of the relationship by sending prepackaged messages to their followers; proper use of the Internet requires, as seen before, a high degree of reception of feedback coming from Internet users. From that point of view, the most successful candidates on the web, with the most popular sites, are those who convincingly elicit and carry on this conversation with followers and supporters.

If we have seen that, under some conditions, TV as well may suit the female style of communication because it projects a sense of the private self (Jamieson 1988, 81), the Internet can be regarded as an even more women-friendly medium. First of all, it has to be stressed that women and men use the Internet in different ways: women tend to use it mainly to communicate. They do it more than men: women send and receive more emails, especially personal emails with family and friends, and regard email as a tool to improve their relationship. In general, it appears that women value the web for enriching their relationships (Fallows 2005). Moreover, women do more social networking, according to a recent report,[5] and have a higher level of engagement with social networking sites. In other words, all findings confirm that female "internauts" are particularly prone to interact with other people on the web.

If we now look at political activities on the web, blogging and political discussion on social networks are playing an increasing role. As Lehman Schlozman et al. (2010, 498) observe, if blogging has "affinities" with offline activities (since "posting comments on someone else's blog is akin to writing a letter to the editor"), then "the

possibilities for political engagement through social network sites such as Facebook do not simply reproduce participation as we have always known it, but instead reflect some of the distinctive civic taste of post-boomer cohorts: their preference for participatory forms that are anchored in nonhierarchical and informal networks and that eschew such traditional political intermediaries as campaigns, parties, and interest groups."

The language of those new web activities is intimate, almost private. As Coleman and Blumler (2009, 37) wrote, "Informally expressed views are often constructed out of the messy fragments of mundane experience . . . the emergence of the blogosphere marks a transition from the kind of online political forum, with its rhythm of formal argument and counterargument, to more autonomous, self-expressive and experientially rooted approaches to the political. In blog posts the conventional political agenda is remixed to fit in with the ethos of citizens as self-reflecting, biographical beings whose encounters with structures and relationships of power obtain meaning through performances and narratives of everyday life." As a body of literature has highlighted (Tannen 1990; Lakoff 1990), there are differences in how women and men use forms of talk, and the former are more inclined to narration and conversation. In sum, it is true that "a medium, even a medium as revolutionary as this one, does not determine the content and the effect of the message," as Castells observes (2007, 248); however, certain characteristics of the medium make some communicative styles and some messages more successful and effective than others.

Starting from these premises, one could advance the hypothesis that it should be easier for women politicians to emphasize the interactive aspect of web propaganda. They should be more effective in mobilizing support, reinvigorating the relationship with followers, raising funds, and so on. But what does the evidence say? Is women leaders' use of the web really different from that of their male colleagues?

One of the most interesting cases of the use of the Internet to build electoral consensus is Ségolène Royal's presidential campaign. As we will see in more detail in Chapter 4, the trademark of Royal's campaign was a participative project launched through her website. She used the Internet to recruit volunteers and invited them to create a network of supporter blogs called "Ségoland." This online

community organized events and meetings that were supposed to help her draft a policy platform. According to the data released by her campaign organization, "the Royal campaign claimed to have recruited about 250,000 online supporters, who had helped generate 150,000 policy proposals and 1,400 blogs" (Vaccari 2008, 6).

Royal's candidacy for the presidential nomination of the Socialist Party was unprecedented: in fact she did not enjoy the support of most of the party establishment, which viewed her bid for the presidency as unviable and preferred other candidates. However, through creating this large online network, Royal was able to build a platform to challenge the party elite and become competitive in the selection process. Most of her support was built outside or at the periphery of the party (Ivaldi 2007) and produced an enlargement of party membership because a considerable number of Royal's fans became members expressly to vote for her (Dolez and Laurent 2007). Acquisition of those new members, mostly recruited on the Internet, altered the equilibrium of the internal forces between party factions and gave her the chance of winning the nomination (Ivaldi 2007).

If one takes into consideration that female leaders still encounter barriers and obstacles in the selection process for higher office, Royal's case is a demonstration of the Internet's potential for making the recruitment process of leaders more competitive for women. Web propaganda may well help all outsiders, especially women, emerge as viable candidates. In traditional parties such as the Socialist French, where the presidential candidate is chosen by party members, the role of the Internet is to enlarge the electorate by persuading people not previously involved in politics to become party members. In general, as Gibson, Nixon, and Ward (2003) have observed, the Internet can blur the lines between party members and informal supporters and activists. Even more massive and influential is the mobilization produced in institutional settings, where activism can be more easily transformed into electoral support, as in primary contests. In this regard, the selection of Barack Obama as the Democratic nominee in 2008 is a paradigmatic example of the extent of Internet influence in primary elections.

The key to Royal's success on the web has been her capability of starting a conversation with her supporters on the basis of the principle of "listening first." By giving them the possibility to take part in the drafting of her program, she was able to gain attention from

the youngest cohorts of French voters. The year preceding the election Royal was already rated as the politician whom young people considered closest to them (Muxel 2007, 9). She was especially popular among young women (Strudel 2006, 15). In discussing the role of the Internet in enhancing participation, especially among young people, Lehman Schlozman et al. (2010, 501) say "politicians' Facebook pages embed politics in a social context and turn political supporters into electronically linked friends and fans." Of course, this holds true well beyond Facebook, but it includes other Internet tools as well. Royal was able to exploit such a phenomenon. As previously observed, the overlapping between fan communities and political constituencies is one of the salient characteristics of the ongoing process of popularization of politics: "the relevance of popular culture for politics lies in the emotional constitution of electorates that involves the development and maintenance of affective bonds between voters, candidates, and parties" (Van Zoonen 2005, 66). The passion and involvement of the many Obama boys and girls who campaigned in 2008 has often been compared to the enthusiasm generated by rock stars. Internet practices of community building are the same, or at least very similar, for both fans and political supporters. For this reason, the web, more than any other, is the medium best suited to develop those affective bonds that are the basis of both groups' relationships. Although in the past the link between voters and parties was built on ideology and party identification, today the relationship between leaders and citizens is "based on such feelings as the appreciation of qualities and defects of the persons concerned, including the ability on the part of the leaders to transmit messages which are emotionally loaded and not merely tapping a rational chord" (Blondel and Thiebault 2010, 5). Consequently, the line of division between the world of politics and fandom has become quite blurred.

In conclusion, it can be reasonably argued, first, that women candidates are likely to be at ease with the horizontal communication prevailing online and could elicit more participation and activism through the web than through traditional media; and second, that female leaders have evident advantages in employing the web since the Internet may help them close the gap in terms of resources and support from the ruling elite. Royal and Obama's

examples are important breakthroughs in showing that typical in-group favoritism can be overcome through a massive investment on the web. Leadership selection is still deeply influenced by the fact that people have clear preferences and positively biased evaluations for members of their own groups. This means politicians tend to recruit leaders from among in-group members. In a male-dominated environment, promising women may not be given access to the inner circle, and aspiring female leaders are "subject to special scrutiny" (Rhode and Kellerman 2007, 10). As mentioned in the first chapter, very often those who rule the selection process think that women have more difficulty in winning and do not dote on them as viable candidates. This attitude has, notoriously, posed obstacles to increasing the number of women running for high office. The Internet can change the scenario by subverting this top-down method of selection. If a female candidate is able to build a large platform of enthusiastic supporters on the web, then she may force the party establishment to take her candidacy seriously.

Therefore, whenever the process of selection of candidates for higher office involves the electoral base, the Internet is destined to play a key role. By using it effectively, female leaders (as well as other outsiders) may successfully challenge the party's ruling elite. If, by contrast, the party's institutional setting makes the leadership contest a matter of acclamation or negotiation among the most influential members, clearly the role of the Internet is more limited. However, in any case a very popular candidate is able to exert pressure on the elite of the party, especially if boosted by the mass media. It should be stressed that ultimately parties need a winning candidate and cannot afford to reject one who promises to attract votes and is also a media favorite. The critical point is that it is not easy for an outsider to receive media attention unless he or she becomes an interesting phenomenon and therefore newsworthy. Existing evidence says that great popularity acquired on the Internet at the beginning of a campaign has helped candidates also break through traditional media at a subsequent stage. In the cases of Royal and Obama, the interplay between old and new media has been fundamental in allowing them to qualify as viable candidates. In some ways, the web was a steppingstone from which they could launch their candidacy.

To conclude: reasonably enough, the influence of the Internet is destined to increase. Therefore, anyone who desires to enter a leadership contest in the foreseeable future should be investing in the new technologies. And since the Internet may really be of help in overcoming some of the traditional obstacles confronting women in politics, this recommendation is even more valuable for an aspiring female leader.

3
Media Coverage of Women Leaders

Visibility: Quantity and quality of coverage of women leaders

One of the most discussed issues concerning media coverage of women politicians concerns "visibility," that is to say the degree of attention the media give them. In a more extended sense, visibility implies not only the quantity of coverage but also how the press frames that coverage. For instance, it is one thing to mention that a woman is a viable candidate, but another to present her as an underdog; it is one thing to talk about her qualifications for the office, but another to describe her appearance and attire. In other words, the fact that a woman is visible is inextricably linked to the frames under which she is made visible. Although the quantity of coverage is an easily measured indicator because it deals with the number of mentions, interpreting the quality of coverage—the lens through which a woman is seen—is a much more complex task because it is subject to subtler gendered constraints. In this section I analyze both aspects: first, the amount of coverage given to women leaders either in electoral campaign or in office; and second, the content and tone of that coverage—that is, if the media tend to focus on personality or policy stands, and if they portray women in a harsh light with respect to their male counterparts.

Visibility of women politicians has been analyzed by a number of studies (Kahn 1996; Devitt 1998; Bystrom et al. 2004). Notwithstanding some exceptions, the emerging trend is that women have become more visible in terms of the quantity of coverage than in

the past. From this point of view, it can be said that gender discrimination is notably reduced. Obviously, the case of women leaders has its own specificities. Because of the prominence of the office, one may expect that female leaders receive as much coverage as men. However, what is true in theory is not always matched by facts. For instance, Norris (1997) found that, although the difference between the sexes is modest, women leaders receive less press attention than men. By looking at some individual cases, Norris highlights a quite surprising fact: even a very popular and notable woman such as Margaret Thatcher was less covered by the press than her male colleagues. The case of the 2008 American presidential election, however, seems to signal an advance toward equal treatment. I will discuss in the next chapters whether and to what extent Hillary Clinton's coverage can be regarded as sexist. But from the point of view of the quantity of coverage, Falk (2010, 153) found that, in 2008 primaries, Clinton received only slightly inferior press attention to that of Barack Obama, and in any case the margin of difference was definitely less than in previous presidential races where a woman was involved. It is interesting to note that, even in the first months of the campaign, when Clinton was leading the polls and could be considered the front runner, Obama received more coverage than she did. As for broadcast media, the evidence is mixed: according to some data Clinton and Obama received about the same amount of coverage, while for others Obama was more visible (Falk 2010, 154). Obama was more prominent especially in TV sound bites (Lawrence and Rose 2010, 159). In general, however, although she, as the front runner, received less coverage than expected, it can be said that Clinton overcame the media barriers experienced by female candidates before her.

Although the 2007 French presidential campaign confirmed the enduring existence of some discrimination insofar as Ségolène Royal receiving less press attention than her male rival, Nicolas Sarkozy (Holtz-Bacha et al. 2009), the majority of cases analyzed all over the world support the view that the gap in the quantity of coverage is closing. In the 2005 German election, Angela Merkel was as visible as her adversary, the incumbent chancellor, Gerhard Schröder. Further data on broadcast media confirm that Merkel, considered by the media as the prospective winner, was amply covered in 2009 (Zeh 2010). Similarly, elections involving women running for higher

executive office in New Zealand and Canada show that female leaders were as prominent in the news stories as their male adversaries (Trimble, Treiberg, and Girard 2007, 9).

Another common theme in analyzing the coverage given to women politicians is the contrast between coverage focused on personal traits and that centered on issues. Much evidence supports the common belief that gender, marital and parental status, and physical appearance are considered more newsworthy at the expense of serious discussion on their policy stands (Bystrom et al. 2004, 178–79; Fowler and Lawless 2009). In this chapter and the next I deal in more detail with the media's inclination to emphasize women's appearance and family relationships. First I advance some general considerations. A body of research conducted on content of media messages in U.S. Senate and gubernatorial races consistently shows that the media link preferably "male issues" (i.e., military, foreign politics, economy) to male candidates and "female issues" (education, welfare, health care) to female candidates (Kittilson and Fridkin 2008; Bystrom et al. 2004, 179–81[1]). These findings are in line with the hypothesis that gender stereotypes on personal traits drive expectations that women and men have different areas of expertise (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993a). Female candidates are regarded as specialized in what Shapiro and Mahajan (1986) have called "compassion issues": social welfare, education, health, and family. By contrast, men are considered more confident in handling business, military, and law-and-order matters (Alexander and Andersen 1993; Dolan 2004, 78).

Second, the fact that "male issues" receive more attention for men than for female candidates has the consequence that voters tend to consider gender as a basis for making an inference about the candidate's ability to deal with such issues (Iyengar et al. 1997). For this reason, it may appear a fruitful strategy for women candidates to stress the issues that voters associate favorably with female traits (Herrnson, Lay, and Stokes 2003). However, this is not always the case: according to Kahn (1996, 134), mass media tend to represent more the campaign messages of male candidates and to ignore the social issues more frequently introduced by women candidates. Therefore, if the media less frequently represent women's priorities, it is likely that voters will see these policies as less important. In so doing, the press promotes the election of men. To contrast this, Kahn concludes (1996, 135) that "women should demonstrate their

commitment to the pervasive issues in the campaign instead of trying to change the agenda, since the latter strategy appears to be largely ineffective."

In any case, for women running for higher office, the strategy of giving prevalence to female issues would be impossible. For women leaders it remains a compelling effort to be convincing that they are experts on the so-called male policy issues since the policy areas in which men are considered as more competent, such as military and economics, are also regarded as the most important for executive office. As argued by some studies, the prejudice that women are less suited to deal with defense and economics is likely to explain why some voters are scarcely prone to support women for the presidency and vice-presidency (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993b; Lawless 2004). In other words, expertise on those issues is inextricably linked with the overall assessment of female fitness for office.

According to Norris's findings (1997), women leaders do not campaign on traditional compassionate issues; so the author advances the notion that "journalistic reporting of the characteristics and concerns of these individual leaders was far more subtle and complex than simple sex-role stereotypes would suggest" (160). As a matter of fact, evidence on individual case studies in terms of issues and personal characteristics is quite nuanced. According to Valenzuela and Correa's analysis of press coverage of the 2006 Chilean presidential campaign (2009), Michelle Bachelet was intensely questioned about her leadership skills. As far as honesty was concerned, Bachelet was described with a positive tone. However, in contrast to what happened to her male adversary, her competence was framed "in a overwhelming negative manner" (2009, 218). Therefore, the authors reach the conclusion that "the press portrayed Bachelet in the traditional female stereotype of care and compassion while the male candidates were framed in stereotypical masculine manners, described as competent and good leaders" (218). In a study on the press coverage of President Bachelet once in office, Cantrell and Bachmann (2008) offer some evidence of how the skepticism about her leadership skills that had surfaced during the campaign subsequently took the form of the insinuation that gender was influencing her capability to make difficult decisions. In framing Bachelet's political action, the press seemed to propagate the stereotype that female leaders are too soft and

victims of their sex. Although less negatively portrayed and indeed linked positively to typically feminine traits, the German Chancellor Angela Merkel and the Liberian President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf shared the fact of receiving "a coverage that differed in tone and content from what to expect from a recently inaugurated male government head" (Cantrell and Bachmann 2008, 441). This does not mean that the coverage was necessarily diminishing their authority; as the authors said, "it is hard to argue for a media conspiracy to exclude or marginalize women" (441), but undoubtedly data showed that "gendered mediation is a strong coverage differentiator" (442).

The American presidential primary elections have offered considerable supporting evidence for the existence of a gendered bias in the quality of coverage. In her 2000 presidential bid, Elizabeth Dole, for example, received less coverage on issues than on her personal traits: "readers (of newspapers analyzed) were more likely to learn about the policy positions of Bush, McCain, and Forbes (the other candidates in the Republican primaries) than they were to discover what Dole stood for and how she planned to govern the country as president" (Aday and Devitt 2001, 61). In discussing the only woman candidate, personality frames obscured issue frames. Once again, this does not imply that personal coverage is always negative and issue coverage always positive. Nor that women receive tougher or more abrasive treatment. However, for a candidate the consequences of the lack of issue coverage may lead voters to think that certain issues are not relevant to that candidacy and the candidate is not expert or competent on them. Apparently Hillary Clinton succeeded in attracting more media attention on her policy stands than her female predecessors had, but it should be noted that the 2008 primary election was generally very focused on the horse race rather than on issue coverage (Falk 2010, 156). In any case, Clinton received more negative comments than her male adversaries (Lawrence and Rose 2010, 160). The general trend that women receive less coverage on issues is also confirmed for U.S. gubernatorial races: Devitt (2002) found that the media prefer to cover female candidates in terms of personal characteristics. Also, incumbent candidates were subject to the same treatment, thus falsifying the defensive argument that the emphasis on women's personal traits is due to the need to introduce them to the public.

Taking care and cleaning up: Lights and shadows of the positive stereotypes

In the next chapters, I will discuss extensively the prejudices and stereotypes that the media adopt when dealing with women leaders with typical masculine characteristics, such as dominance and assertiveness. Some attention has to be given, however, to how the press and the public deal with those qualities and features commonly attributed to women, such as nurturing, warmth, and moral integrity. As Chait Barnett (2007, 149) observes, one of the favorite questions from the media concerns whether "women are more democratic, empathic and sensitive than men" in their leadership style. It has been observed that an image of a gentler and warmer approach to power may be beneficial since it is consistent with a traditional view of female leadership, the one usually exerted within the family and in other communities, often without having a formal role (Pittinsky et al. 2007, 99).

Such a notion of difference is shared by feminist thought as well. As observed by Keohane (2010, 147), a long line of gender studies stem from the key arguments of Carol Gilligan (1982) that women are different because they care about individuals rather than relying on abstract moral judgments. This has produced serious consequences for the female potential for leadership: "the residue of the belief that women are different in ways tied to a woman's traditional role is seen in findings that female candidates are expected to deal more efficiently than men at tasks allied to women's traditional strengths—family matter, consumer protection, and education" (Jamieson 1995, 115).

It appears evident that the mass media tend to cover women leaders along the lines discussed above. For instance, they emphasize women being maternal protectors of their people. In particular, if the female leader comes to power after a period of authoritarianism, violence, and corruption, she may be portrayed as someone who can heal the country and bring peace and reconciliation. This happened, for example, to Corazon Aquino of the Philippines, Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf of Liberia, and Violeta Chamorro of Nicaragua (Col 1993; Cantrell and Bachmann 2008; Solheim 2000). In some ways, the gender difference is used "to signal the intent to bring a new kind of administration" that reflects "more inclusive leadership styles

than their predecessors" (Keohane 2010, 138). The nurturing frame is clearly based on what we could consider a positive stereotype, since it allows thinking in terms of a broader range of leadership styles. At the same time, however, the nurturing stereotype might also make women's ascent to power more difficult: as will be argued further, it confines women in some positions and excludes them from others.

Another common frame applied by the media to women leaders is that of the "outsider" (Braden 1996, 2; Norris 1997). Women are often represented as lacking the traditional *cursus honorum*, that is to say, an ordinary political career. Rather they are described as having access to the top positions only by chance or by following some extraordinary circumstances. As Norris (1997, 162) underlines, news stories often insist on female leaders' limited experience or do not evaluate correctly that experience by looking at "the appropriate qualifications for the job in terms of the masculine characteristics of the past office-holders." It may happen, for example, that past appointments in ministries labeled "for women," such as environment or education, are presented as second-rank qualifications in comparison with other cabinet experience. As for previous careers, then, although men who entered politics with achievements in other fields are often lauded for their innovative potential—as happened to many former academics and entrepreneurs who became successful party leaders and prime ministers—women with similar records are not particularly praised (Norris 1997, 162).

In the narratives of the political career of women leaders, the emergence of an element of unpredictability and good luck is recurrent. Just to give a few examples: Margaret Thatcher was often described as a leader by chance. She became leader of the Conservative Party because, although many were tired of the incumbent Edward Heath, nobody else was willing to challenge him (Steinberg 2008, 214). Therefore, as King (2002, 452) underlines, if it is true that she was an "accidental leader," it is worth stressing that "she was the only one of Heath's former cabinet colleagues who was prepared to stand against him for the leadership." Her success was actually due to her capability to face a challenge that her male colleagues were not ready to take. Analogously, it has been often said that Indira Gandhi's ascent to power was initially supported by a number of party colleagues who viewed her as one who could be easily manipulated (Keohane 2010, 134). Soon after her election, she had a chance to show them

to what extent they were mistaken. The same happened to Angela Merkel (Keohane 2010, 138). In other cases, women in top executive positions are portrayed as puppets in the hands of men, as happened to the French Prime Minister Edith Cresson, described by the media as a creation of President François Mitterrand (Freedman 1997). In sum, it applies to politics the same line of reasoning that dominates the world of business: "when women succeed, they are viewed as having some special stroke of good fortune—a wonderful mentor, a lucky break, being at the right place at the right time. Their success is treated as a happenstance, an outcome over which they had no particular control" (Chait Barnett 2007, 157).

If the argument shows how the outsider frame contributes to disqualification of women leaders, nonetheless it has to be observed that, in some cases, it may play in their favor. In fact, women for whom the status of outsider is an inescapable label attached to them just because of their sex actually have the possibility of exploiting the advantages inherent to the typical style of leadership of outsiders. According to Anthony King (2002, 436), outsiders can be classified in three ways: "social" or "demographic", "psychological", and "tactical." The social outsider is one who does not belong to a predefined group. In illustrating the case of Margaret Thatcher as a social outsider, King identifies several determinant factors, but "above all," he writes, "she was a woman; they [the Conservative party] were men—all of them—and the world of the postwar Conservative party was a man's world" (ibid. 443). Thatcher was a social outsider also for other reasons, for instance her being a grocer's daughter in a party establishment mostly composed of upper-class people. However, it is worth stressing that, in the political field, women are often considered social outsiders just because of their sex. This happens independently of any other coexisting factor.

Although being a social outsider with respect to a given group is a matter of fact, being a psychological outsider is rather a subjective condition: a psychological outsider is a person who *feels* himself or herself to be an outsider. He or she may or may not also be a social outsider, but what matters is that he or she is convinced of being extraneous. However, a connection between being a social outsider and a psychological outsider is likely, and even plausible. In particular, historically speaking, many pioneers testify to feeling in some way different, and even isolated. Clearly this condition

applies also to the first women leaders in the male-dominated world of politics.

Finally, the tactical outsider is the person who chooses to play the role of the outsider, provided that this status allows him or her to bypass or ignore conventions to accomplish goals. In other words, tactical outsiders are those leaders who, under special circumstances, transform a potential liability, such as being different and extraneous to the group, into a very useful resource. King (2002, 441) argues that "a tactical outsider need not be either a social or a psychological outsider . . . However, it seems probable that a person who is either a social or a psychological outsider—or both—is more likely than an insider to adopt the tactics of an outsider, to feel comfortable with them and to exploit them successfully." This means that to appear or behave like an outsider may be an asset for a political leader because it helps in reframing the leadership role differently. Consequently, the outsider frame does not necessarily hurt women, provided it is linked to a narrative of freshness and change. In terms of policy, in particular, an outsider may claim much more convincingly to be willing to adopt those tough measures that the establishment would avoid (ibid. 453).

It is worth noting that, in the case of women leaders, the theme of outsider is often linked to another media frame: that of agents of change who will fix a difficult situation and, in particular, who "will clean up corruption in politics" (Norris 1997, 163). Wilson (2007, 271) sums up the point: when things get really messy, women get to clean up. Trust that women may resolve critical situations more efficiently than men depends on two factors. The first is the well-rooted belief that women are more honest, and therefore less easily infected by power. Such a viewpoint is part of the more general stereotype that women are not compatible with power because they are too good for it—an insidious way of putting them on a pedestal, whose consequences will be discussed in the next section. The second factor relates to the fact that, on those occasions when the disastrous state of things is produced by the male dominant elite, female leaders are perceived as involved less or not at all. Therefore, being extraneous becomes an asset whenever the situation is so serious that real change is needed. Not bearing any responsibility, women are supposed not to have interests or a reputation to be protected and are seen as less limited in their action.

For instance, in the early 1980s the ascent of the Norwegian Gro Brundtland to the prime minister position was attributed to the country's economic troubles: "She admitted that sometimes the atmosphere seemed to indicate that she and the other women ministers had brought in were expected 'to do the dishes after the party' " (Solheim 2000, 71). Pretty much in line with this interpretation, the *Wall Street Journal* dedicated this headline to Brundtland's cabinet: "A Distressed Norway Counts on Its Women to Set Things Right" (Solheim 2000, 72). Almost three decades later, in Iceland, the press made sense of the election of a female prime minister in her early forties, Mari Kiviniemi, by claiming that a woman could better face the financial crisis that her predecessors were unable to cope with (Ertel 2009). Another paradigmatic case is Merkel, who "gained an advantage by appearing to have more integrity than her colleagues involved in a corruption scandal. She was assumed to be ready to clean up German politics, in part because of stereotypes about her gender" (Keohane 2010, 138). This has been true for many others: Aquino in the Philippines, Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma, and Chamorro in Nicaragua, all portrayed as outsiders running to revive their countries.

To sum up, not all stereotypes can be considered as negative and acting against women in politics. However, the idea that positive stereotypes are useful tools for the advancement of female leaders is not uncontroversial. Pittinsky et al. (2007, 98) define positive stereotypes as a "precarious pedestal" since "by characterizing and stereotyping leadership traits as gendered, we ultimately exclude, misrepresent, mold and polarize the sexes, and leadership in general." Supporters of a skeptical view of positive stereotypes do not deny that they may be of help in individual cases, by favoring the ascent of individual women to top positions. However, they think that positive stereotypes may reinforce the idea that women are fit for leadership only under certain conditions or in order to perform certain tasks. By using the previously illustrated frames—women as caretakers; women as outsiders; women as those who clean up politics—the media system may believe it is behaving fairly and giving the right emphasis to female leaders' positive traits. However, it can be argued that the media are actually perpetuating some key stereotypes that may endanger women in politics in a significant way.

As for the first frame taken into consideration, women as caretakers, the point is that "an adherence to certain positive stereotypes creates fertile ground for exclusion . . . when supposed feminine traits such as communality, cooperation, warmth, nurturing, and gentility are touted as specific and unique to women, jobs or tasks that require opposing or different traits may not seem appropriate for women" (Pittinsky et al. 2007, 93). As Jamieson (1995, 115) observes, "the argument from difference made it more difficult for women to secure leadership positions, particularly in areas not identified with women's issues."

Similarly, when the press stress that women leaders are outsiders and emphasize that their access to power has not occurred in an ordinary way but under extraordinary circumstances, they are reinforcing the idea that women cannot secure a "normal" political career step by step but can arrive at the top only via an unpredictable path. This actually works as a proper mechanism of exclusion. The outsider framing tends to validate the opinion that successful women leaders are peculiar individuals with a special destiny. As Jamieson argues (1995, 127), the myth of "the exceptional woman" is a way of sustaining gender prejudices, rather than a way of acknowledging the merits of a single woman. The "Great Man" approach to leadership says that a number of great men appeared in time of need and set the standards for heroic and excellent leadership; its female version has become the "Great Woman" approach (Pittinsky et al. 2007, 95). In line with this perspective, the media focus on a limited number of "superstars" who attract "special notice" and "receive higher evaluations" for their exceptional achievements (Rhode and Kellerman 2007, 10), while a larger group of qualified women who pursue a regular political career are substantially neglected and not taken into consideration for key political positions.

Although it has proven useful for the advancement of several female leaders, the media emphasis on the cleaning-up stereotype has noteworthy side effects. Popular expectations of these leaders, who are perceived as presenting alternatives to the traditional political world, are often higher than those of their male colleagues (Keohane 2010, 135). As a consequence, such a deep trust in their capacity to fix difficult situations can give room to sharper disappointment if in the end they are not able to achieve what they promised. And when

they fail and withdraw, "their departures attract particular notice and reinforce stereotypes about women's lesser capabilities and commitment" (Rhode and Kellerman 2007). A parallel with the world of business is in order: "The media are eager to embrace any story about women who fail in high-level positions . . . Women who fail spark a national discussion about women's commitment to work; men who fail never ignite debate about men's commitment to work." This can also be taken as an instance of a typical double standard: "Whereas the media often treat the failure of a high-level businesswoman as proof that women in general cannot excel in a man's world, no such generalizations are made when a woman succeeds" (Chait Barnett 2007, 156–57).

Viability and the horse race: Are the media educating future female leaders?

For a long time, one of the main problems of women candidates has been viability; the media hold preconceptions about women being less likely to win elections. As a result, they tend to cover them as prospective "losers." The immediate consequence is that women, if considered less viable, receive less coverage than comparable male candidates (Kahn 1996, 13). Because the core of the stereotypical argument against the electability of women is skepticism about their leadership skills, the viability assessment is therefore absolutely crucial for women competing for higher office. In many electoral contexts, as Falk (2010, 41) writes, the viability argument is framed by the press in terms of readiness ("Is the country ready for a woman president or prime minister?") and expressed through the display of poll results. The idea of a woman chief executive is more acceptable today; for instance, before the 2008 American presidential campaign 88 percent of respondents to polls declared themselves to be willing to vote for a woman.[2]

Gender is no longer represented as a disqualification, and recent research shows that the media now present female candidates to be as viable as men (Bystrom et al. 2004, 178; Kittilson and Fridkin 2008). Nevertheless, there are also indirect ways of questioning viability. Analysis of coverage reveals that journalists may still portray the fact of being a woman as a "vulnerability" for a political leader. Although existing research shows that women are actually not at all

less capable of collecting money to finance their campaign (Lawless and Fox 2005, 22), doubts about a woman's chances of raising funds are often advanced (Falk 2010, 45). When Merkel was negotiating in the postelection period to form a coalition government, the press speculated on her concrete chances of becoming chancellor (Marx Ferree 2006, 99). On the one hand, the media tend to openly support the view that the time has come for women political leaders and refuse any claim that they do not take women seriously; on the other hand, often journalists do not refrain from representing existing prejudices against women as a potential vulnerability and as a persistent feature of the political context.

Another aspect connected to the viability issue is the "horse race" frame. As already illustrated in Chapter 2, it consists of reducing electoral complexity to a simplified representation based almost exclusively on personal competition between candidates. According to the horse race frame, mass media devote disproportionate attention not just to candidates' personal characteristics but above all to the contest. This implies constant monitoring of voting intentions to check who is leading and who is trailing in the polls, who is the front runner and who is the underdog. The major news organizations carry out regular polls on which journalists then base their reports on candidates' chances and strategies. According to some studies, the news reports on the state of the horse race surpass the reports on candidates' policy stands by a factor of two to one (Iyengar and McGrady 2007, 69).

The issue of viability lies at the core of the horse race frame because the assessment of the concrete possibility of winning determines the amount and tone of a candidate's coverage. According to the conventional wisdom, when the gap between candidates is close in the polls, the race is exciting and candidate coverage remains high; conversely, as the gap increases, coverage falls because the final result is taken for granted. But, to come to our question, if the mass media focus more attention on the horse race, what are the consequences for female candidates? Several aspects have to be taken into consideration. According to the seminal study by Kahn (1996), the election context makes the difference: for instance, in campaigns for the U.S. Senate the press focuses more intensively on horse race issues, with the consequence of making women candidates' viability more salient to voters. Under such conditions women are seen as

less viable than their male counterparts. By contrast, in gubernatorial campaigns women are not affected very much by the horse race coverage, although in open races they are viewed as less electable than men. As stressed above, coverage depends on how large the gap is between candidates in the polls. Smith (1997) found that variations in competitiveness do not produce a great differential gender impact on coverage. However, in his analysis of senatorial and gubernatorial elections, he registered that women got less media attention in open races and more in gubernatorial contests where they were often the challengers against a male incumbent, or were the first female governor of their state. Smith's conclusion is that "the coverage advantage in gubernatorial contests may represent a residue of novelty effect" (76). Still, women are relatively new political actors in races for governor and therefore may be considered by the media as more newsworthy than candidates for the Senate.

The novelty frame may well play a role in gubernatorial races; this holds even truer for higher office as well. According to Falk (2010, 35), the majority of women candidates for U.S. president have been framed as the first women running, even if they were not first at all. As Norris (1997, 161) writes, "in story after story (on women leaders) the headline and lead almost invariably focuses on the 'first women' breakthrough, with a positive slant for the woman who won against the odds." Doubtless the novelty frame helps women get more media coverage. On the other hand, however, it may be observed that the novelty frame is considered the flip side of the coin of the viability issue. As Falk (2010, 37) observes, the persistent framing of women at first prevents normalization of female presence in politics and reinforces "the notion of women as out of place and unnatural in the political sphere."

Finally, the media's viability assessment has much to do with female self-perception of the concrete possibility of being elected. A body of research has investigated why women are less inclined to run for office (Lawless and Fox 2005; Fox 2007). Among several possible explanations is the fact that women are significantly less likely than men to think they will win their first race (Fox 2007, 266). If the mass media propagate the notion that women are still "unnatural" in the political field, this may exert a remarkable effect on female self-perceptions. Even more importantly, it may influence the perception of party leaders who are in charge of recruitment.

The persistent belief that women are less electable is one of the main barriers to female political careers because women are not likely to be selected for important races if party leaders feel they have only a limited chance of winning (Sanbonmatsu 2006).

The perception of viability exerts important consequences also on the process of socialization of younger generations. In their seminal study on female interest in officeholding, Lawless and Fox (2005, 154) stressed that what young girls start to think about politics in their early years has a remarkable impact on their life approach to politics. If the political career of most women politicians is not visible or is perceived as difficult, it less likely that politics will be included among the "sandbox dreams of little girls" (Cantor and Bernay 1992, Chapter 5). By contrast, young men are used to identifying themselves "with both distant heroes and accessible mentors" (129).

To sum up, visible women running for higher office could serve as role models to encourage female political ambitions. As Burns et al. (2001, 351) observed, "Visible women in politics might function as role models and carry a kind of symbolic significance—sending the message to women citizens that politics is an inclusive domain, open to them." Consequently, media assessment of their electoral viability may fuel, or dampen, women's inclinations to dream of holding a leadership role. In conclusion, it can be said that the mass media play a major role in educating future female leaders to develop correct expectations about their concrete possibilities of fitting into leadership positions.

4
The Double Bind

The nature of the femininity-competence double bind

A large body of research on women and politics has consistently shown that the most common gender stereotypes influence how women leaders are perceived and represented by the media. In particular, gender stereotypes may have serious implications for female leaders running for executive office. The key point is that, whether in politics or in management, the cultural stereotype of the leader is *male* (Oakley 2000), as discussed in Chapter 1.

Since the traditional model of leadership tends to assume typical male characteristics, for lack of alternatives, women leaders "feel compelled to cultivate a style that conveys strength in traditional male terms" (Sykes 1993, 225). As a consequence, women running for high-level office feel obliged to deny the stereotype of women as typically compassionate and warm, and must communicate a message of strength and decisiveness. However, if an aspirant to political leadership acts too assertively, she will run the risk of being criticized as too aggressive. Kathleen Jamieson (1995) describes this phenomenon as the femininity-competence double bind, a particular type of the social binds that have historically constrained women: "All too often there is a contradiction between the attributes voters expect in a candidate and what they want in a woman. Ambition is a plus in a man but a drawback in a woman. Men should be tough, but strength in a woman is threatening" (Cantor and Bernay 1992, 85).[1] Accordingly, female leaders are forced to appear tough to be taken seriously. However, they should be aware that this behavior is likely to elicit negative

and defensive reactions from the mass media and the public. The substance of the double bind of femininity and competence is the quite impossible combination of looking tough enough to lead the nation in a war, but also caring enough to understand people's worries and problems (Jamieson 1995, Chapter 6).

A good indicator of the diffusion and influence of such a double bind is language. As the linguist Robin Lakoff observes: "To cite just a few examples, there are lexical differences in the way we talk about men with power, versus women with power. For example, we use different words to describe similar or identical behavior by men and women. English (like other languages) has many words describing women who are interested in power, presupposing the inappropriateness of that attitude. *Shrew* and *bitch* are among the more polite" (Lakoff 2003, 162).

The attitude underlying activation of the double-bind effect by the mass media is based on the idea that the presence of women in the public sphere is somehow inappropriate or unnatural. In the past, this belief openly permeated press coverage of female candidates. Today, the notion of political correctness prevents open expression of the idea that a woman cannot become president; however, as Falk (2010, 33) reports in her analysis of presidential campaigns with a woman running, it often comes to the surface in a subtler way. The root of the belief that women are not well suited for political leadership is to be found in a strongly rooted view of power as the use of force. A common perception of power implies a moralist judgment according to which power may also be evil. As Machiavelli said, the prince's behavior cannot be assessed through an ordinary moral code: he must be ready to use force. Zemmour (2006, 34) observes that "the essence of politics is Eros—attracting people's and allies' likings—and Thanatos—killing adversaries." But presuming that a woman may be wicked enough to plan the assassination of her enemies contradicts her loving and caring image, as she is stereotypically described. Until power is seen to be antithetical to love, the relationship between women and political leadership is destined to be difficult. According to Carl Jung, "Wherever love reigns there is no will to power; whenever will to power is huge, love is lacking" (Jung 1953).[2] The clear implication of Jung's view is that seeking power is a behavior contradicting love. Therefore, a woman seeking power may be regarded as doing something contrary to her nature, that is to say "unnatural."

The stereotype of the incompatibility between feminine character and the exercise of power seems refuted by the mass of historical evidence. In fact, contrary to the common view of women as peacemakers, many women have led their nation to war. Moreover, a number of women rulers did not abstain from using violence to reach their objectives, or from condemning their adversaries to death. One should think of Queen Isabella of Spain, who expelled Jews; Caterina de Medici, who was behind the massacre of Huguenots; or Queen Elizabeth I of England, who condemned her cousin Mary of Scotland to death. But there seems to be a paradox with these "warrior queens." As Fraser (1990, 9) wrote, "the phenomenon is found almost everywhere; yet the person concerned is generally regarded as the 'singular exception' and that very singularity for better or for worse provides her aura." The warrior queens are seen as a series of individuals, extraordinary cases that cannot change the common prejudice that politics is no place for women because they are too virtuous for it.

In any case, participation in the political field on the part of women who are perceived as willing to violate the "natural order" and seek power is subordinated to acceptance of male rules. In the common representation of politics, aggressive language is seen as a part of the "game," framing politicians as warriors fighting for their advantage (Patterson 2000). In contrast to these expectations, the presence of women in the competition does not reduce this game-like aspect of politics; it actually emphasizes it. Female leaders are often portrayed as the aggressors. As observed by Trimble et al. (2007, 18) in their study of political campaigns in New Zealand, "the game was not feminized; rather the female leaders were masculinized . . . women leaders are written into the election news script as pseudomales." A similar conclusion was advanced by Gidengil and Everitt in their study of language and behavior in Canadian electoral debates (2003, 574):

> The increase in the number of women competing for elite elected office (and in the number of women involved in news production) has done little to change the convention of political journalism . . . . The prevailing "masculine" news frames subtly serve to highlight the "unnatural" position of women in politics. Suggestions that a woman might "land a blow," deliver "a knockout punch" or even "have a breakaway on an open net" challenge

> traditional social expectations of appropriate gender role behavior. If a female party leader tries to fit in by behaving combatively, media coverage tends to exaggerate her aggressive behaviour and she will risk appearing too aggressive. On the other hand, if a female party leader fails to conform to the traditional masculine approach to politics, her behavior is likely to receive less attention from the media than a similarly low-keyed performance by a male leader and she will risk being sidelined.

According to some psychologists, prejudice against female rulers is to be seen as a consequence of "benevolent sexism" (Glick and Fiske 2001). This means that a positive view of women who incarnate conventional roles and support traditional values coexists with more or less implicit hostility toward women who are perceived as departing from their "natural" ways. The theory of benevolent sexism highlights how apparently positive stereotypes such as associating women candidates with gentleness and care may have negative implications, because they question women's skills and competence to assume duties such as those concerning the military or defense (Mebane 2008, 146). Benevolent sexism is the primary source of the double bind since it constrains women into behaving according to traditional expectations of their role and duties in to gain acceptance, but that behavior is not consistent with what is required in the exercise of power. As the French sociologist Bourdieu theorized in his famous essay *On Masculine Domination* (2001, Chapter 2), if women act like men, they are seen as a threat to the natural order of power relations; if they act like women, they are not considered qualified for power positions. Moreover, benevolent sexism may force women to resort to indirect strategies to attract attention and gain power, which are "the weapons of the weak," as Bourdieu (2001, 59) calls them: "an outburst that is inevitably seen as an unjustified whim or as an exhibition that is immediately defined as hysterical; or seduction, which, inasmuch as it is based on a form of recognition of domination, tends to reinforce the established relation of symbolic domination." On the other hand, Bourdieu continues:

> One would not need to enumerate all the cases where the best-intentioned men . . . perform discriminatory acts, excluding women, without even thinking about it, from positions of

> authority, reducing their demands to whims that can be answered with a mollifying word or a tap on the cheek, or, with an apparently opposite intention, reminding them of and in a sense reducing them to their femininity, by drawing attention to their hairstyle or some other physical feature, or using familiar terms of address (darling, dear, etc.) in a formal situation (doctor and patient, for example)—so many infinitesimal "choices" of unconscious which come together to help to construct the diminished situation of women and those cumulative effects are recorded in the statistics on the very weak representation of women in positions of power, especially economic and political power.

All these involuntary forms of symbolic prevarication are clearly mirrored in the way the media describe women leaders: from calling them by name to drawing attention to their appearance, as will be analyzed at length in later chapters.

An important aspect of the double bind is open expression of emotions. Women are forced into a balancing act between meeting the gender expectations that ask them to be sensitive and tender-hearted, and to avoid appearing overemotional and, therefore, unbalanced. The second concern has long been predominant: to defeat ages of prejudice about supposed female mood swings, and the consequent implication that women are not fit to make decisions under stress, women politicians have always been worried about expressing emotions in public. As Cantor and Bernay (1992, 217) observe, "A problem is learning not to respond emotionally to attacks because emotional responses by women are frequently ridiculed or used as examples of women's inability to handle real pressure." In particular, there are two critical behaviors: expressing anger and crying. Both are related to traditional gender stereotypes according to which men are not supposed to cry and women are not supposed to swear or express rage in an undisguised form. Lakoff (2003, 163) observes that "the constraint on both sexes seems designed to intensify the preexisting power imbalance between the sexes . . . . The expression of sorrow is an expression of powerlessness and helplessness; anger, of potency. So although these rules may seem to equalize the sexes, they intensify male power and female powerlessness." It follows that women are imprisoned in a double standard: if they swear, shout, or address someone aggressively, they are mocked or treated as if they were out

of control and potentially dangerous. In any case, for them anger is not an indicator of power.

As for crying, if this is acceptable behavior for women in general, it is not for a woman leader. Leaders are supposed to lead. Thus, in line with a notion of leadership close to stereotypically male traits, crying in public is forbidden to leaders of both sexes. When it happens, tears are usually interpreted by the media as an indicator of weakness, in particular as a response to a setback or some personal difficulty (different is the case of tears on the occasion of national mourning, where crying could have a cathartic effect for the audience). For a male politician, however, it is observed that crying in public has recently become "sensitive instead of wimpy" (Falk 2010, 91). Some time ago, crying in public was seen as an unforgivable disqualification for a candidate for higher office. Something of this sort happened to the Democratic presidential candidate Edmund Muskie in the 1972 primary. He was supposed to be the front runner, but after he cried in public to defend his wife from rumors she was an alcoholic, negative media coverage of the event damaged him irreparably (Lawrence and Ross 2010, 50–51). On the other hand, it is becoming a more shared view that, due to a general process of devirilization in contemporary social contexts, even in politics it is now more acceptable for a man to show his feminine side (Zemmour 2006). As a consequence, one may argue that the gender stereotypes concerning male behavior have proven to be less resistant to change than those relating to women. For instance, a study of emotional traits ascribed to candidates in the 2008 Democratic primaries showed that the media portrayed Hillary Clinton as more emotional than Barack Obama, but emotions ascribed to Obama were much more positive than those related to Clinton (Bachmann 2009).

For a woman, in fact, crying remains a tricky matter. Clinton's campaign offers a good example of the ambiguity in media treatment of female tears. One day before the New Hampshire primary, Clinton, at that time the front-running candidate in trouble after the defeat in Iowa, cried in answering a question on how she was dealing with the burden of the campaign. Media reactions to Clinton's tears were mixed. Some followed the traditional line, stressing she could not stand the heat; others were substantially positive, praising her for being spontaneous and showing real emotion (Falk 2010, 169; Lawrence and Rose 2010, 49). Some interpreted her tears as a strategic

move, as she wanted to soften her image to gain consensus in New Hampshire after the setback of Iowa (Spiker 2009; Lawrence and Rose 2010, 49).

Even in the case of positive coverage, however, it is worth noting the disproportionate attention given to the episode: all the media focused on it, and the video footage was played endlessly on TV. If it is true that the press is eager for media events like this, it is also true that during the same campaign the tears of male candidates (i.e., Republican Mitt Romney) attracted much less attention. As Falk (2010, 171) comments on this different treatment, "one reason that the press may focus more on women's emotions than men's is that such depictions are consistent with stereotypes. Women's displays of emotions, particularly sadness, may be more salient and memorable to reporters in contemporary culture because such traits are already associated with women. The fact that women's emotionality has historically been one of the arguments against their fitness for higher office may have highlighted the relevance of emotional displays in the minds of reporters and perhaps made them more likely to mention sadness in a story."

Iron Ladies and mothers of the nation

If the femininity-competence double bind is such a pervasive phenomenon, how have prominent and successful leaders managed to counter its impact? And to what extent were they successful? It is worth noting that some women leaders have closely imitated a male style of leadership (Schwartzenberg 1980), in politics as well as in other fields. Organization theory, for instance, has found evidence of this attitude also in management and public administration: as a whole, men are more competitive than women and women are more democratic than men in their styles of leadership. However, as illustrated in Chapter 1, women who gain a high level of authority tend to resemble their male counterparts (Oshagbemi and Gill 2003; Nicolau-Smokoviti 2004).

In politics this is especially true in the case of the first pioneers whose appearance on the political scene was so exceptional that it did not raise any question about the nature and scope of female leadership. Eventually, those women came to be perceived and treated almost like men. Not much has changed since the age of Elizabeth I of England, when the need to legitimate the queen produced the

theory of "the king's two bodies," as illustrated by Ludwig (2002, 30): "When she assumed the throne her whole being was altered. Once her mortal flesh, which was subject to all the imperfection of womanhood, became wedded to the immortal body politic, which was timeless and perfect, all her female shortcomings were eliminated. Therefore, as a result of this transformation in her being, her gender no longer posed a danger to the glory and welfare of the nation." *Mutatis mutandis*: it may be argued that the same line of reasoning has been applied to contemporary Iron Ladies as well.

The term "Iron Lady" was coined for Margaret Thatcher by the Soviets, who mocked her in the *Red Star,* the official journal of the Red Army. The nickname was quickly embraced by Thatcher herself, who considered it as a great slogan to express her determination and willfulness. She declared: "The Iron Lady of the Western World? Me? A Cold Warrior? Well, yes—if that is how they wish to interpret my defence of values and freedoms fundamental to our way of life" (Fraser 1988, 316). Thatcher always showed a very aggressive style, without becoming unpopular. Nor did the characterization prevent her from winning three consecutive elections. In particular, it is worth noting that Thatcher's temper was never put into discussion because of her gender: indeed, she was pictured as being as assertive as a man, and an "extraordinarily assertive" prime minister in comparison with all her predecessors (King 1986).[3]

The term Iron Ladies is further used to describe a category to which several other leaders are supposed to belong (Lee Sykes 1993, 225). Among them was Indira Gandhi, who notoriously said: "As a prime minister, I am not a woman. I am a human being" (Fraser 1990, 309). Gandhi also adopted a very tough style of leadership; Everett observes (1993, 126) that "she seemed to operate as an 'honorary man'," not abstaining from behaving "in a ruthless and authoritarian manner" (Everett 1993, 127).

Both Thatcher and Gandhi seem to have bypassed or at least withstood the double bind. They appeared as tough as strong and willful men, without paying a price in terms of consensus. However, some observations are in order. The origin of the term Iron Lady is paradigmatic in itself. As Sykes argues (1993, 225), it was invented by the media with the aim of transforming "strength and determination (so admired in men) into rigidity and insensitivity (perceived as flaws in women)." An iron woman is a sort of oxymoron, since the

common stereotype describes women as delicate creatures in want of male protection: "Perceptions of leadership style prove more important than any objective reality and gender clearly colors both popular and elite perceptions of the Iron Ladies" (226).

In any case, it is disputable that the Iron Lady model could still be viable in keeping the double bind under control. If leaders such as Thatcher and Gandhi were so rare that they could be considered like men without raising further discussion, nowadays, for a woman who aspires to become prime minister or head of state, being considered too tough may be just as negative as too traditionally feminine. Clinton's primary campaign, which will be examined at length, offers interesting insights on this matter. Today, the rising presence of women in elective bodies and in the political elite ensures some of them, albeit still a very small group, will have access to leadership positions. But this apparent increase in opportunity has not reduced stereotyped prejudice. Rather, the double bind of femininity and competence acts more strongly and subtly now, with the emergence of women as heads of state and government, and the issue of women's suitability for important political roles on the table. In conclusion, a female leader with a very masculine approach could be less tolerated today than back when women in power were really exceptions.

Nor does it seem to be a completely effective strategy to transcend the double bind by playing the role of "mother of the nation." This is one of the most common images adopted by women political leaders. As Schwartzenberg (1980, 115ff.) argued, the mother of the nation is one of the few alternatives to the typical male model of leadership as far as promoting an image of power based not on authority (stereotypically associated with fathers) but on care and provision of goods.

The political history of the last few decades offers many examples. As president of the Philippines, Corazon Aquino was described as wanting to be "the mother of her nation" (Col 1993). Evita Peron, formally only the wife of the president of Argentina but actually the charismatic leader of the Peronist regime, accurately built an image of herself as the mother and high priestess of her country (Zanatta 2009, 217). The former president of Nicaragua Violeta Chamorro was pictured by the media as a mother figure (Norris 1997, 159;

Saint-Germain 1993; Solheim 2000). Tarja Halonen, who stepped down as president of Finland in 2012, made her personal traits the basis for projecting an image of symbolic motherhood (Van Zoonen 2006, 292ff.). The current Liberian president, Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, has been called as "Ma Ellen" and often described as the one who could heal the country after civil war (Cantrell and Bachmann 2008, 438). The Burmese leader Aung San Suu Kyi was frequently said to be a sort of reincarnation of her father, the national hero of Burmese independence (Kane 2001, 153), and seen by her followers as a symbolic mother (Mitchell 2004).

Although the model of the "nation's mother" seems to make reference to a matriarchal order that, in contrast to the patriarchal one, should be more characterized by "softer power," dominant and assertive personalities too have successfully employed the image of symbolic motherhood. When she was the Israeli prime minister, Golda Meir, for instance, was seen as "a genial and grandmotherly figure" (Steinberg 2008, 145), from which image she "derived strength, not least among her strongly matriarchal people" (Fraser 1990, 311–12). But the most interesting case is surely Gandhi, who always played the game of patriarchal politics but at the same time fully exploited the motherhood imagery (Everett 1993, 128). As Fraser (1990, 309) observes, "she assumed the role, even the title of 'The Mother', so deeply embedded in the Hindu consciousness, with the aura of those goddesses bright and dark, Durga and Kali, rulers of fertility and destruction, hovering about her."

The model of the mother of the nation has the advantage of being a culturally approved model of female leadership, because it is rooted in the traditional values of nurturing and caring. What Saint-Germain (1993, 969) observes for Latin American countries ("it is only on their cultural authority as mothers that women can acceptably venture into the political sphere") is virtually extendable everywhere. However, the nation's mothers also have to show they are competent and able to fight. As a consequence, even this model of leadership is not completely immune to the double-bind effect. It may happen that symbolic motherhood is reversed, changed from an asset into a threat for female leaders. The mother may be seen not only as a gentle and supportive figure who takes care of her family but also as an authoritarian figure scolding her husband and children

(Schwartzenberg 1980). As a consequence, a female leader who adopts the language and posture of strength may also be perceived as a malevolent mother (or stepmother) aiming to dominate and repress the country. This seems to apply mostly to leaders who are especially assertive. Indira Gandhi, for instance, was accused by her detractors of being a "mother goddess in her most terrible aspect" (Rushdie 1985, 522).[4]

She is a good example of the deep sense of betrayal that women leaders may elicit in making tough decisions that seem to contradict the role of caretaker usually associated with a maternal figure (Hoogensen and Solheim 2006, 64). Even if they do not elicit feelings of betrayal, the mothers of the nation may be more vulnerable to provoking disillusionment and disappointment. Since they "are looked at as representing the purity of motherhood, . . . these women are expected to be perfect people while in office" (Hoogensen and Solheim 2006, 65). Therefore, any mistakes or liability receives hard criticism that would perhaps never be directed at a man.

In sum, the femininity-competence double bind seems to act as a barrier to advancement independently of personal traits and style of leadership—a sort of penalty to be attached to any woman aspiring to become president or prime minister. A crucial factor is the role of the media in portraying those candidates in a gender-relevant perspective. I will take up this claim by analyzing the electoral campaigns of two women who recently ran for president: Ségolène Royal in France and Hillary Clinton in the U.S. Such cases may clearly highlight how the double bind applies to apparently opposing (or at least very different) cases and to what extent it may be effective and pervasive. Evidence from Royal's and Clinton's campaigns will illustrate the two faces of the femininity-competence double bind. Royal's case shows that when a female political leader is perceived as too feminine, she is also likely to be pictured as deviating from the standard of competence. Clinton's case shows that when a female political leader is perceived as too assertive, she is likely to be pictured as deviating from the standard of femininity in a strident way. In both cases, the mass media are supposed to have actively operated to perpetuate and emphasize the competence-femininity double bind. The two leaders tried to take advantage of the media coverage, but in the end they suffered from how the media put their images in relationship to gender stereotypes.

When women leaders are too feminine: The case of Ségolène Royal

Royal experienced a quite common situation for a female politician. She had a record of expertise on so-called women's issues. Between 1992 and 1993 she was France's minister of environmental issues. In 1997 she was appointed one of the deputy ministers of education in Lionel Jospin's cabinet. In 1992 and 1993 she was minister of the family, and in 2004 she became president of the Poitou-Charente region, an electoral success obtained in difficult circumstances (the defeat of the Socialist party). This highly symbolic victory gave her national visibility and represented the starting point of her candidacy for the presidency of the French republic (IFOP 2007).

According to public opinion, women are supposed to be ideally suited for such issues as education, health, welfare, and children's issues. By specializing in so-called women's issues, Royal established her reputation. This was an advantage when family issues became the "key for understanding French society," as was observed by Nicolas Barotte (2007). In the late 1990s the French people appeared tired of and disappointed by an excessively ideological political discourse; they were after a more pragmatic approach. Royal seemed to fit the bill. Her speeches focused on education, children, and even law and order (albeit in a reassuring way). She was capable of formulating programmatic proposals that appeared neither conservative nor progressive. Also, she possessed the appropriate personal characteristics of being the unmarried mother of four children. Her partner, François Hollande, was the leader of the Socialist party, but she managed to project an image of autonomy and self-reliance in both public and private life.

Royal based the primary campaign on her perceived difference from the other aspirants to the presidential nomination of the Socialist party. Her rivals, Laurent Fabius and Dominique Strauss-Kahn, belonged to the party establishment and had outstanding though quite traditional political careers behind them. To obtain her party's presidential nomination, Royal needed to distinguish herself in a remarkable way. Through her website, she launched her project of "participative democracy." She declared herself to be ready to listen to what the French people had to say, and she asked citizens to take active part in the platform drafting process. Her appeal to the voters

appeared to cross the usual divide between the political elite and the people; it sounded particularly appealing to those segments of the population who were previously detached and discouraged by the apparent distance of politics from ordinary life. Namely, she attracted many young people who were enthusiastic supporters from the very beginning and judged her to be the politician closest to their needs.[5]

By putting listening first, Royal emphasized clearly the feminine nature of her political project. This helped her in bringing change to the selection process of her party's presidential candidates. Through her huge investment in the Internet and new technologies, Royal was able to find new supporters who became party members with the view of voting for her in the primary process (Ivaldi 2007). Very soon the polls showed she was the socialist candidate with better chances of defeating Nicolas Sarkozy (Mossuz-Lavau 2010, 174). In November 2006 she won the primary election with 60 percent of the votes. Although Royal was not the first woman candidate for president, she was definitely the first one with concrete chances of winning. For some time, media stories and headlines focused on the "first woman" breakthrough, a common frame that is recurrent in the coverage of women leaders (Norris 1997, 161).

It should be stressed that during the primary campaign Royal was already a media favorite because of her novelty and her quest for virtual intimacy with citizens. In the first phase of the presidential campaign, she was able to exploit media gender stereotypes to her advantage. Because the media tend to give disproportionate coverage to women's personal lives and appearance, Royal emphasized her being the mother of four children in her self-presentation as a leader who would take care of France in a maternal way. Her campaign poster, with the slogan "La France presidente," was intended to put an uncommon and gentle face on power and authority. Accordingly, the media helped Royal project a "feminine" style of leadership, one based on understanding, cooperation, and empowerment. Royal's indisputable physical attractiveness was a clear advantage in conveying an image of tidiness, beauty, and serenity. The press called her by flattering nicknames: "gazelle," in contrast with the "elephants" of the Socialist parties; or the "Dame or Madone of the Poitou" (the Lady or the Madonna of the Poitou), an image projecting a sort of religious and mothering aura onto the candidate (Salmon 2007, 207).

As the presidential campaign progressed, Royal was treated much less gently by the media, which were quite severe in evaluating her competence and credentials. The underlying question became, "She is caring, but is she competent and tough enough to lead the country?" At that point Royal needed to prove herself assertive, specific on issues, and reliable as a leader—qualities that were largely being displayed by her opponent Sarkozy. While her competence was tested by the press and her leadership record highly questioned, Royal in fact failed to establish a presidential image. All over the campaign, polls showed that Royal maintained an embarrassing deficit when it came to "being presidential." By contrast, her strengths appeared to be honesty and understanding, two features that, as discussed in Chapter 1, voters tend to attribute more often to women than to male candidates.[6]

To what extent was Royal a victim of the double-bind effect? Should one think that her effectiveness in incarnating the feminine side of power had the side effect of making her less convincing as an assertive leader? Could it be advanced that the media actively operated to emphasize the gender stereotypes? First of all, it has to be stressed that several other prominent French female politicians had occasion to complain about the sexism of the media system and French public opinion (Freedman 1997; Sineau 2001). Janine Mossuz-Lavau observes that, with respect to the past, Royal was never humiliated with openly offensive sexist statements; however, she was the object of subtler attacks concerning her competence (Mossuz-Lavau 2010, 144). It is meaningful that even a Gaullist politician such as Michèle Alliot-Marie reacted to Royal's treatment by declaring that "being a women does not imply the impossibility of being competent" (Bacque and Chemin 2007, 144).[7]

A 2008 analysis by Holtz-Bacha et al. of the French press showed that the assessment of Royal's competence was mostly negative. According to this source, however, there is no clear evidence that such a critical assessment was influenced by sex stereotypes (2009, 100). Rather, the coverage was likely to be related to a negative perception of her electoral program. One may wonder, however, if this perception was totally independent of her choice to stress the feminine image of the listener rather than a male style of leadership. As observed by Vedel (2007), although Sarkozy was already busy illustrating details of his revolutionary policy plans, Royal's

participative meetings were still ongoing. Her timing was clearly not synchronized with the media that started asking if her vague message of change was not empty of specific policy proposals.

During the campaign Royal complained that "her record and achievements would probably not be questioned in the same way if she were a male candidate for the same office."[8] There is no incontrovertible evidence in support of her statement. However, a direct comparison may offer some insight. It is worth noting that François Bayrou, another presidential candidate, was much better pictured by the press (Holtz-Bacha et al. 2009, 91), notwithstanding a record that was not really superior to Royal's in terms of his government and political experience. So, at least in this regard, a certain disparity of treatment can be presumed. In any case, Royal's strategy of victimization did not sweeten media attitudes toward her. Rather, she was criticized for not being able to accept criticism and denigrated for her complaints.[9] Nor did Royal find more sympathy among voters. According to a poll, only one-third of respondents acknowledged she could be the victim of gender prejudice.[10] More generally, it may be advanced that her complaints damaged her by reinforcing the stereotype that women are weaker and less capable of reacting to criticism.

In sum, although there are certainly a variety of reasons to explain Royal's defeat, including the fact that her adversary was more experienced and offered more detailed policy prescriptions, it may be advanced that Royal suffered from the double-bind effect. Her strategy of incarnating a "female" style of leadership seems to have carried advantages, especially in the first phase of her campaign, but it also had some side effects. The idea of drafting a programmatic platform through a process of consulting citizens was a very good one from the point of view of reinforcing her image as a candidate taking care of people's desires and needs. As I have stressed, it also had an element of novelty in the French political context. On the other hand, the proposal to consult the people on all crucial matters, although very democratic in principle, clashed with the traditional idea of strong leadership incarnated by the president of the republic in the French Fifth Republic. According to a very well-rooted tradition that goes back to General de Gaulle, the president is regarded as the head of executive power, who receives by popular election his or her legitimacy to make decisions on behalf of the whole nation (in contrast

to the Parliament, which is seen instead as the place of expression and confrontation of special interests among parties and groups). In other words, a woman aspiring to become president of the French Republic is forced to adapt more closely to an ideal type of leadership that, for historical and cultural reasons, is clearly based on male traits (Campus 2010a). This may lead French women political leaders to be especially vulnerable to the double-bind effect.

When women leaders are too strong: The case of Hillary Clinton

From many points of view, Hillary Clinton's 2007 primary campaign may be regarded as the reverse of Royal's case. As a former first lady, Clinton was visible and well known even before entering the Senate in 2000. After seven years as senator from the State of New York, her popularity was further increased. As the *Economist* wrote, "she has the most powerful name in the business, a smoothly working political machine, a wealth of experience in both the legislative and executive branch. And she exudes competence."[11] In the Senate she was on the Armed Services Committee, a typical and traditionally male area of expertise. In contrast to the French candidate Royal, Clinton positioned herself as competent on a wider range of issues, from domestic to international policies. On the eve of the primary election, polls still registered a large majority of Democratic voters believing she was the most suitable to be president.[12]

Similarly, a few months later, in the middle of a campaign much tougher than Clinton had expected, voters still saw her as the most experienced of all candidates. In a survey by the Pew Research Center (2008), respondents described her as strong, determined, smart, and capable, all attributes usually employed to describe male candidates. No doubt Americans perceived her as qualified for the job of the presidency. In short, though Royal was presumably penalized by the stereotype of women not being fit to lead their country and to be the commander-in-chief, Clinton represented one of the few exceptions as a woman credited with being as tough as a man.

However, as previously observed, if a leader such as Thatcher was allowed to emphasize the dominant traits of her character without paying a price, today's female leaders face a much more difficult job: combining enough toughness to lead the nation and enough care

to understand people's worries and problems. Well aware of this, Clinton's campaign worked hard not so much to establish her credentials on leadership and competence, which were taken for granted, but rather to cultivate human relations (Leibovich 2007).

As was often stressed by the media, Clinton never appeared to be a very warm woman. Indeed, especially in her early years as first lady, the press often criticized her for being excessively ambitious and calculating (Brown and Gardetto 2000). In contrast to her husband, who is famous for his human touch, Hillary Clinton is reported to speak like a "political science professor," having a command of the issues, being clear and informative, but not able to project emotion (Warner 2007). Her campaign was clearly aware of this shortcoming from the very beginning and tried to contrast it by adopting an appropriate strategy: "Mrs. Clinton's campaign's operative concept is the 'conversation.' It is impossible to attend a Hillary-for-president event and forget you are joining a conversation instead of hearing a conventional political speech. Mrs. Clinton relentlessly repeats the catch word, and for those who missed it, there are huge 'Let the Conversation Begin' signs on the wall" (Leibovich 2007). It should also be remembered that Clinton announced her candidacy via her website in a video where she sat on a big sofa in a living room and tried to convene a message of intimacy with the audience.

As the primary campaign progressed, it was easy to see that Clinton's strategy to overcome the image of excessive assertiveness was not adequately received by the media. Rather, the fact of having shown enough competence and strength to be president did not prevent criticism of being hard and lacking femininity. Especially outside the mainstream print press, on the Internet and in broadcast media, Clinton was addressed with "some shockingly misogynist comments" (Falk 2010, 152; Seelye and Bosman 2008). A paradigmatic example concerns the use of the word "bitch." Falk (2010, 162) reported at the time that a simple Internet search yielded more than 9000 hits; a search on YouTube revealed 427 videos linking Clinton with that word. Clinton was openly defined as a bitch in several TV and radio broadcasts (2010, 163). Clinton was not new to this sort of offensive language: already as first lady of the U.S., she had been notoriously defined as a bitch by the mother of Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. As observed by Anderson (1999), in earning the "b-word" she joined a lot of famous female politicians, including

another prominent candidate, Geraldine Ferraro, who campaigned for the vice-presidency in 1984. As a first lady, Clinton was the object of a malignant narrative because, in contrast to her predecessors, she never concealed her influence and power. Therefore, she was considered a model of women's political power and treated with the same acrimony reserved for other female leaders. Indeed, Clinton's image was even more tarnished by her power being seen as illegitimate. The news accounts on Clinton often said she had access to power without being elected (Brown and Gardetto 2000, 22). As a matter of fact, Bill Clinton had openly campaigned by treating his wife as a running mate (with the famous slogan, "Buy one, get one free"). However, the press coverage never really accepted her in that role and noted the violations of a standard behavior for a first lady (Houchin Winfield 1997).

Use of the bitch narrative has to be seen as a clear indicator of the "simplistic thinking that fosters double binds" (Anderson 1999, 617). As observed before, we use different words to describe the same behavior on the part of men and women. There is no corresponding word to bitch that applies to men in condemning toughness and assertiveness. Indeed, a certain degree of aggressiveness is seen as a component of leadership. Rather, the lack of it is perceived as a liability.

In the search for an explanation of this phenomenon, it should be underlined that the media have much of the responsibility: the mass media reinforce this kind of attack, also because of the sensationalist content. However, part of the explanation lies elsewhere. According to Anderson (1999, 617), the "containment culture" acting against ambitious women in public and professional life has to be situated in a larger cultural context. The coverage of Clinton as presidential candidate can be seen as a confirmation that a certain degree of sexism still persists in U.S. politics.

In contrast to Royal, Clinton did not play the card of "the mother of the nation." Indeed, it seems that her chief consultant, Mark Penn, theorized that her image had to be parental in a sort of neutral way, a kind of "tough single parent"—someone who can combine toughness with negotiating skills (Harnden 2008).[13] The strategy of degenderizing Clinton's role, however, was not successful at all. A look at how she was covered in the media shows a biased picture of her as a sort of scolding mother. To give just an example, on Fox

News it was said: "When Obama speaks, men hear: 'Take off for the future.' When Clinton speaks, men hear: 'Take out the garbage.' "[14] From this point of view, Clinton's case offered new evidence for Schwartzenberg's thesis (1980) that a female style of leadership may also elicit negative reactions if strength and toughness are associated with a desire to dominate and usurp men's power. If not the mother of the nation, it is nevertheless true that Clinton tried to play the role of the "nurturing warrior", "tough enough to lead Americans in wartime but tender enough to understand their burdens" (Leibovich 2007). But in the end, the media pictured her simply as deviating from the standard of femininity, or even worse, as interpreting an arrogant standard of femininity (Carlin and Winfrey 2009).

Another indicator of the negative sexualization of Clinton's persona was the insinuation that she castrated men. This statement appeared on the Internet and was repeatedly heard on broadcast TV (Falk 2010, 164). The metaphor of castration represents a further attempt to sexualize women's power in a perverse way by suggesting the idea that a female leader is a threatening intrusion into the male realm, and that her ascent can be accomplished only at the price of humiliating and depriving men of their power.

In conclusion, there is no doubt that Clinton received sexist and unfair media coverage, as confirmed by the lively debate between members of the press that occurred in the weeks following her withdrawal.[15] Her case demonstrates that attracting wide coverage and being considered as presidential is not enough to protect women from gender stereotypes and the double bind. Strength is certainly an indispensable feature of the presidential character, but one that for a woman candidate is very difficult to deal with.

5
The Appearance of Power

Women leaders and the personal factor

The process of personalization of politics has encouraged the mass media to focus on the image of politicians. The more that political communication becomes candidate-centered, the more the media are concerned with transmitting the visual impressions communicated by leaders. Of course, the press does not limit itself to objective description of how candidates appear. Rather, the media "highlight, underplay, or diminish particular features of candidates. . . . These media-shaped images conveyed to voters . . . become powerful symbols that identify and/or define a candidate" (Kotler and Kotler 1999, 5).

The image of a leader centers on a visual picture that voters should be able to recognize and retrieve at mention of his or her name (Newman 1999, 91ff.). It also involves personal characteristics and attitudes, along with physical presence, gestures, clothing, and so on. These last aspects must not be underestimated because they are essential components of the overall picture as well. Indeed, appearance is supposed to give important information about who a person is. It has been argued that the leader's image should be projected consistently on all public occasions (Louw 2005; Kotler and Kotler 1999); personal appearance must be coherent with the messages the candidate is conveying. A problem may arise, however, if the emphasis on looks is overemphasized, at the expense of other notable aspects such as the leader's character and political positions.

As Dianne Bystrom (2006, 173) noted, "Examples of the media's attention to the appearance of women political candidates are backed

by more than twenty-five years of research by scholars from political science, journalism, and communication. Even though media coverage has improved, women and men in politics are still treated differently by the media, suggesting gender stereotypes continue to pose problems for female candidates." In fact, the studies that are generally positive about an improvement in media coverage of women candidates offered evidence of clear gender differences in candidate portrayals. For instance, Devitt (2002) found an equal treatment of American gubernatorial candidates in terms of the quantity of coverage, but journalists more often described the appearance of women candidates than that of men. Similarly, Bystrom and her colleagues' analysis of newspaper articles covering gubernatorial and U.S. Senate races showed press treatment to be more balanced as to the amount of coverage and the viability assessment, but not as on candidates' descriptions (Bystrom et al. 2004).

If simple mention of the details of a woman's body or attire may appear insignificant and not influential, it should be noted that taken together they contribute to the general phenomenon of trivialization (Stevens 2007), which undermines the seriousness and credibility of female candidacy and political action. Clearly, such a media approach may contribute to marginalizing women in public life. To highlight this point, Stevens (2007, 139) makes an interesting comparison between how the press covered the 12 ministers of the French government of Alain Juppé (1995–1997) and a conspicuous group of British Labour Party MPs in the 1997 general election. In both cases women were linked to the man who was supposed to lead them: the French ministers were labeled "les jupettes," while the British MPs were nicknamed "Blair's babes." But the symbolism evoked by both labels went beyond simple evocation of a relationship of dependency with a man. Actually they can be considered openly denigrating: in French "les jupettes" means "bit of skirt," and the term "babe," as one of the women MPs remarked bitterly (Childs 2004, 64), is readily associated with sex and "blond tousled hair."[1] Therefore, Stevens concludes (2007, 139), "trivialization is a form of symbolic sexism and another possible pitfall for female politicians."

The key point is that trivialization corresponds to disempowerment. As linguist Robin Lakoff (2003, 173) observes:

> It is true that men in the public eye can be criticized for their looks (Al Gore's incipient bald spot, Bill Clinton's paunch, George Bush's

> "smirk"). But these barbs are both less frequent and less prominent directed at men than at women. Further, comments about looks are much more dangerous to a woman's already fragile grasp of power than to a man's: they reduce a woman to her traditional role of *object*, one who is seen rather than one who sees and acts. Because this is a conventional view of women, but not of men, comments about looks work much more effectively to disempower women than men, and are more hurtful to women, who have always been encouraged to view looks as a primary attribute—as men usually have not. Being the passive object of the gaze is presupposed for women, never for heterosexual men.

Sreberny-Mohammadi and Ross (1996, 109) advance a similar argument on the difference in media treatment: "The media tendency toward privileging form over function, presentation over policy increasingly means that all politicians are subject to the tyranny of telegeinity and must surrender to sartorial scrutiny, not only women. Yet while there are sufficient 'pretty-boy Blair' stories to make it increasingly so, the objectification of male politicians in this way is still noticeable because of its infrequency, whereas for women politicians it is, on the contrary, the rule."

All this said, for women politicians in general, nothing differs in particular as far as women leaders are concerned. In her study of American presidential candidates, Erika Falk (2010, 87) counted the number of descriptions of the body of each candidate in press reports. She found that, on average, women received close to four physical descriptions for every one applied to men. Falk's results have also emphasized that there was no substantial change over time since the first female presidential candidate in 1872. As Cantor and Bernay (1992, 76) observed in their seminal study of female leadership, women politicians cannot escape this kind of media coverage. The fact that women leaders' physical appearance is often a source of media comments has received validation by a large number of case studies. For instance, the coverage of three recent American presidential and vice-presidential candidates—Elizabeth Dole, Hillary Clinton, and Sarah Palin—speaks to this trend. According to Aday and Devitt (2001), journalists reported on Dole differently than they did on her male adversaries by giving more space to the personal factor. Dole had her candidacy framed in terms of her personal traits, especially in terms of family issues, background, and personality, but

a certain degree of attention was given as well to age and appearance. As the authors commented, "this is not to contend that issue coverage is positive and personal coverage negative." The point is that "personal coverage does not offer information on how candidates will govern, thereby suggesting that such public policy matters are not relevant to their candidacies" (Aday and Devitt 2001, 62). Also, Heldman, Carroll, and Olson (2005) found a much-evident gendered approach in newspaper coverage of Dole: not only did the press pay more attention to her personality traits and appearance than to the same characteristics of her male adversaries, but when her appearance was mentioned comments were mostly negative, as was not the case with the other candidates.

In the 2008 presidential campaign, a rich body of academic research confirmed the first impression of a significant bias in the media coverage of personal factors and physical appearance of women candidates (Carlin and Winfrey 2009; Carroll 2009; Gutgold 2009; Stein 2009). In the case of Clinton, restricting the analysis to the mainstream print press shows a limited number of physical descriptions (15 percent of coverage) with special attention to what she wore (Falk 2010, 158). However, as soon as one extends the focus to broadcast TV, online news outlets, and Internet blogs, instances of inappropriate and sexist coverage rise notably (Stein 2009; Lawrence and Ross 2010, 152–53). And, as Carroll noted (2009, 13), what is especially striking is that "sexism and sexist remarks by journalists and on-air pundits were treated as acceptable forms of expression. . . . There are so many examples here that it is hard to know where to begin. There is, of course, the coverage of Clinton's pantsuits, and her cleavage, and the famous 'cackle.' "

Carroll's quotation mentions three issues raised during the campaign, all evidence of the trivialization that operated against Clinton's candidacy. Leaving aside the theme of pantsuits (to which I return in the next section), the most glaring example is the "cleavage story." A journalist from the *Washington Post* opened the debate by reporting on Clinton's low neckline on an outfit she wore during a floor speech.[2] Her article became the focus of several media stories on broadcast TV and the Internet, ranging from plain narrations of what happened to very offensive and outrageous comments (Stein 2009; Falk 2010). From many sources the question of appropriateness was raised, with the result of "a lot of press time and attention once again

devoted to coverage of a woman candidate's attire and appearance rather than her policy positions" (Falk 2010, 159).

"No sooner did the uproar over [Clinton's] necklines simmer down in the media," reported Gutgold, "when her laugh became the subject of media inquiry" (2009, 86). The "Clinton cackle" was investigated by the press as a matter of capital importance; articles flourished on the web, several newspapers entered the debate, and an anchorman questioned whether her laugh seemed presidential (Gutgold 2009, 87). Indeed, by shifting the discussion from esthetic judgment to moral assessment, an article in the national news section of the *New York Times* posed the question of whether Clinton's laugh was authentic or calculated (Carroll 2009, 13).

As for vice-presidential candidate Sarah Palin, it may be argued that her coverage marked the peak of media comments on physical appearance for any female candidate. An evident sexist approach in describing her "stemmed from her beauty queen background, her youthful appearance, wardrobe, and her unabashed feminine nonverbal communication such as winking" (Carlin and Winfrey 2009, 330). If some of the press statements were apparently insignificant and just meant to underline her attractiveness, most of them—such as the obsession with labeling her as a sexy woman or calling her a Barbie or former pageant queen—were openly dismissing her as a serious candidate for the vice-presidential office (Carlin and Winfrey 2009, 330). In their study of media coverage of vice-presidential candidates, Heldman et al. (2009, 34) found that the only two women who were candidates for that office, Geraldine Ferraro in 1984 and Palin in 2008, clearly received more coverage mentioning dress and appearance than male candidates. Moreover, comparing media treatment of Ferraro and Palin directly, they concluded that the intensity and the volume of personal coverage were not reduced despite media claims of being less subject to gender prejudices today, and that they have actually "dramatically increased." Since both women could be regarded as very attractive, the authors stressed that comments on Palin were more sexually explicit: "Ferraro was diminished by reporters describing her as blonde, slender, blue-eyed, smiling, etc. . . . The sexism in Palin's coverage was even more intense and misogynistic: 'I initially dismissed her as good-looking, [but] that backfired'; 'Caribou Barbie'; 'Malibu Barbie'; 'Presidential Barbie'; 'Winking Wonderwoman of Wasilla'; our 'National Obsession'; 'His

[McCain's] cheerleader choice'; 'Hugh Hefner asked Sarah Palin [to pose] for Playboy, because right now she is posing as a vice presidential candidate'; etc." (Heldman et al. 2009, 17).

In the case of Palin, and with Clinton, it is interesting to note that, although mainstream media were more balanced, the most offensive and sexist comments appeared prevalently on broadcast media and Internet blogs. However, especially in the case of Palin, there was no great difference between old and new media as for the attention given to dress and appearance. Indeed, the mainstream press seemed to be even more interested in those aspects than Internet blogs were, which rather preferred to grill Palin on her family (Heldman et al. 2009, 21). In sum, the fact that the mainstream press often claims to have adopted internal rules to avoid gendered coverage of appearance and private life of candidates did not prevent Palin from receiving a great deal of comments on her appearance and attire.

If U.S. politics offers crystal-clear evidence of the gendered treatment of candidates' appearance, one should stress that looks and style of dress tend to color media descriptions of women leaders also outside the U.S. In France, female politicians' appearance and style is notoriously a matter of intense media debate (Freedman 1997, Chapter 2). This is only partly justified by the greater propensity of the French press to deal with appearance and attire because of the central role of the fashion world in French life. In fact, social, cultural, and political differences do not seem to alter news coverage in an exceptional way. Valenzuela and Correa (2009) found that, although the Chilean press did not seem very interested in President Michelle Bachelet's attire, newspapers did place more emphasis on her appearance than on that of her male adversaries. In Germany, Angela Merkel's candidacy for the premiership attracted media attention and also criticism of her hairstyle and dress (Marx Ferree 2006; Van Zoonen 2006). To confirm cross-cultural similarities, a comparative analysis including Merkel, Bachelet, and the Liberian Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf found limited emphasis, but at least "some attention," to appearance in 60 percent of newspaper stories examined (Cantrell and Bachmann 2008, 435). A study of leadership contests of Canadian conservative parties (Trimble 2007) found that the frequency of mention of appearance of female candidates seemed to depend also on contingent variables: in 1993 Kim Campbell's looks were not an issue for the press, with her being the front runner

making her newsworthy for other aspects. However, just a few years later, in 2004, Belinda Stronach, an attractive woman with a glamorous image and a much poorer chance of winning, received very different treatment. Trimble does not underestimate the fact that the campaign was not very exciting and so the media needed to liven up their coverage; nonetheless she does not seem to believe that Stronach would have been treated very differently under other circumstances (Trimble 2007, 989).

A question arises: why have the media improved their treatment of women leaders in terms of the amount of coverage and viability assessment but still give more emphasis to their appearance than to that of men? A benevolent explanation is that, from the point of view of how they look, women are fascinating characters, less predictable, and more varied than men. Thus, even though men go unnoticed, women capture more media attention. There may be some truth in this line of reasoning, but there are also many other elements to be taken into consideration to understand the deep reasons for the gendered approach adopted by the mass media.

According to Falk (2010, 88), the fact that women in power are likely to be described physically today as they were a century ago depends on cultural and deeply rooted beliefs that cause women to be judged by how they look: "Women have traditionally been valued for their ability to find a good husband, and appearance has been assumed to be a primary measure of a woman's value in that regard. Though few in contemporary American society would agree with this, the persistence with which the press has tended to comment on women's appearance reveals the enduring legacies and unconscious ideologies of this value system."

Freedman (1997, 80–81) observes that the evolution of political communication has forced men to be more concerned with their image as well; however, women politicians are still judged more by their appearance than men. This is due to the fact that "notwithstanding the social changes, the body image remains more at the core of female representation than of the male one." Indeed, what is called "celebrity politics" may only reinforce such a phenomenon. Liesbet Van Zoonen argues convincingly that "celebrity confines female politicians to notions of femininity that are not easily transposed to the political field." Women who gain high media visibility and therefore celebrity mostly succumb to the Hollywood star system,

which "is commonly seen as the historical source of celebrity culture. . . . As a result, female celebrity is articulated primarily with the codes and conventions of media representations of women; of Hollywood conventions initially and an amalgam of television, pop music and advertising images later" (Van Zoonen 2006, 291). Still, "female celebrity remains built primarily on the appearance of the body" and "most notions of female celebrity do not travel easily to the political field" (292).

The media also seem to consider how women leaders look as being closely related to their personality. The analysis by Bystrom et al. (2004, 184) of gubernatorial and Senate races has highlighted that, although there is no great difference in references to candidate personality in the coverage of both women and men, newspapers stories tend to establish a link between the personality and the body appearance of women in a way that is not usual for men. For instance, a female candidate's smile is often a source of comments. One of the most famous labels the Turkish media gave to Prime Minister Tansu Ciller was "the lady with a smile of still" (Norris 1997, 159), a way of associating her personal charm with a quality of extraordinary confidence and determination. Ségolène Royal's smile was pictured as inspiring (Salmon 2007). It is true that the smile is an important indicator of sincerity: as the psychologist Paul Ekman has shown, one may be trained to distinguish spontaneous smiles from those hiding negative feelings (Ekman and Friesen 1982; Ekman 1985). However, the point is that the media are not really concerned with analyzing the facial expressions of male candidates and consequently limit themselves to banal comments. Above all, trivial details of body and appearance are taken as possible indicators of a woman's personality. For instance, when Hillary Clinton was still the first lady, her frequent changes in hairstyle were interpreted as a metaphor for a chameleon character (Schnoebelen et al. 2009, 45). All such instances show that even apparently insignificant particulars of appearance may be taken as evidence of authenticity, honesty, and reliability.

The mass media show special interest in the outward appearance of women in politics, as if they hope to infer some hidden traits of their personality. It is as if the media feel the need to describe women politicians' appearance to better understand them (Freedman 1997, Chapter 2). This can be an advantage for those women who are able to make a good impression; they may capitalize on it to transfuse

that positive feeling to their overall leadership image. The other side of the coin, however, is a sort of implicit (and dangerous) correlation between a woman's appearance and her credibility as a politician. For instance, a number of female British representatives declared that they believed if one of them were to appear in the House of Commons with dirty hair and stained and shabby clothing, her suitability as an MP would be immediately questioned by the media (Sreberny-Mohammadi and Ross 1996, 109). In some ways, being good-looking, or at least appearing neat and appropriately dressed, is perceived as an obligation, a necessary qualification for taking part in public life. On the contrary, one may speculate on what might happen to a shabby male leader: he would be blamed and even ridiculed, but it is unlikely his competence or leadership would be criticized as a consequence.

Another factor that may take on a gendered role in defining leadership is age. It is another of the personal characteristics frequently discussed by the media. A good leader is supposed to have experience and plenty of energy, two qualities that taken together should rule out those who are too young or too old. The first need not be discussed here: in most contemporary democracies the candidate selection process tends to block ascent to higher political office for 20-somethings of both sexes. The other end of the spectrum, however, proves to be more controversial. Several old leaders have also been very influential and effective heads of state: Ronald Reagan was elected president of the U.S. at 69 and re-elected at 73; Charles de Gaulle became president of the French Republic at 68. Nevertheless, advanced age may become a lively matter of discussion in electoral campaigns; in 1984, for instance, Walter Mondale directed this argument against Reagan. However, before Hillary Clinton no presidential candidate in his or her early sixties was ever regarded as unqualified for the office. In particular, how Clinton's age issue was raised illustrates very well the existence of a link among age, gender, and appearance. As a matter of fact, it all started from a very unflattering photograph posted by conservative blogger Matt Drudge, in which Clinton appeared very tired and had evident wrinkles. In the days following, several other media outlets mentioned and reproduced the image. This launched a debate on the suitability of an aging woman to lead the country. Conservative political observer Rush Limbaugh openly asked, "Will this country want to actually watch a woman

get older before their eyes on a daily basis?" (Falk 2010, 159–60). During the 2008 campaign the Republican candidate, the 71-year-old John McCain, was questioned by the media about being too old, but with a much more respectful tone. In particular, what is striking in Clinton's case was that the true issue was not age (since Clinton was actually closer to the average age of presidential candidates than her rival Obama) but the *appearance of age*. As Lawrence and Rose (2010, 137) noted, "most women enter politics on average later than their male counterparts, and because they must take time to establish their credibility and suitable experience, women can expect to run for the presidency later than men. But to the extent that mature women face cultural discrimination in the United States, arguing the 'experience' message may inadvertently become code for advanced age, as it surely did in Clinton's case."

As Jamieson observes, another double bind takes place to a female disadvantage: aging versus invisibility. This prejudice too has very old roots: "In days of yore, in the public sphere, the older man was a wizard, the older woman a witch; the older man a sage, the older woman a nag; the older man a prophet, the older woman a hag" (Jamieson 1995, 160). It is a fact that some influential female political leaders came to power well into their sixties, Golda Meir being a prominent example. However, the few exceptions aside, a look around shows that aging women in the world of TV and the movie-star system are openly disadvantaged with respect to men. Therefore, since celebrity politics tends to treat women leaders as if they belong to one of those categories, it is not surprising if older women politicians are assessed according to the same criteria: "If middle age can confer power and increase sex appeal on men, in women the reverse is held to be the case" (151). To avoid invisibility, as Jamieson suggests, aging political leaders may retreat into the symbolic role of grandmother, as seen in the previous chapter. This option is not always available to all candidates, though, and it certainly was not viable for Clinton.

The dress code of women leaders

Research evidence shows that newspaper articles are more likely to comment on outfits or haircuts of female candidates than on male ones (Bystrom et al. 2004, 179). According to most women engaged in a political career, the press seems obsessed with detailing female

leaders' clothing independently of the political and national context. Even in a progressive country such as Norway, which ranks among the most conspicuous for female representation in politics, the prime minister, Gro Brundtland, had reason to complain about media coverage: "the attacks came on many fronts: clothing, hairstyle, speech, gait, manner of leadership . . . women leaders are criticized more, and differently, than their male counterparts" (reported by Young 2011, 137).

Besides regularly describing what they wear, newspaper stories often include information about female leaders' preferred fashion stylists as though the candidates were "ambassadors" for one or another stylist (Freedman 1997, 110). For instance, Simone Veil is associated with Chanel; Ségolène Royal's signature was the tailleur by Paule Ka. Clothes of female leaders may even be at the center of public discussion. This happened to a coral jacket worn by Hillary Clinton during one of the 2008 primary debates among Democratic candidates. Her adversary, John Edwards, made a remark about the color of the outfit, and the press extensively commented on the incident. Nothing really surprising for Clinton: her suits previously attracted media attention in her 2000 race for the Senate (Bystrom et al. 2004, 179). Even more fuss was made in Spain over an outfit that Minister of Defense Carme Chacon wore at a solemn commemoration. Protocol prescribed gowns for women, but the young minister chose an elegant black pantsuit. In so doing, she started a public debate in the press, where criticism alternated with expression of solidarity from ordinary women and her female colleagues (Young 2011, 132–33). The list of possible examples is very long. In light of this, a question is in order: why does the style of dress of women leaders receive so much coverage by the mass media?

Media interest in the hairstyle and dress of female politicians partly reflects the attitude, already discussed, according to which the press tends to cover female political leaders as if they were movie or TV stars. Exaggerated attention is given to every aspect of a female's body and appearance, style of dress included. However, the issue of female politicians' clothes deserves further and deeper investigation. According to most sociologists of fashion, clothing is a form of "visual language" (Davis 1992, 3) through which "a person announces his identity, shows his values, expresses his mood, or proposes his attitude" (Stone 2006, 148). Thus the clothes of a leader make an

important statement, one that should be coherent or at least not contradictory with the overall image of leadership he or she intends to project. This holds for both sexes, but because women's fashion offers a much broader variety, women become far more interesting subjects of analysis for the mass media and the public.

Like women in all sorts of executive office, female political leaders are less constrained by conventional choices in their clothing. As Bard (2010, 363) observes, "women have to build their own image," in contrast to male political leaders, who stick to the *costume bourgeois*, that is to say the classic man in the suit. In fact, the clothing code for male leaders consists of the "traditional middle-class male dress" that "signals the privileged access to the sources of economic and political power in industrial and postindustrial society" (Davis 1992, 40). In light of this, it is clear why, in the case of male leaders, clothing becomes a media issue only when it is somehow deviant from the conventional code, usually when it is too informal for an occasion. Or if men display a frivolous attitude, as with Gerhard Schröder dying his hair (Marx Ferree 2006) or Silvio Berlusconi wearing a "bandanna" (a sort of foulard) during a summer holiday with Tony Blair (Mancini 2008). But all these are just the exceptions confirming the rule.

Not having a predefined clothing code, women leaders could permit their dress to be more varied and given to the novelties of fashion. Nevertheless, their style of dress has even more complex symbolic meaning. As Davis observes, for women a higher degree of freedom means also greater opportunity to make mistakes in terms of mismatch, exaggeration, or neglect. But if, for a woman who is not pursuing a career, "mistakes in dress can be set aside more easily" because ultimately "her wardrobe, however well or poorly it succeeded in impressing others, was but an indirect reflection of status [. . .], which in the middle-class scheme of things resided in the man's occupational status and the wealth possessed by the family" (Davis 1992, 42), the same cannot be said for professional women. In particular, top executives and political leaders face the task of identifying an appropriate clothing style and feel the pressure of not making mistakes in signaling their position and status rank. Since the clothing codes of women are not supposed to represent power, "there is a tension at the center of women politicians' difficulties: a tension between projecting images of femininity and images of power. For

men, the task is easy: projecting images of masculinity and projecting images of power are the same thing. For women, there is always a contradiction: how to assume the appearance of power and, at the same time, to preserve their femininity?" (Freedman 1997, 99).

In the 1970s, "dress for success" made its appearance among the ranks of professional women. The basic idea was to de-emphasize the most feminine components of dress by wearing tailored suits with man-style jackets, "a figure suggesting masculinity, but leavened by some feminine touches like silk blouses, soft bow ties, earrings, clutch handbags, manicured nails" (Davis 1992, 50). Nowadays, however, the code of dressing for success is more nuanced and looser: as Young (2011, 9) writes, "in the past few years we began to witness a major paradigm shift in power dressing itself . . . more political women are now engaging with contemporary fashion, integrating its whims into what was for too long a worn-out power-dressing uniform." Notwithstanding, it may be observed that a clearly masculine style still remains the choice for a number of female politicians, notably the French minister Michèle Alliot-Marie (Bard 2010, 367) and the Israeli leader Tzipi Livni (Young 2011). Clinton's colorful pantsuits were her trademark, and a source of public debate, during the 2008 campaign (Stein 2009). For Clinton, as for many other women politicians, this sort of choice is probably due to her desire to find a look that will "silence people" and give her relief from all the comments and remarks she received in the past (Young 2011, 30). Angela Merkel usually wears jackets and pants too. At the beginning she was criticized for her lack of fashion sense, but after she adopted better-tailored pantsuits (often black, sometimes with brightly colored jackets), she gained approval even from fashion insiders (Young 2011, 68–70).

However, for a female politician, recasting her image too closely to that of men may not necessarily be the winning strategy; it can be seen as defiance and can make a woman less acceptable in the corridors of power (Freedman 1997, 98). In some ways, clothes can be taken as a metaphor for the competence-femininity double bind: a too-masculine style of dress contradicts the "true nature" of women, while a too-feminine touch may jeopardize their credibility. If clothes signal that a woman is not aggressive, this may well be reassuring for her male colleagues. But a woman with too reassuring an image may experience more difficulty in being regarded as a credible competitor for top positions (Davis 1992, 51).

Therefore, once again the personalization of politics, with emphasis from TV and the popular press on visual material and with an inundation of photographs and videos makes clothing style a sensitive issue for women leaders. In the search for their own choice among the competing images proposed by the fashion system (Crane 2000), women politicians should be aware that their clothes are not neutral but instead have an impact on how voters perceive the coherence of their message. Just as body language that does not match what one is saying may produce unease in the audience, so too the wrong dress can suggest discrepancy and inauthenticity. This is also why the choice of style of dress should be consistent with the tastes of the leader's constituency. Sarah Palin's style, for instance, is an example of how fashion consultants may help a candidate become a style icon for her potential electorate (Young 2011, 145). A similar line of reasoning may well explain the style of President Kirchner in Argentina. She tends toward feminine wear that has nothing in common with the more formal style usually adopted by her female colleagues in the same top political offices. On the other hand, as Young (2011, 77) writes, "her attempt to appear less elitist through a refreshing girl-next-door kind of image has helped to keep the votes (of the country's poor and working classes) coming in." By contrast, but equally coherent with her political background, Marine Le Pen, the leader of the French party of the radical right, seems at ease in pantsuits that match well the masculine image of her party. Sometimes a detail is sufficient to convey the right message. Maybe the most famous hairstyle of a female political leader is Yulia Tymoshenko's blond braid curled around the head like a crown. According to the commonly held opinion, the former prime minister of Ukraine adopted her hairstyle as a tribute to her country folk traditions and therefore as a means to "underline her nationalist credentials" (Levy 2007).

If women leaders should pay attention to their style of dress not making them too distant in a fashion sense from their voters, another potential source of controversy and ambiguity is the extreme variability of fashion trends. One of the most valuable assets of a leader's image is recognizability. A haircut or style of dress may become a signature. So a woman in public life cannot change her image too frequently without creating a sort of cognitive discomfort in her audience. Moreover, as a subtler consequence, too many changes of style

can suggest she is capricious or unable to make up her mind—a dangerous reputation for a political ruler to take on (Braden 1996, 6). But excessive attention to fashion trends can suggest a frivolous attitude that may tarnish the image of a politician. This was the case with Palin, whose expenditures for wardrobe were a much-discussed issue in the 2008 U.S. campaign (Carlin and Winfrey 2009, 330), and with French Minister of Justice Rachida Dati, dubbed Miss Dior and often criticized for her expensive outfits.

But if too much glamour and too developed a taste for fashion seem to contrast with the ideal of authoritative behavior, neglect can be perceived even more negatively. Lack of elegance can be a glaring shortcoming for a woman leader. Merkel, who has been comparatively less subject to gender prejudices than many other women in power (Zeh 2010), was so openly criticized for her hairstyle and dress that she was forced to revise her haircut and clothes (Van Zoonen 2006, 295). In her case, especially at the beginning of her political career, deficiencies in style were mostly attributed to her coming from East Germany rather than to a lack of femininity (Marx Ferree 2006). Somehow, even if this offered her an alibi for lack of elegance, it is worth noting that the press put pressure on Merkel to represent the image of the nation in a proper way. Similarly the president of Finland, Tarja Halonen, who albeit very popular was nonetheless ranked by polls as one of the worst-dressed public figures in the country, was advised by the mass media to dress more suitably for her office (Young 2011, 139). In France, some female ministers were invited to incarnate more adequately the world-famous French style (Bard 2010, 368).

To sum up: first, as Rosenthal and Peters (2008, 60) wrote in referring to the excessive focus of the media on Nancy Pelosi's pearl necklace and collection of scarves, "the woman leader may be doughty, may change her hairstyle often, may be suspected of surgical interventions; or she may be regarded as too elegant, too fashionable, too refined. Unlike Goldilocks's favorite porridge, her appearance is rarely 'just right.' " Second, clothing is a clear indicator of media confusion about how to cover women in public life: on the one hand, modern journalism rules say not to describe a woman's appearance in a story unless you would do the same for a man (Braden 1996, 8); on the other hand, the press is still willing to weigh in with stories entirely centered on female leaders' style of

dress. As Young (2011, 13) observes, "The challenge for today's media is to strike a balance between giving colorful details that lend clues about a woman's personality, political views and character through her style choices without reducing her profile to superficial qualities or focusing unfairly on her exterior."

Power and seduction

Political leadership can be seen as the art of seducing voters and followers. However, though the relationship between power and personal charm is always a positive factor for a man, the same cannot be said for a woman. Indeed, under certain conditions, the mix of beauty, sexual attraction, and seduction may even be counterproductive for female political leaders.

If one looks at the universe of possible typologies of male political leaders, there are several examples of what has been called the "charming leader" (Schwartzenberg 1980), that is to say, young, handsome, brilliant, and admired by women; one thinks of John and Robert Kennedy, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, Pierre Trudeau, and Barack Obama. However, as Schwartzenberg observes (1980, 115), there does not exist a female counterpart to the charming leader; it is simply a model not available to women. Male political leaders may easily capitalize on their physical attractiveness to seduce voters, but even very beautiful women, once in power, have difficulties in projecting a successful image of "charming female leader." Instead of being an asset, beauty may become a liability for a woman aspiring to higher offices.

Several points should be taken into consideration. First of all, in the age of political marketing, nobody can deny that physical attractiveness is a key resource. TV carries the leaders' faces into everybody's home daily; being handsome and telegenic certainly helps to capture the attention of viewers. However, although for a man the act of seducing through his physical attributes is in any case perceived as an action with him as the leading actor, for a woman the use of her appearance as a tool of seduction transforms her into an object, a passive recipient of other people's gaze. In the words of a British MP, "Women politicians are there [in the public eye] and the minute anyone wants to be critical in any way, their looks or the fact they are a woman instantly sexualizes them and so their sexuality is

part of them all the time they are commented on, for good or ill" (Sreberny-Mohammadi and Ross 1996, 109).

In light of objectivization of the body for female politicians, a number of questions arise: is this an obstacle to the exercise of political leadership? As Freedman (1997, 131) asks, "May a woman seduce and, at the same time, preserve her legitimacy and political authority? Does she run the risk of losing her symbolic capital?" To answer, it should be stressed that a media focus on the physical attractiveness of a woman leader distracts attention from other more substantial attributes such as her background, her competence, and especially the platform she advocates. If the image of a woman leader is perceived through the messages conveyed by the media, and if such messages mostly center on her seductive potential, her credibility as a leader is likely to be diminished: "Emphasis on women as sex objects deflects discussion of qualities related to political office" (Carlin and Winfrey 2009, 331). Unusual attractiveness increases the risk of biased coverage as well as of reducing the possibility to be seen as a strong contender and an effective ruler. A glaring example is the case of Edith Cresson, who served as France's first (and, so far, only) female prime minister in 1991–1992. It should be said that the French political culture has always been notoriously sexist, even very explicitly so. It is well known, for instance, that some years ago when a woman spoke at the Assemblée National she could be addressed with cries of "Get naked!" and "Fuck you!" by her own colleagues.[3] The minister of the environment, Dominique Voynet, was received at the Salon de l'Agriculture by shouts of "take off your slip" (Sineau 2001, 147).

In a similar context, a certain degree of sexism in the coverage received by the first female prime minister should not be surprising. However, the media treatment of Cresson went beyond simple expressions of sexism; actually it is paradigmatic of how seriously attractive appearance may disadvantage a woman leader. Since her appointment Cresson, a pretty lady in her fifties, was pictured as the favorite of the prince, as if her only qualification were her friendship with President Mitterrand (Sineau 2001, 146). As Freedman (1997, 225ff.) observes, it was certainly true that Cresson was a Mitterrand's political creature and the choice of a female premier was intended as a coup de théâtre; however, the press diminished her poise much more than it did with others of Mitterrand's previous protégées, such

as Laurent Fabius. Media representation of Cresson as a "woman object," a sort of puppet created by Mitterrand to entertain the press and the public by virtue of her novelty, tarnished her credibility as a serious leader irremediably. A consequence of the emphasis of her as a "vedette" on the political stage was to deprive her political action of all meaning: "The eternal femininity, the art of appearing, the necessity of smiling, and seducing: Cresson could not escape all those clichés related to femininity" (Freedman 1997, 233).

If the French political context has always been characterized by a high degree of sexism, what happened in 2008 to Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton in a country where "political correctness" is considered a fundamental value appears nonetheless striking. In commenting on media coverage of the electoral campaign, Carlin and Winfrey (2009, 339) expressed the common view that even "mainstream media find it acceptable to be blatantly sexist and, with few exceptions and suspensions of reporters, unapologetic [...] there is no denial that both Palin and Clinton had strikes against them that contributed to their lack of success, ... but those strikes were unrelated to their being women .... If one accepts the shortcomings of the two campaigns and the two women themselves on political merits, there is still no reason for sexist attacks to enter into the debate." If in the past other American women politicians were victims of media objectivization of the body, the treatment of Sarah Palin, a young and attractive woman, has to be regarded as uncommonly sexually explicit. Heldman et al. (2009, 24) argue that the reason Palin got more sexist and raunchier coverage than her predecessor (Ferraro) was the "normalization of women's objectivization and mainstream pornification, neither of which existed in 1984." It is true that the phenomenon emerges more openly where there is no editorial filter as is the case on the Internet, but it is not less true that mainstream media are currently involved as well. Indeed, there exists an "increasingly thin line between pornography and mainstream media," a "culture that celebrates sexually explicit images and themes." All this said, it is not surprising that, for a woman like Palin, who did not refrain from showing her femininity in her body language and attire, it was difficult to avoid sexist coverage.

Should we conclude that all attractive women in politics are destined to face a sort of degradation in media representation? Royal, for instance, is a beautiful woman who succeeded in avoiding being

represented as a sexual object. It is enough to say that the press gave her the nickname of the "Madone du Poitou" by referring to a mystical imaginary or set of related images, rather than to sexual ones. Somehow, Royal was able to project a physical image coherent with her whole message. Her goal was to appear as the mother of the nation, one who listens and takes care of citizens. She stressed this mothering and almost mystical aura consistently, in her appearance and clothing as well (see, for instance, the preference for the color white). However, even if she could emphasize her femininity without appearing to be a seductress and therefore avoid the worst of sexist coverage, this does not mean she was not the victim of other forms of gender discrimination, as previously discussed. Nor could she prevent disproportionate coverage of her attire during the whole campaign, which suggested to her adversaries arguments against her seriousness as a presidential candidate.[4]

Another peculiar and interesting case is Margaret Thatcher. She was always perceived and pictured by the media as a powerful woman with a domineering character. (This corresponded accurately to the truth, as personality profiling amply confirmed; Steinberg 2008.) Nonetheless, she did not aspire to be described as a masculine woman but instead projected an image of a woman who was masculine for her character traits but feminine in her appearance and capacity for seduction (Freedman 1997, 216). She attracted a great deal of media attention for her hairstyle and clothing as well, appearing as a traditional middle-class woman with a preference for very feminine dresses and blouses. In this regard, the press did not refrain from making comments and remarks, but it was as if they were emphasizing something external, from which one could not misread her true personality (Freedman 1997, 215). In other words, for Thatcher looks did not convey a message consistent with her political action, but this did not hurt her. Indeed, her claim to exceptionality—a true woman who happened to be stronger than men—saved her from any form of double bind.

A further explanation of Thatcher's success in avoiding demeaning gendered coverage suggests she was able to synthesize masculine character and feminine seduction by making an appeal to a female model that is supposedly strongly grounded in British culture: the governess (Jamieson 1995, 160; Nunn 2002, 22; De Michelis 2010, 109). By playing this part, her dominating approach became

acceptable. This underlines the limits of Thatcher as a role model: not only did she belong to a past era where powerful leaders were so rare that they did not raise any problem of defining female leadership but her experience, as Jamieson stressed (1995, 160), is also culture-bound and not easily exportable to other countries.

Finally, it is worth noting that the sex appeal and the sexual life of women leaders are extremely controversial matters in the public eye. The fact is that a female leader reverses what is the presumed natural order of the relationship between sex and power. As Pierre Bourdieu argued in *On Masculine Domination*, the difference in gender socialization makes men love power games and women love men who play them. If a woman plays those games, can she be regarded as lovable? Will men admire and love her, as women are fascinated by powerful men? Probably not, because this would contradict "the principle of division between the active male and the passive female and because this principle creates, organizes, expresses and directs desire—male desire as the desire for masculine domination, as eroticized subordination or even, in the limiting case, as eroticized domination" (Bourdieu 2001, 21).

Therefore, a woman in power who is also sexually attractive is one to be feared, not desired. It does not apply to women the positive association between political power and sex that leaves sexual practices of male rulers characterized by access to multiple women, a condition that reminds us of the advantages reserved for alpha males among primates (Ludwig 2002). There is a long list of political leaders who found time in their tight schedules for a great many sexual conquests. Not only did this philandering not usually hurt their political career, but in several instances it appears that an almost compulsive sexual behavior reflected a leader's supposed qualification to rule, in the public mind. This was the case for many charismatic dictators, from Mussolini to Sukarno (Willner 1984). Legends associated with some democratic leaders also suggest their success with women (Ludwig 2002, 59–63), as with John Kennedy in the U.S., and François Mitterrand and Jacques Chirac in France (Zemmour 2006). But the inverse case has never occurred: a political woman praised for her sexual conquests. In any case, for a woman in power an intense sexual life would be much less acceptable than for a man. In her book on "Warrior Queens", by which is meant women who led their nations to war, Antonia Fraser stressed that the sexuality of those

women, whatever the truth, was always called into question. Propaganda ranged from attribution of total chastity to a presumed sexual voracity. However, although chastity was described by supporters as a supernatural attribute, attribution of extraordinary sexual appetite was used more to denigrate than to celebrate them (Fraser 1990, 334). Linguist Lakoff argues that in comparing the connotations of the words "stud" and "slut," "political males are sometimes seen as sex objects, but we should not be misled by apparent parallels: sexual conquest enhances a man's power, but weakens a woman's" (Lakoff 2003, 173).

6
The Family Factor

The good wife and the good mother

The image of the good wife and the good mother is a common concern of both the media and female candidates. Although the family of a statesman is not a primary object of media attention unless it offers a good photo opportunity, the fact that women leaders are wives and mothers is intensively scrutinized. The obvious rationale for this is that in many cases women's political commitment is seen as a sort of extension of the home role; this is particularly true for those leaders who try to project the image of the mother of the nation. All said, however, the fact that a woman meets popular expectations by getting married and having children is a key aspect of the media coverage of every female candidate, independently of her personal history and style of leadership. One may speculate that the mass media want to reassure their audiences that a candidate qualified for a political job may be also a traditional woman (Braden 1996, 65). Though male identity is not necessarily related to the role of husband and father, a woman is often described through the experience of marriage and motherhood. As a consequence, most empirical research shows that information on marital status and number of children is made available in most cases for female candidates, while the private life of equally prominent male politicians is ignored unless they choose to shape their public image in that direction (Jamieson 1995; Falk 2010). To put it in Jamieson's words (1995, 168), "Maternity remains more relevant than paternity to those who put together the news pages."

Doubtless, the focus on family life may have some positive consequences insofar as it helps women to establish a direct and almost intimate link with citizens. This is why women leaders usually allow the media to inquire about their domestic life and sometimes use the image of the good mother for their political advantage. Even some of the most "masculine" leaders have followed this line. Indira Gandhi, who was said to have sacrificed her marriage to public duties (Steinberg 2008), always stressed that motherhood was the most important part of her life (Everett 1993, 127). She was attentive to projecting an image of a modest and traditional woman, for example, in her choice of dressing in a simple sari, the national costume (Everett 1993, 127). Even Margaret Thatcher, apparently a not very likely housewife, assumed the public role of devoted wife and mother (Steinberg 2008, 11). Indeed, she even exalted domestic expertise as a potential political skill, by declaring that running a home was good practice for running a campaign (Fraser 1990, 321).

In general, the media seem particularly keen to emphasize information about the female domesticity of women candidates and leaders. The fact that Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir met the members of her cabinet in her kitchen and made coffee for all has been one of the media's favorite narratives (Thompson 1993, 157).[1] One widely reported story about the campaign of Geraldine Ferraro, candidate for vice-president of the U.S. in 1984, tells of when she was asked by the agriculture and commerce commissioner of Mississippi if she was capable of baking a blueberry muffin. Chronicles report she did not appear touched and answered, "Sure can" (Braden 1996, 109). The refusal to act according to such expectations appears even more newsworthy: when Hillary Clinton, at that time not a candidate but the wife of a presidential candidate, revealed she was happy not having spent her life baking cookies and was proud of her career as a lawyer, the press jumped in with such bitter comments that she was forced into a public apology (Bernstein 2007, 206). It is evident that the media handle stories differently when they deal with a woman, by giving room to details that would never enter the coverage of a man. But a predisposition to focus on these minor matters is presumably part of a larger picture where the true aim is to test women on their capability of conforming to a feminine role model.

Ironically enough, however, even in marriage, motherhood, and housekeeping—all areas traditionally considered the female

realm—women political leaders walk through a minefield. The emphasis on family life does not prevent criticism. As observed by Van Zoonen (2006, 299), "Private life is a potential site of trouble for female politicians, not because it contains the danger of sexual scandal as it does for men, but because it is a continuous reminder of women's odd choice of public mission instead of private fulfillment."

If being wife and mother is reassuring information if taken as the indicator of a caring, nurturing, trustworthy personality, the commitment to family raises speculation about the capability of reconciling private life with public duties. For instance, Laurent Fabius, an adversary of Ségolène Royal in the Socialist primary elections, after the announcement of the latter's candidacy asked ironically, "Who will take care of the children now?" (Royal is a mother of four.) (Mossuzlavau 2010, 176). Such a very inappropriate remark, however, reveals a deep-rooted, although not always openly expressed, prejudice that is diffuse not only in politics but also in business. There exists a persistent skepticism as to the degree of dedication of a woman who may need some flexibility to balance her family and career.

This prejudice may especially affect women with young children who are supposed to be in need of great care and attention. In general, a woman who enters politics after her children become self-sufficient is less controversial. Indeed, an older woman with adult sons and daughters (and possibly a number of grandchildren) could better capitalize on the role of the good grandmother to reinforce a matriarchal image (Jamieson 1995, 160). This was the case with Meir, who became prime minister in her seventies, and also of a woman with a more youthful aspect, Nancy Pelosi, the first female speaker of the U.S. House, who has been often described (and photographed) by the media in her role of grandmother (Rosenthal and Peters 2008; Adelstein and Wilcox 2010).

By contrast, women who are single or childless and therefore presumed to have more time to devote to their public duties may experience difficulties in preventing criticism and generating a positive impression. Even in this case, private life may become a critical issue. First of all, being unmarried seems to be as newsworthy as marriage or motherhood (Jamieson 1995). In fact, the media always convey this information in introducing a female candidate, and regularly speculate on it. Being engaged without getting married is perceived as strange, if not deviant, behavior. In a progressive country

like Finland, the fact that the first female president, Tarja Halonen, lived with a partner instead of marrying did not seem to be an issue (Hoogensen and Solheim 2006, 91). However, soon after the election Halonen chose to get married (Van Zoonen 2006, 292). If single or not officially engaged, female politicians have to face rumors about being lesbian, or even worse, being labeled as spinsters who have sacrificed their sexuality to benefit their career. This happened in recent decades, for instance, to U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno (Jamieson 1995, 73) and to the U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice (Allen-Mills 2007). As for Rice, in an interview on CNN[2] she was intensively questioned about the topic of marriage and the "dream man." As political observer Bella De Paulo commented (2011), the anchorman asked a long list of questions looking for reassurance that Rice "was not a single at heart" and that she would have married and still hoped to marry. More evidence that singleness for a political woman is still regarded as a form of inadequacy.

Being married but not being a mother may raise indiscreet speculation, since women are suspected of making a choice of this sort as a calculated career move. Another common insinuation is that lack of children also means lack of natural instincts. Thus a childless leader should not be regarded as qualified to represent women. A criticism of this sort was addressed, for instance, to New Zealand Prime Minister Helen Clark (Devere and Davies 2006[3]) and to Angela Merkel (Marx Ferree 2006). Nevertheless, such remarks did not hurt Merkel, as would be expected. As Cantrell and Bachmann (2008, 438) suggested, actually Merkel resembles the German workingwoman majority, who are more and more childless. Thus she could convincingly incarnate the nurturing qualities of the mother of the land even without being a mother.

In sum, there is no optimal arrangement for women leaders: if mothers, they may be accused of neglecting their children, or on the contrary, of being distracted by them. If they are single and career-oriented, they are pictured as deviant and perhaps cynical workaholics. What about scandals concerning personal behavior? What happens if a woman is charged with infidelity in marriage or promiscuity in her sexual life? One may conjecture that she would be censored by the media and public opinion much more than a man. Nowadays, sexual scandals become especially significant because they are a sort of credibility test (Thompson 2000). The more politics

grows personalized and voting is increasingly based on assessment of leaders' character, the more importance people assign to all those markers of moral weakness and untrustworthiness. Adultery can be forgiven for a man, provided he appears sufficiently remorseful and the reconciliation with his wife takes place in the limelight—as Bill and Hillary Clinton have masterfully done on repeated occasions. For a woman, because her identity is much more defined in relation to her role as good wife and "angel of the household," one may presume that obtaining forgiveness for jeopardizing her family's happiness would be much more unlikely.

Going personal for women leaders

In the previous chapter I discussed the impact of personalization of politics on the image of leadership, with special attention to the case of female leadership. I focused on the role of appearance and the ambiguity of a sexual, gendered appeal. Here I analyze how women leaders deal with another consequence of the process of personalization and popularization of politics: the rise of the "intimate politician." As anticipated in Chapter 2, the diffusion of popular culture in politics and so-called celebrity politics has special consequences for women leaders. Van Zoonen (2006, 289) argues that personalization of political culture produces both opportunities and limitations for female political leaders. As for potential advantages, it should be stressed that women possess an evident inclination to create virtual intimacy. As the linguist Deborah Tannen underlined in her well-known bestseller *You Just Don't Understand* (1990, 42), while men speak and hear a language of status and independence, women speak and hear a language of connection and intimacy. Of course, as Jamieson (1988, 81) reminds us, the task of separating stereotypes about male and female communication from actual behavior is difficult because of the common tendency to incorporate social expectations. However, "whatever their cause, and despite the fact the assertiveness of female speakers is on the rise, gender-associated differences remain" (Jamieson 1988, 81).

Bringing into the public domain their private and intimate selves is more natural for women. In particular, Tannen argues, "for most women the language of conversation is primarily a language of rapport: a way of establishing connection and negotiating relationship"

(77). For them a public address can be approached like private speaking: they do so by using their own experience as evidence and drawing a connection to the experience of others. This logic—making sense of the world as a private endeavor—is the same as what underlies going personal. All this said, it is not surprising that a female style of speech matches the TV medium better than male eloquence. In her seminal analysis of political speechmaking in contemporary communication, Jamieson (1988, 81) writes: "The intimate medium of television requires that those who speak comfortably through it project a sense of private self, unself-consciously self-disclose, and engage the audience in completing messages that exist as mere dots and lines on television's screen. The traditional male style is too hot for the cool medium of television. Where men see language as an instrument to accomplish goals, women regard it as a means of expressing internal states." It should be said that women are traditionally considered good storytellers, transmitting common wisdom from generation to generation by narrating legend, tales, and stories. Therefore, Jamieson concludes that since "television invites a personal, self-disclosing style that draws public discourse out of a private self and comfortably reduces the complex world to dramatic narrative" (Jamieson 1988, 84), narratives of women are "well-suited for television" (Jamieson 1988, 83).

Because of such predispositions, women may appear very convincing in narrating their intimate biography. Two parallel examples are especially interesting. Both Margaret Thatcher and Ségolène Royal publicly discussed their relationship with their father. As for the content, the two narratives stood as opposites. Thatcher's PR staff advised her to talk about her childhood as a grocer's daughter (Deacon 2004, 14) to emphasize her status as a self-made woman. But, above all, she stressed especially that her father had always encouraged her to express her views and expand her knowledge. Although her family belonged to the lower-middle class, her father set high educational standards for her. She declared that, "I owe almost everything to my father"; in some ways, she carried out a sort of retrospective mythologizing of him (Steinberg 2008, 259). By contrast, Royal had a very conflictual relationship with her father, a conservative army officer. Her rebellion against paternal authority was pictured as a fundamental step in her emancipation, evidence of her combative character (Friedman 2012, 45).

If Thatcher's and Royal's experiences were really different, however, the common aspect of those two stories is the use of a family narrative as a means for inviting the audience to formulate a proper assessment of personality. As Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles (2002) argue, such kinds of self-disclosing memories, including personal reflections and revelations, are very effective in giving citizens what they need in terms of knowledge about their leaders. Albeit in different ways, through the narration of their childhood and the role of their father in early years, both Thatcher and Royal were able to demonstrate their strong character and determination, both compelling qualities for a leader. In so doing they also managed to incarnate a dream of emancipation and self-determination that every citizen, particularly women, would have liked to identify with. Of course men can also exploit intimacy and self-disclosure to appeal to voters; Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles's book (2002) focuses on Bill Clinton's image-making, which was strongly based on the construction of a virtual intimacy. However, thanks to their apparent predispositions, it may be argued that women can do it better, being better fit for the narrator role for cultural reasons.

However, as Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles stressed (2002, quoted by Negrine and Stanyer 2007, 252), personal revelations are risky because they reduce the distance between leaders and citizens. In fact, distance is an essential ingredient of leadership. As Stuckey (1991, 139) observes regarding the American presidency, "The distance of formality was intended to protect the president and provide her or him with a certain degree of freedom of action within the constraints of democratic accountability. When presidents act to decrease the distance between themselves and the mass public, they also decrease the degree of insulation and protection available to them. This in turn increases the fragility of the presidency as an institution."

The balance between visibility and the need for privacy is a sensitive matter for those in power. Leaders need visibility to establish and reinforce themselves in power. But at the same time, following and developing Edward Shils's theses on power and charisma (Shils 1975), Gérard Leclerc (2006, 52) observes that power aspires "to a certain form of non-visibility (of secret, of opacity, of shadow)." This phenomenon can be called "aura," defined as the sacred distance that distinguishes the ruler from followers and subjects: "The charisma is what attracts the look and the bodies. The aura is what averts one's

eyes and keeps at a distance. The power could be established through a complex dialectics of visibility and invisibility, of self-exposure, of showing-off and of retirement within the shadow and the secret" (Leclerc 2006, 53).

The reduction of distance produced by the popularization of politics, therefore, may unbalance in unpredictable ways the equilibrium between the leader's need to be visible and the necessity of remaining somehow distant. However, virtual intimacy may appear less contradictory in the case of female leaders. The point is that women are conventionally less apt at impersonating the image of a masterful and authoritative ruler. In this sense, going personal on the part of women leaders may also be more convincing than for their male colleagues. As noted above, women are naturally more focused than men on intimacy, which requires minimizing differences and avoiding the appearance of superiority (Tannen 1990, 26). A key element of connecting people is feeling equally close to one another; therefore women are advantaged in playing the card of going personal, with respect to men for whom leadership is more related to a world of status and hierarchy (Tannen 1990, 28). Since the popularization of politics is mostly about sending, through displays of ordinariness, the "not particularly subliminal message" that "This is the real me; I am like you; I share your concerns; you can safely entrust me with your vote" (Kuhn 2004, 33), such a message is likely to sound more credible coming from a woman.

It is worth noting that women political leaders are often called by their first name by the media and the public. This discrepancy with how men are addressed, usually by their last name, is often stigmatized as a form of gender discrimination. However, sometimes the leader herself holds responsibility for such treatment. For instance, in the 2007 French election Royal was often addressed in the media as Ségo, while her adversary's nickname, Sarko, was a short form of his last name. But the emphasis on her first name was actually introduced by her campaign, which started calling the network of her supporting blogs "Ségoland." In Germany in 2005, the Christian Democratic Union party (CDU) used the song "Angie" by the Rolling Stones to campaign for Angela Merkel. Use of the first name may be regarded as dismissive, but at the same time it becomes part of the strategy for the search for intimacy (Stein 2009, 176). Keeping this in mind, it is not surprising that some leaders use their name as a

promotional tool, or in any case declare, as Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Brundtland did, that they do not mind being called by their first name (Hoogensen and Solheim 2006, 86).

For all these reasons, one may say that, in principle, going personal should advantage, or at least not damage, women in politics. However, as already observed, there is also the other side of the coin. In the previous section, it was stressed how the family issue may become controversial for a woman seriously committed to a political career because of work-life balance. Another aspect is that the media tend to regard women as more responsible for the behavior of their families: "References to husbands and children have cropped up repeatedly in news stories about women politicians in contexts where family would not be mentioned if the politician were a man" (Braden 1996, 7). A clear example was Geraldine Ferraro, the Democratic candidate for vice-president in 1984. Because of her Italian origins, she had to face prejudices that her family could be related to organized crime. She was subject to unprecedented scrutiny, and although law enforcement agencies did not take the allegations seriously, the media questioned her family finances very aggressively (Braden 1996, 110–15).

In general, one of the primary consequences of the popularization of politics is the increasingly public role of the leader's spouse. This is not only the outcome of the growth of tabloid outlets, which are most interested in stories on private lives, but also of the transformation of the traditional press and of broadcast media, now more inclined to give space to soft news and infotainment (Delli Carpini and Williams 2001). As for the U.S., first ladies have always played a role in shaping the public image of the presidency, but their visibility enormously increased after the advent of TV (Stanyer 2007, 74). In other countries, the issue came to the surface more gradually. In the U.K., to reach a level of attention comparable with the U.S. case, one had to wait until the 1990s with Tony Blair's wife, Cherie (Stanyer 2007, 74). In France, the "couplization" is even more recent (Zemmour 2006, 38–39). A book by Bernadette Chirac on her life with the president can be considered a first example of the mediatization of intimacy (Kuhn 2004, 34), but the phenomenon exploded only with Nicolas Sarkozy and his wives, first Cecilia and later Carla Bruni. Both women have become media favorites and have provided the press with an endless soap opera with all the appropriate

ingredients: marital infidelity, initial reconciliation, final separation, divorce, *coup de foudre*, sudden marriage, and pregnancy. In Italy too, the difficult relationship between Silvio Berlusconi and his wife dominated the press for a long time, but also the less flamboyant Prime Minister Romano Prodi went personal and published a book *Insieme* (Together), co-authored with his wife, where the main subject is the narration of Prodi's private life (Vaccari 2006).

Excessive self-exposure of the couple is not always profitable. For instance, Sarkozy, who had played at being Kennedyesque by arranging photographs of himself and Cecilia hand-in-hand and of their young son under his father's desk—much like John-John Kennedy in the Oval Office (Zemmour 2006, 111)—was forced to regret his choice of going personal when *Paris Match* published reportage of Cecilia and her lover in New York. However, in confirmation of such a trend being irreversible, the bad experience did not prevent Sarkozy from exposing himself even more at the beginning of his relationship with Carla Bruni. But if men run concrete risks of damaging their image only in the case of infidelity or unpleasant revelations about their spouse's behavior, the visibility of women leaders' partners has different and potentially dangerous implications even when everything is going well. This derives from the fact that, although men are rarely considered to be under the influence of their wives, women are still supposed to be subsumed by their husband's identity. Hillary Clinton's difficulties in seeing clearly how to employ her husband during her campaign are revealing. The fear that people would see the candidate as being manipulated by her husband suggested keeping the former president offstage. On the other hand, Bill Clinton's campaign skills would clearly be a wasted resource, while Clinton's opponent Barack Obama could fully exploit his wife's history and personality to his own advantage. In the end, the uncertainty about Bill Clinton's role reinforced the impression of the existence of a crucial liability concerning the marital relationship of the candidate.

All this said, if the exhibition of a nice family may become part of a convenient public relations strategy, it is not surprising to see that some women leaders prefer to keep their husband's exposure to a minimum. Merkel, for instance, has always concealed her private life; her propaganda is always little focused on sharing private feelings and experience (Van Zoonen 2006). She may be helped by the fact that the German media context is more traditionalist with

respect to other countries and "even a most public figure, such as the so-called media Chancellor, can still expect to enjoy the right to privacy" (Holtz-Bacha 2004, 51). Another female head of state, Halonen in Finland, followed the same line (Van Zoonen 2006); when she got married, soon after her election, she chose a very simple and private ceremony (Hoogensen and Solheim 2006, 91). These two cases led Van Zoonen (2006, 299) to observe that "women—willingly or not—may end up as the last keepers of traditionalist modernist ideas of politics as a separate sphere . . . [these two cases] represent a more classical ideal of political citizenship, with clear boundaries [among political, cultural, and personal] and singular codes and conventions."

In conclusion, going personal may help women to develop an easier relationship with the public through the expression of feelings and emotions that is culturally accepted and appreciated for women. On the other hand, disclosing the private self in terms of emotions and beliefs should not imply too great an emphasis on family life, in particular if this may suggest a potential psychological dependence on their husbands. By contrast, men have it safest in the "couplization" process because in their case the disclosure of an affective life may compensate for difficulties in developing nonreciprocal intimate relationships, like those between leaders and followers, because of their unease in displaying emotions. Once again, it could be argued that, in general terms, those common trends of political communication such as personalization and going personal have a differing gendered impact on leadership.

Dynastic politics: When daughters and wives enter politics

It cannot be ignored that a considerable number of female political leaders gained power because of what Ludwig (2002, 22) calls "the infectious charisma that came from being 'widows-of-him' or 'daughters-of-him'—the him being their martyred or revered husbands or fathers." This was the case for several famous women world leaders: Indira Gandhi of India and her daughter-in-law Sonia Gandhi, Violeta Chamorro of Nicaragua, Corazon Aquino of the Philippines, Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan, and Aung San Suu Kyi of Burma. Other women who succeeded a deceased husband or father

are less known on the international stage but have nonetheless been influential in their own country, such as the first female prime minister of Sri Lanka, Sirimavo Bandaranaike; the prime minister of Bangladesh, Hasina Wajed; the president of Argentina, Isabelita Peron; and the president of Panama, Mireya Moscoso. It merits mention that at least three "wives-of-him"—the him being a well-known and powerful political leader—played very important roles on the political stage: Eva Peron, who shared power informally with her husband, Juan; Argentinian President Christina Kirchner, who followed her husband, Nestor, into the presidency; and former First Lady Hillary Clinton, who campaigned for U.S. president and became secretary of state under the Obama administration.

Apparently the family factor plays a not-negligible role in the selection of female political leaders. The list of people mentioned here is varied: some of them, in particular "the daughters-of-him," were exceptionally well-educated and qualified people who were trained for a political career, as with Gandhi and Bhutto. Others, especially the "widows-of-him," found themselves playing a role they were not supposed to assume, as with Aquino and Chamorro, who were housewives and mothers before being projected onto the political stage. For all, however, the possibility of capitalizing on the legacy of their dead relatives became a precondition for their political commitment and an essential political asset.

The career of most "daughters and widows of him" is launched by the fact that their fathers and husbands were assassinated because of their political stance. As a consequence of this tragic disappearance, the widows and daughters replace them as a necessary figurehead in a sort of symbolic changeover. At the time of death, the husbands of Cory Aquino and Violeta Chamorro were fierce opponents of the dictatorships, respectively, of Ferdinand Marcos and Anastasio Somoza. Both husbands were murdered and acquired the status of national martyrs. Their widows did not appear to be the most qualified choice for president, but in the end they proved to be very popular and successful candidates. As observed in the case of Chamorro, "widows-of-him" are not chosen for their political skills but "to represent an ideal of democracy" (Saint-Germain 1993, 84). In such cases, the mass media usually help to project an image of national mothers who have accepted the burden of the political commitment to honor the memory of their husbands and realize their political dreams. Chamorro's

campaign, for example, focused on her as a figure of reconciliation, a strategy made viable by her not being a politician (Saint-Germain 1993, 84; Solheim 2000, 86–87). Aquino centered her message on sincerity (Ludwig 2002, 27), in contrast to the corrupt Marcos government. When Marcos attacked her lack of experience, she replied: "Yes, I had no experience in lying, cheating, stealing, and killing political opponents" (Col 1993, 25).

The Chamorro and Aquino cases offer evidence that women may find their path to power more easily in difficult and messy circumstances than in ordinary times. As observed before, Chamorro's ascension to power was favored because, in a deeply polarized and divided country, only a true outsider—and who better than a woman?—could hold the nation together (Saint-Germain 1993, 84). Being a woman, and so being able to play the card of femininity as a reconciliation value, was a further asset. In her inaugural speech, and on many other occasions, Chamorro described Nicaragua as a family plagued by internal conflict and herself as the national mother who would pacify it (Saint-Germain 1993, 97). As for Aquino, beyond the maternal image it was the positive stereotype that "women clean up politics" that substantially increased her appeal. Aquino was especially convincing as a fresh alternative to a corrupt and male-dominated political regime. However, neither Aquino nor Chamorro would have had a chance to climb to leadership if they could not act as living symbols of the memory of their husbands. The same observation can be applied to many other women leaders, particularly in certain areas of the world such as Asia.

The Burmese Aung San Suu Kyi is an even more interesting case of the power of the moral capital derived by being the heir of a murdered hero. She was two years old when her father, Aung San, a hero of Burmese independence, was killed. It took 40 years before she assumed his legacy and became the leader of the opposition to the military regime. Initially Suu Kyi introduced herself as her father's daughter, so motivating her public commitment to a democratic Burma.[4] After the victory of her party in the 1990 election, the military junta refused to withdraw and arrested and confined her in house imprisonment. Suu Kyi's courage and her exemplary conduct attracted great attention from the international media. She was awarded many prestigious human rights prizes, including the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991. At that point, outside Burma she was no

longer just the daughter of her father (who was mostly unknown in the wider world) but became "the definitive voice and face of the democratic cause of Burma" (Kane 2001, 167). Therefore, if in Burma Suu Kyi was seen as a sort of reincarnation of Aung San and could capitalize on his being a founding father to present herself as a symbolic mother of the nation for her followers (Mitchell 2004), on the international stage she played instead the role of the fearless heroine challenging an authoritarian regime. "Suu Kyi's physical appearance, enhanced by the trademark flowers in the hair, projected a persona of combined strength and fragility," according to Kane (2001, 167), which helped her become a media favorite and consequently a celebrity all over the world. The daughter-of-him may well have inherited the mantle of leadership, but eventually she acquired world fame and symbolic status on her own.

A similar observation can be made for two other daughters-of-him who rivaled in celebrity their world-famous fathers: Indira Gandhi and Benazir Bhutto. These remarkable women leaders were the heirs to a political dynasty, and in contrast to the previous mentioned cases of "politicians by chance" (that is to say, women unexpectedly involved in continuing the political mission of their dramatically deceased relatives), they had training in politics. Gandhi was one of the closest assistants to her father, Jawaharlal Nehru, when he was prime minister of India; Bhutto's father, Zulficar Ali Bhutto, prime minister of Pakistan, clearly doted on his promising young daughter and sent her to Harvard and Oxford to study politics and economics. In the case of Bhutto, the death of her father, incarcerated and then hanged by the military regime that had removed him from power, served as precious capital to start her political involvement.

Both women had long political careers. Gandhi was almost uninterruptedly[5] in power from 1966 to 1984, when she was assassinated; Bhutto was twice elected prime minister of Pakistan (in 1988 and in 1993). She was assassinated in December 2007, when after several years spent in exile she returned to Pakistan to run as the opposition candidate in the national election of 2008. The tragic death of both women contributed to the growth of their myths. In particular, Gandhi is considered a charismatic figure and still serves as a role model for many other female leaders. The narration of her meeting with Margaret Thatcher, when the latter was a young newly elected party leader, gives testimony to Gandhi's stature and

her capability to impress people. It has been said that the meeting reinforced Thatcher's belief in her possibility of becoming a prominent stateswoman (Steinberg 2008, 216). Bhutto always showed great determination, whether in her younger years when she was imprisoned by the military regime or when she defended her administration (especially her husband) from charges of corruption and mismanagement. In principle, both Gandhi and Bhutto would have been qualified for consideration as potential rulers independently from their belonging to a political dynasty. In practice, it is not very likely they would have come to power on their own merits. In these cases, as in many others, the family factor played a twofold role. First, in certain areas of the world political power is commonly inherited, and both males and females may be beneficiaries of the family's connections. Actually this is an important privilege in an environment where a large number of women are still poor, are not educated, and have very limited access to a political career (Hoogensen and Solheim 2006, 62). Second, being heir to a political dynasty may reduce the stereotype that women are not competent enough. Because they are seen as incarnations of their deceased fathers, it appears that the transmission of expertise and political skills works between generations. Therefore a daughter-of-him may be less scrutinized by the media and public opinion than a woman who comes to power through her own efforts.

This seems to be true also for the rising star of the French National Front, Marine Le Pen, who succeeded her father Jean-Marie as president of the party in January 2011. Marine Le Pen has always been active in politics, since her formative years, and in particular very involved in managing her father's most recent electoral campaigns. But it is evident that being her father's daughter has made the difference and has been crucial in making this 40-year-old woman accepted at the head of a male-dominated party. Consistently, profiling of her supporters shows she is popular among her father's traditionalist electorate (Perrinau 2011, 9), which suggests she is capitalizing on the daughter-of-him effect. Jean-Marie Le Pen's legacy was determinant as well in focusing press attention on Marine, in France and abroad, with the media asking to what extent she is the true heir of her father or if she is actually undertaking a process of reform of the French extreme right (Crumley 2011). In her image-building and her relationship with the media, Marine Le Pen has played the daughter's

role, not refusing her paternal legacy but stressing her belonging to a new and younger generation. An evolution is represented by her appearance as a modern woman who dresses in casual but elegant clothes, is divorced, and supports secular policies such as abortion rights.

The wives-of-him are another interesting category of women for which the family environment has been crucial in determining political careers. Argentina has a long tradition of wives who collaborated or succeeded their living husbands. It all started with Eva Peron, who actually shared power with her husband informally. Initially her influence was due to her marriage to Peron; however, with the passage of time, Eva gained an independent legitimacy for her political activities. She became the moral leader and the living symbol of Peronism (Zanatta 2009). Although she aspired to a formal political role, internal opposition and serious illness prevented her from a bid for elective office. After Eva's premature death, Juan Peron married again and chose his new wife, Isabel, as his running mate in the 1973 presidential campaign. Following her husband's death in 1974, Vice-President Isabel Peron occupied the presidency until 1976, when she was deposed and then sent into exile. The most recent case is Cristina Kirchner, who was elected president of Argentina following her husband, Nestor, in 2007. Previously, Cristina Kirchner, a lawyer, had served in Parliament for several terms. If Kirchner clearly received a boost from being married to the former president (since she was elected to guarantee continuity to her husband's policies), the case of another wife-of-him, Hillary Clinton, is more nuanced and controversial. Clinton too derived great popularity from her experience as first lady. However, at that time her contribution to the Clinton administration was "often derided by the media and the public" as a display of ambition and intrusiveness (Schnoebelen et al. 2009, 63). This coverage gave birth to a "media narrative" that described her as part of her husband's political career. In this regard, it was suggested that it was "her role of wife that, for historical, cultural, ideological reasons, prevented her success in her campaign" (Torrens 2009, 29). Somehow, being a wife-of-him exerted a likely negative impact on public opinion: the media were used to seeing her "as a junior member of 'Billary,' the derisive nickname coined by the media for herself and her husband," and continued to treat her in the same way even during her own bid for the presidency, as if "Obama's opponent"

were not her but "some amorphous creature called 'The Clintons' " (Stephen 2008, quoted in Schnoebelen et al. 2009, 47).

In conclusion, given the proportion of wives- and daughters-of-him among female leaders, one should conclude that dynastic politics is a possible path, and perhaps also a shortcut, to power. However, it is worth noting that the rise of women leaders who are members of prominent political families is also culture-bound, in the sense of depending on contexts where family dynasty and name recognition are important factors and men are commonly selected because of their family connections. So, what did not work in the case of Hillary Clinton? Political family dynasties are not unusual in U.S. politics; consider the Kennedys, the Bushes, with a generous reading of "family" the Roosevelts, and much further back the Adamses, and so on. She could be the victim of a more general double standard that, as Solheim (2000, 105) stresses, is applied to women who have famous relatives, but not to men. But another possible explanation lies in the peculiarity of the role of American first ladies. As Campbell (2005, 181; quoted by Schnoebelen et al. 2009, 46) observed, "Presidential wives challenge the public and press differently than do women candidates for public office. Women candidates ask voters to revise the relationship between women and public power directly. By contrast, presidential wives raise the more problematic issue of the relationship between women, sexuality and power . . . their influence is indirect and intimate, a subtle intrusion of the private into the public, political sphere." Shifting from the one role to the other is not easy because it means to bring the private into the public (Schnoebelen et al. 2009, 46). Hillary Clinton met this challenge by brilliantly winning the race for U.S. senator from New York, but when she offered herself as an ideal replacement for her husband and ran for the highest office, she may well have failed ultimately because of the overlapping roles in the public perception.

7
Conclusion: In Search of a New Style of Political Leadership

The crisis of traditional democratic leadership

In recent years, on the basis of an array of opinion surveys, researchers have registered a general decline in trust toward political institutions and especially toward parties and politicians (Norris 1999; Pharr and Putnam 2000; Cain, Scarrow, and Dalton 2003; Dalton 2004). The phenomenon has affected all the advanced industrial democracies, although the timing depends on national contexts. Such findings confirm a common trait that many people have been observing: the erosion of political support in Western democracies. It should be said that democracy as a founding principle and a political model does not seem in danger as "the present questioning of governing often comes from those who strongly adhere to the democratic creed" (Dalton 2004, 192). However, it is quite evident that there is pressure to change institutions and political culture. In the debate that has followed, there are issues that deserve to be especially underlined because they fuel demands for some changes that, among other things, could greatly affect the notion of female leadership. I am going to argue that a possible answer to these growing demands can be found in a redefinition of democratic leadership. Some ongoing trends point to an evolution, and possibly to an overcoming, of the traditional concept of leadership. In this perspective, women leaders could be better welcomed and accommodated.

First of all, one should consider that, as a primary consequence of the crisis of representative institutions, today political leaders have

assumed a more central role in the voters' eyes. In the past, the link between parties and voters was based on traditional social cleavage such as class or religion. Partly to compensate for the void left by the end of the great ideologies and the weakening of the affective bonds with parties, citizens look now at leaders as the only political actors who may still project a political vision: "Individuals seemed to count rather more, with all their characteristics and not merely with those characteristics binding them to a group often, perhaps typically, not even of their own choosing" (Blondel and Thiebault 2010, 2). Following the classic contribution of Bernard Manin, the passage from "democracy of the parties" to "democracy of the public" is characterized by the fact that citizens vote for a person rather than for a party (Manin 1996, 279).

Another point worth stressing is the pervasiveness of such a phenomenon: if the personal factor has always been crucial in presidential systems, where the head of the government is elected directly by the people, supporters of the thesis of the presidentialization of politics argue that political leaders become more powerful and autonomous even in parliamentary democracies (Poguntke and Webb 2005). As was extensively discussed in the previous chapters, the mass media are expected to play a major role as they frame politics centered on leaders and candidates (Mazzoleni and Schulz 1999). Even scholars who are not entirely convinced of such an impact of the leadership factor on the overall political system agree that political communication has definitely become leader-centered (Karvonen 2010).

The decline of trust in institutions reinforces the idea that leadership is a special ability of the leader rather than an attribute attached to the office. At the same time, the crisis of partisan politics leads citizens to focus their attention on the performance of government and leaders: "But this focus on performance, in turn, created a rather shallow form of political exchange in which the allocation of credit or blame in performance politics is at the heart of contemporary democracy" (Stoker 2010, 56). We have seen how the media largely contributed to this state of things. Not only do they give leaders greater visibility, but media coverage is also permeated by increasing references couched in personal terms (Karvonen 2010). Citizens react to this kind of media interpretation of politics by developing feelings of appreciation (or dislike) of the qualities and defects of

leaders. According to Blondel and Thiebault (2010, 33), citizens may be affected by leaders in differing degrees: "Notoriety is at the bottom: it is based almost exclusively on the ability of the citizen to recognize a given leader. Popularity is somewhat stronger as it indicates that a given leader enjoys not just recognition, but a degree of support. Charisma refers to the most powerful link between citizens and leaders, although there have been substantial variations in the interpretation given to that concept, ranging from a total religious embrace . . . to a rather less exceptional form of influence of the leader on the mind of citizens."

In contemporary democracies this emerging need on the part of citizens for identification with a leader who represents the incarnation of public desires and aspirations often takes the form of populist appeal (Mény and Surel 2000). Charismatic leadership is often based on the language of antipolitics and anti-elitism (Campus 2010b). Taguieff (2007, 211) coined the expression "telepopulism" to describe those leaders who, from an initial position outside the political system, emerge into the public arena criticizing the elite and proclaiming themselves as the guardians of the people. Just to give some crystal-clear instances, let us cite Ross Perot in the U.S., Silvio Berlusconi in Italy, Fernando Collor de Mello in Brazil, and Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands. But there are also several others who may be taken into consideration: leaders who have never been outsiders but nevertheless played with the populist language and fully exploited political marketing (and especially televised communication), such as Tony Blair in the U.K. and Nicolas Sarkozy in France.

As a matter of fact, the success of this new breed of populist or pseudo-populist leader may be regarded as a consequence of the crisis of representative politics, especially of the decline of intermediary organizations such as parties and trade unions. Taguieff (2007, 169) stresses the point: "The basic message of any populism is the refusal of mediation, judged as useless and unnecessary, as restrictive and detrimental. This refusal can be pictured as a dream of immediacy, closeness, direct contact, of transparency or return to the original, primordial, natural." The major emphasis on political leaders as heads of government may be interpreted both as a way of limiting the sphere of action of partial and partisan interests and, at the same time, as the rediscovery of a direct link with the people.

The same skepticism toward the functions and the role of intermediaries such as parties and other formal organizations is presumed to produce another phenomenon that may be regarded as a reaction to traditional politics as well. It has emerged that, in contrast to a diffuse decline in traditional forms of participation, as with voting, citizens are willing to engage in alternative behaviors that can be considered related to citizenship in a broader sense, ranging from volunteerism to public protest. What Russell Dalton calls "engaged citizenship" involves activities such as boycotts, demonstrations, direct contact with politicians, and Internet activism (2008, 150). These transformations are also due to generational changes. As for the Internet in particular, the youngest generations are the vehicle of change (Mossberger et al. 2008). "Age remains the strongest determinant of Internet use," says Margetts (2010, 74), "and today's youth undoubtedly enjoy a special relationship with communication technology in a manner distinct from how it is experienced by other members of other generations." In sum, thanks to widespread use of the new technologies, we may expect a reconfiguration of political participation and of the logic of collective action (ibid.).

All this said, one may wonder whether the two trends highlighted—increasing demand for more effective leadership, and a growing critical citizenship—may concur to give rise to a new democratic relationship between citizens and political institutions. And, to come directly to the issue of this book, does the crisis of Western democracies offer women politicians more opportunities to emerge as political leaders and rulers?

As illustrated in Chapter 3, a consequence of the loss of faith in formal political organizations and in the political establishment may be the activation of the "clean up politics" stereotype. Women are perceived as more honest and less entangled in power games. Often being outsiders and in many cases the first, or among the first ones, to apply for higher political office, they are still seen as a novelty. In this way, they may respond to the increasing demand for change coming from citizens tired of the old politics. Thus the choice of a woman may appear consistent with the search for identification between citizens and leaders that derives from the loss of partisan and ideological identification. In some ways, women may be even more convincing because of their greater ease with emotion and feelings. Today, if an important aspect of the communication of leaders

is the rise of "intimate politicians," as described in Chapter 2, women politicians might learn to better exploit the natural feminine talents for intimacy and sympathetic relationships.

On the other hand, we have already considered the intrinsic danger of being put on a "precarious pedestal." In fact, if women are appointed or elected just because citizens are looking for novelty and reassurance in difficult times, the possibility of failure is higher than for men, "which means that the task of women is much more difficult and that we can correlate poor performance with women—but it is the poor performance causing the appointment of women not the other way around" (Grint 2010, 73). A large body of research on the "glass cliff" has shown that women are more likely than men to be found in a risky or precarious position of leadership (Ryan and Haslam 2005, 2007; Haslam and Ryan 2008). As a consequence, stressing a gender difference that is based on greater honesty and spirit of service is not always the best route to reinforce the argument for promoting women to top positions. By contrast, as will be seen in the next section, the contextual transformations involving civic engagement and the public sphere may encourage some more promising strategies for changing more concretely the nature and scope of leadership.

Time for degendering leadership

This book has offered plenty of evidence that there still exists a problem of perception of women as leaders and that the mass media largely contribute to maintaining and propagating gender stereotypes on leadership. Women experience a severe double bind: they are criticized for being too strong and assertive, and for being too caring and collaborative. This appears to be the result of a long and deep process of polarization that conceptualizes leadership in a rigid distinction between a male model, according to which leadership is based on authority, decision-making capacity, and assertiveness; and a female one, according to which leadership involves cooperation, concern for others, and communality.

As Pittinsky et al. (2007, 111) stress, however, the result of such a black-and-white polarizing process along gender lines is actually a constrained range of possible styles of leadership for both sexes. Therefore, even if women are more disadvantaged, men are limited as

well. "Stereotypes are used to simplify the complexities of individuals and leadership and are prescribed indiscriminately, with little if any consideration to deviations . . . . Like all stereotypes—both positive and negative—notions of feminine and masculine leadership categorize and polarize styles that should (or could) be used by all leaders, regardless of sex. In so doing, the stereotyping limits the techniques available to both groups. Finally the polarizing effect . . . may have a deleterious effect on men as well, as their inclinations to engage in certain forms of leadership may be stymied or misconstrued as a result of being labeled feminine."

Observation of real life seems to contrast with the belief in a rigid division. As already described in Chapter 1, leaders tend actually to exhibit a wide range of such leadership behaviors that are not so easily ascribed to one model or the other. In reality, women always feel compelled to find a compromise because of the need to face the conflicting pressures deriving from the double bind. They become "bilingual" in the sense of feeling compelled to learn the rules of competition, an "education that allows them to master male codes, while dealing with social structures that are (albeit indirectly) harmful to women's professional careers" (March and Weil 2005, 65–66). As Carli and Eagly (2007, 134) observed: "In one way or another, women generally split the difference between the masculine and feminine demands that they face. Successful female leaders generally find a middle way that is neither unacceptably masculine nor unacceptably feminine." To stress this point, Solheim (2000, 77) reports very interesting comments on Gro Brundtland, a successful pioneer who is considered one of the most famous political figures in Norwegian political history: "Gro combined feminine and masculine styles of leadership. She was very much on her own level, unique, and even those who opposed her respected her highly. Hers was a personality-driven success. She listened well and was open-minded. Brundtland's emotions were a problem at first but became less problematic later. She was definitely willing to use her power when necessary and could be very durable. She was very confident; she could cry at funerals and during her Christmas speeches, but she was powerful as well. She mixed her femininity with strength, redefining the common notion of strength, perhaps."

If women have learned to be bilingual in this regard, men on the other hand are experiencing a certain amount of pressure to abandon

a too-evident "macho" style of leadership. In this regard, interesting insights can be derived from the debate on hard and soft power, recently developed in the field of international relations. Nye's contrast (2004a) between hard and soft power is based on the principle that other people's behavior can be affected either through force or through persuasion. Hard power relies on force and command. Soft power, by contrast, is the ability to persuade people by argument and to attract them. According to Nye, the two approaches are not exclusive:

> Hard and soft power are related because they are both aspects of the ability to achieve one's purpose by affecting the behavior of others. The distinction between them is one of degree, both in the nature of the behavior and in the tangibility of the resources. Command power—the ability to change what others do—rests on coercion or inducement. Co-optive power—the ability to shape what others want—rests on the attractiveness of one's culture and values or the ability to manipulate the agenda of political choices in a manner that makes others fail to express some preferences because they seem to be too unrealistic. The types of behavior between command and co-option range along a spectrum from coercion to economic inducement to agenda setting to pure attraction. Soft power resources tend to be associated with the co-optive end of the spectrum of behavior, whereas hard power resources are usually associated with command behavior. Hard and soft power sometimes reinforce and sometimes interfere with each other. A leader who courts popularity may be loath to exercise hard power when he should, but a leader who throws his weight around without regard to the effects on his soft power may find others placing obstacles in the way of his hard power.
>
> (Nye 2004b)

Nye's reflections suggest that the key to effective leadership does not rely on a simple exhibition of character traits, male or female. Rather, and for men as well, too strict adherence to the canons of so-called masculine leadership can be limiting and constraining. In his provocative book *Le premier sexe*, the French journalist and writer Eric Zemmour argues that in contemporary Western societies men are now subject to a process of feminization. This concerns

the field of politics as well. He reports the case of Nicolas Sarkozy, a leader credited with being very assertive and even too aggressive. Faced with the infidelity of his wife, instead of showing his outrage Sarkozy went on TV to say he was trying to solve his marital problems (Zemmour 2006, 41). So doing, he actually followed the example of the several wives of unfaithful politicians who stood by their man, as Hillary Clinton repeatedly did with Bill. Zemmour looks at George W. Bush and his macho attitude as a positive reaction to this process of devirilization of politics (132). However, if U.S. elections are taken as a paradigm, then the victory of Barack Obama is rather an indicator that the masculine model is out of date. Indeed, because of his ability to foster emotional identification and to provide inspirational language, Obama's style is frequently described by the media as "feminine" (Baird 2007).

As Obama's case shows, the media are playing a role in this gradual paradigm shift. The paradox is that, at the same time, they still perpetuate gender stereotypes, as illustrated in previous chapters. Notwithstanding, there are several circumstances pushing things in a different direction. The solution to the problem of gender stereotypes in leadership style is not found so much in evidence that they are less legitimate and appropriate than commonly supposed, but more in a complete change of paradigm. The focus should be on "degendering" the debate on leadership: "recognition should be made that similarities between the sexes are far more prevalent than differences, and instead of analyzing the suitability of an entire gender in a leadership contest, attention should be paid to the functions of effective leadership necessitated by a given situation" (Pittinsky et al. 2007, 115).

In the process of degendering leadership, a special role should be assigned to the notion, already discussed, of transformational leadership (MacGregor Burns 1978, 2003), according to which transformational leaders are those able to communicate a vision to their followers that forces them to rise above self-interest. Although the notion of transformational leadership is neutral, in fact it constitutes a departure from the traditional male concept of leadership. As Carli and Eagly (2007, 139) observe, "it is not distinctively masculine" and therefore is useful "to resolve some of the typical incongruity between leadership roles and the female gender role." In particular, the related concept of empowerment illustrated in

Chapter 1 points to a less hierarchical and more horizontal and democratic notion of leadership. As MacGregor Burns (2003, 185) wrote, "with such a dynamic and mutually empowering interaction between leader and follower, a crucial change occurs. The process is so complex and multidimensional, so fluid and transforming, that persons initially labeled 'leaders' or 'followers' come to succeed each other, merge with each other, substitute for each other. Leader and follower roles become ephemeral, transient, and even indistinct." As already observed, the horizontal and nonhierarchical dimension of power is one of the traits usually associated with feminine leadership.

As discussed in Chapter 1, empirical evidence confirms that women leaders in organizations have more inclination than men do toward the transformational style of leadership. Therefore, it may be advanced that "women lead in a style that appears to recommend them for leadership. For many years, leadership researchers have called for transformational and collaborative styles to manage the complexities of contemporary organizations" (Carli and Eagly 2007, 139). Therefore for both sexes adoption of this perspective may be advantageous for a number of reasons, including the fact that this notion of leadership merges the traditional individualism of leadership—focused on the qualities a leader should have to be deemed fit for the role—with recognition of the interaction dynamics between leaders and followers and with greater attention to collective processes (Haslam et al. 2011, 42–43).

In conclusion, even in the political field the effort to degenderize leadership is expected to produce a greater differentiation that allows leaders of both sexes to face more effectively the new challenges posed by leading and ruling in contemporary democracies. Clearly, a paradigm change is not likely to occur in the space of a few years. As March and Weil (2005, 65) observe, "the world is changing, but our official ideology runs ahead of the real functioning of our organizations." So one should not expect that "asserting the usefulness of the female style of leadership" will produce an immediate and real transformation. Nevertheless, women who reach top political positions now, albeit co-opted in a world that still works according to male rules, "may constitute the Trojan Horse of change and their bilingualism often allows them to take more effective advantage of opportunities that escape their male colleagues." And probably the

most powerful agents of change are the mass media, as will be argued in the next section.

Media as agents of transformation

The crisis of trust in political institutions and organizations; the demands for new leaders who are able not only to impose decisions but also to attract, inspire, and persuade; and the increasing role of the bottom-up process in participation are all phenomena that point to the direction of better integration between horizontal interaction among citizens and hierarchical interaction between leaders and followers. The central question is, how do ongoing developments in political communication and in media systems encourage this shift from a traditional model of leadership to a more flexible, degenderized, and transformational one? And what are the consequences of such a process of change for women pursuing higher political office? According to Carli and Eagly (2007, 141), current global trends are destined to improve women's position: "Although people's masculine perceptions of leadership have placed women leaders at a disadvantage, these perceptions are changing in ways that increasingly favor women. Global competition, technological growth, increased workforce and customer diversity, and accelerated social change have all placed increasing pressure on organizations to find new and creative approaches to leadership and management."

But concrete rejuvenation of the relationship between leaders and citizens and a boost for female leadership may come especially from the Internet. As discussed, new technology proves to be a powerful tool for political mobilization: interest groups and social movements use it as a means of exerting pressure on the political elite. In particular, blogging has "democratized the access to the tools and techniques required to make a political difference through content creation" and is destined to "become an established means of Internet-mediated mobilization" (Chadwick 2006, 129). In sum, the decline of traditional political participation and loss of faith in the political elite produce new forms of civic activism for which the web can be "an empty space of power" that is "open to occupation by citizens who have few other spaces available for them to express themselves in constructive, democratic ways" (Coleman and Blumner 2009, 9). Moreover, it should be kept in mind that one of the peculiarities of

the web is "the intrinsically egalitarian quality absent from the real world" (Chadwick 2006, 26).

If we advance the idea that the impact of the Internet on political life points to greater equality, we may be tempted to say that the web has no innate predisposition in shaping political leadership, which always presupposes a kind of "asymmetry of influence between leaders and followers" (Keohane 2010, 175). On the other hand, we have observed that a new model of leadership should imply some transformational and collaborative styles to better face the complexities of contemporary democracies. Therefore, the question is, can the Internet promote change in the predominant style of leadership? Some recent examples seem to validate this hypothesis: as illustrated in Chapter 2, the new media had a fundamental impact on leadership selection in the cases of Barack Obama and Ségolène Royal. Should we infer that these two candidates possessed some specific skills and talents that allowed them to use the Internet to full advantage? More generally, should we argue that there is a style of leadership that is more suitable for the Internet age?

Intervening in the debate between those who claim that the Internet promotes alternative routes by empowering citizens against the political elite and challenging institutions and those who feel that new media may be used to restore trust in institutions without altering any power balance, Coleman and Blumler (2009, 3) adopt a third view: "We would argue that for democratic participation to have a meaningful impact upon political outcomes there is need for inclusive and accountable institutions that can provide a space for consequential interaction between citizens and their elective representatives. Indeed, a key aim of this book [*The Internet and Democratic Citizenship*] is to argue for an institutional innovation that could nurture critical citizenship and radical energy, while at the same time opening up representative governance to a new respect for public discourse and deliberation."

In this vein, one could argue that the new technologies may constitute a potential space for articulation of a renewed relationship between leaders and citizens. If we accept the idea that leadership may also imply "mobilizing the energies of others" (Keohane 2010, 20), then it may be argued that leaders can channel the new energies that are released on the web by giving more space to alternative forms of democratic participation. As shown in Chapter 2, TV, at least

in its traditional form, has favored the advent of mediatized leadership, and therefore the enhancement of a traditional hierarchical rapport between leaders and followers. By contrast, new media could open the door to some new modes that are more compatible with forms of participatory democracy. As Benjamin Barber stresses, political systems that "mix participation with representation" are actually "burdened with the need for leadership" (Barber 1984, 238).[1] The leadership he has in mind, however, is more multifaceted than the traditional notion. In particular, he stresses the importance of including two elements: first, a *facilitating* dimension for which individuals are protected from the prevarication of those who are naturally more gifted in terms of power, experience, and personality; and second, a *moral* dimension, which consists of the capability of inspiring a sense of community. All forms of democracy, Barber wrote, need "symbolic leaders of great spiritual stature—leaders whose stature can become a rebuke to men of merely average courage and conventional wisdom" (1984, 241).

Barber's reflection tries to solve, or at least reduce, the potential contradiction between leadership and inequality. According to Nannerl Keohane, however, this tension is not necessarily to be considered negatively: "Differences in wealth, status, and expertise are regarded as normal parts of human life except when they are excessive or abused. And citizens take for granted that there will be leaders in their polities. They admire and even adulate those individuals and see no inconsistency between powerful leaders and democratic systems." However, she also notes that "some citizens (including many political theorists) are concerned about the deformation of democracy through the accumulation of privilege and power" (2010, 176–77). Nevertheless, it is not an impossible mission to give answers to such worries: "Those who care about sustaining democracy should look for ways to prevent the perpetuation of the same people in positions of leadership, emphasize the accountability of leaders to other citizens, ensure that citizens have free access to multiple sources of information, enlarge the extent of popular participation in government, and limit the accumulation of privilege" (188).

Doubtless, the Internet is a powerful tool for accomplishing the full list of these objectives; it has already shown its potential on several occasions. In particular, as mentioned before, the Internet was

able to produce turnover in a position of leadership by determining the outcome of a fundamental election, the 2008 U.S. presidential election. Obama's campaign created on the web "a nationwide virtual organization that . . . mobilized a grassroots movement of more than 5 million volunteers" (Cogburn and Espinoza-Vasquez 2011, 205). Moreover, the web continued to be used after the election as well for purposes that match the same list of objectives in terms of promoting accountability and diffusing information. As a matter of fact, the Obama administration has used many of the same routes as during the campaign with the aim of channeling civic engagement to influence the administration and the Congress: "Since the inauguration, the network has been mobilized on a number of occasions to support the public policy agenda of the new administration, e.g., stimulus package, Sotomayor nomination, health care reform" (Cogburn and Espinoza-Vasquez 2011, 205).[2] In sum, it is impressive to see the extent to which Obama changed campaigning and governance by using social media. But, as Cogburn and Espinoza-Vasquez advance (209), the same apparatus would probably not have worked so well in the hands of another candidate or another organization. So, once again, the relevant question is whether we can identify a style of leadership that is especially fit for the Internet.

Obama was covered by the mass media in quite a different way with respect to the traditional masculine model of leadership, well incarnated by George W. Bush. For a long time, the polls showed that Obama was perceived as less presidential than Hillary Clinton. Notwithstanding, a list of qualities commonly attributed to Obama, such as the fact he was "a new person and a fresh face" and that he was supposed "to bring change," gradually convinced the American electorate as to his leadership potential.[3] Similarly, it was observed that Obama had an almost feminine style of communication, at least in comparison with his female adversary Hillary Clinton. Clearly, it is inappropriate to make generalizations from just one case; however, the success of Barack Obama reinforces the view shared by many political observers and theorists that the time has come for enrichment of the notion of leadership. The Obama and Royal cases have some common traits. Both leaders were able to mobilize grassroots participation and activity online, especially among young people. Those online activities translated into on-the-ground activities by personalizing the campaign and making individual supporters feel

part of it (Cogburn and Espinoza-Vasquez 2011, 201). Supporters were allowed to organize some activities at their discretion even if, at least in Obama's case, the campaign managers maintained a certain amount of control (Vaccari 2010). In any event, however, both campaigns were a departure from traditional centralized, controlled, and top-down campaigns. Beyond this organizational aspect, there is also the fact that both candidates were able to appear to be really interested in encouraging self-direction and creativity in their supporters. In such a way, they projected a style of leadership that was more transformational than transactional.

I opened this chapter by observing that the debate about the opportunity to increase women's influence in politics, including the need to give them easier access to top political offices, is deeply entangled with the discussion on how to face the crisis of representative democracy. Subsequent analysis of contemporary leadership has highlighted that a key element is reconceptualization of what a leader is and what he or she should do. Therefore, the main conclusion of the book is that the issue of female leadership cannot be really dealt with except in the context of more general reflection on a renewed theory of political leadership. The concept of transformational leadership is a promising starting point, but it needs to be integrated with other elements. Current research on the psychology of leadership is working in this direction (Haslam et al. 2011, 42ff.). Including the gender issue more explicitly in the scholarly agenda could certainly offer a fertile area for future research and will improve our understanding of the role and function of leadership in contemporary societies.

A second conclusion concerns the role of the media. The pervasive role of media in our society is well known. Although research in the field is not as expansive as one might expect, studies reviewed in this book and the analyses carried out should have convincingly demonstrated that the media significantly influence the careers of women politicians and, especially, the fortunes of those women who aspire to become political leaders. However, better knowledge of the media impact on political female leadership will require further and more systematic research. In particular, future studies should take into consideration that the rapid evolution of communication technology has been bringing changes in political communication. All this has key implications for the functioning of political systems and

the quality of our democracies. This book suggests the need to further explore some topics, namely the interplay between politics and popular culture and the role of the Internet in reshaping leadership, both research avenues that may pose a stimulating and fruitful challenge to scholars of political science and gender studies in the years to come.

Notes

Introduction

1. Cantor and Bernay (1992) wrote a pioneering book on the relationship between women and power. Extended research has been carried out on women who hold formal political office, such as representatives in parliaments and women executives, like U.S. governors (for a review see Thomas 2003), but really there are few contributions on national political leaders. Among them are Solheim (2000), who has a special focus on Scandinavian countries, and Hoogensen and Solheim (2006), who analyze a number of national leaders across the world. Genovese (1993) offers a collection of essays devoted to analysis of some cases of women in top executive positions. Jalalzai (2008) did comparative research on the impact of institutional and structural factors on women leaders. An interesting and provocative book is that of Steinberg (2008), on the personality and leadership styles of Indira Gandhi, Golda Meir, and Margaret Thatcher, which is a significant contribution to the study of political leadership from the perspective of psychobiography.
2. On this point, there is a useful critical review by Duerst-Lahti and Kelly (1995). It is worth noting, however, that some very recent contributions on leadership (i.e., Keohane (2010) and Grint (2010)) include discussion of female leadership.
3. We deal with most of this literature in the following chapters. For a synthetic, but very useful, review, see Kahn (2003).
4. A considerable number of studies offer description and analysis of how media have covered singular cases of women leaders. They are discussed in the following chapters.

1 Gender and Models of Leadership

1. For a discussion of the individualistic model of leadership, the several attempts to move beyond it, and a proposal for a new psychology of leadership, see Haslam et al. (2011). A review and analysis of models of leadership in relation to the gender issue can be found in Kellerman and Rhode (2007).
2. Quoted after Collins and Singh (2006, 13).
3. Quoted after Stevens (2007, 136).
4. Keohane (2010, 44) does not agree with MacGregor Burns's picture of Queen Elizabeth I and rather argues that "an alternative perspective would see transformative moral dimensions in her leadership of a more peaceful, self-confident vigorous England, less driven by religious hatreds, focused on the production of goods and adventure in the world."

2 The Media and Representation of Leadership

1. Notwithstanding, it has to be noted as well that campaigns have become so rough that women adapt to the trend: an analysis by Bystrom et al. (2004, 39) of 1400 advertisements from female and male candidates running in U.S. Senate and gubernatorial races in the 1990s shows no significant gender difference in the use of negative advertising.
2. Quoted by Bystrom et al. (2004, 44).
3. See the special issue of *Parliamentary Affairs* on "Public Images, Private Lives: The Mediation of Politicians around the Globe" (Stayner and Wring 2004).
4. Scandal politics has recently become the object of intensive research analysis (Sabato, et al. 2000; Thompson 2000; Castells 2007).
5. "Women on the Web," http://www.comscore.com/Press_Events/Presentations_Whitepapers/2010/Women_on_the_Web_How_Women_are_Shaping_the_Internet, accessed 28 July 2011.

3 Media Coverage of Women Leaders

1. For Bystrom et al. (2004), however, attribution of male issues to male candidates has been decreasing in recent elections, while the link between female candidates and women's issues appears more persistent.
2. www.gallup.com/poll/26611/some-americans-reluctant-vote mormon-72 yearold-presidential-candidates.aspx.

4 The Double Bind

1. Quoted also by Jamieson (1995, 124).
2. Quoted by Hillman (2009, 29, my translation from Italian).
3. Quoted by Genovese (1993, 198).
4. Quoted by Everett (1993, 103).
5. "Les jeunes s'intéressent à la politique mais condamnent sa représentation"; www.ipsos.fr.
6. See polls from Le Baromètre Politique Français (Boy and Chiche 2007).
7. Quoted by Mossuz-Lavau (2010, 177).
8. Declaration given during the talk show "J'ai une question à vous poser."
9. Interviewed by Traub (2006), Royal answered a question on Iraq by responding to the journalist, "Would you ask me this question if I were a man?" Since it was the beginning of the campaign, she meant that it was too early to ask about those sensitive issues. However, her sentence was seized on by the media and she was ridiculed in the satirical TV show "Les Guignols".
10. Le Figaro-LCI, La campagne jugeé par les Francais, Baromètre Politoscope, 22 Fevrier 2007.
11. "Ready to Run the Movie Again?" *Economist*, 6 October 2007; http://www.economist.com/node/9904609.

12. CBS News/New York Times Poll, 10 December 2007.
13. Quoted by De Michelis (2010, 96).
14. "What's Been Said about Clinton," *New York Times*, 13 June 2008, http://www.nytimes.com/imagepages/2008/06/13/us/20080613_WOMEN_A_GRAPHIC.html.
15. For a discussion, see Seelye and Bosman (2008). An interesting analysis of sexist coverage of Clinton and Palin in the 2008 campaign is Carlin and Winfrey (2009).

5 The Appearance of Power

1. In a study by Sreberny-Mohammadi and Ross (1996, 108), British women MPs complained that their appearance was the focus of media attention, citing mentions of age, how women look, family circumstances, and fashion sense.
2. Robin Givhan, "Hillary Clinton's Tentative Dip into New Neckline Territory," *Washington Post*, 20 July 2007.
3. The original source in French reads "En 1997, quand des femmes ministres intervenaient à la tribune de l'Assemblée nationale, il n'était pas rare d'entendre crier 'À poil!' dans les travées. On lançait du 'Nique ta mère' à Christiane Taubira, députée de Guyane" (Mossuz-Lavau 2010, 176).
4. Royal was criticized even by her own party colleagues with such statements as "presidential election is not a beauty contest" or "presidential election is not a matter of size" (Mossuz-Lavau 2010, 176).

6 The Family Factor

1. Particularly touching is the description given by Oriana Fallaci of Golda Meir living alone and cooking and washing up (Fallaci 1974).
2. Piers Morgan, "Tonight."
3. Quoted by Adelstein and Wilcox (2010).
4. As she said in her first public speech in 1988, "The present crisis is the concern of the entire nation. I could not, as my father's daughter, remain indifferent to all that was going on" (Kane 2001, 148).
5. She was removed from power in 1977 and elected again in 1979.

7 Conclusion: In Search of a New Style of Political Leadership

1. Quoted also by Keohane (2010, 175).
2. For a detailed description of President Obama's activities on the web, see also Barins (2009).
3. Source: CBS News/New York Times Poll, 10 December 2007.

References

Aday, S. and Devitt, J. (2001) "Style over Substance: Newspaper Coverage of Elizabeth Dole's Presidential Bid," *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 6: 52–73.

Adelstein, S. and Wilcox, C. (2010) "Una visuale di genere? La copertura mediatica delle donne candidate e leader," in D. Campus (ed.) *L'immagine della donna leader* (Bologna: Bononia University Press).

Alexander, D. and Andersen, K. (1993) "Gender as a Factor in the Attribution of Leadership Traits," *Political Research Quarterly* 43: 527–45.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1995) "An Investigation of Female and Male Constructs of Leadership and Empowerment," *Women in Management Review* 2: 3–8.

Allen-Mills, T. (2007) "Gay Rumors Eclipse Condi's Glory Moment," *The Sunday Times*, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article2983771.ece; accessed 9 March 2011.

Anderson, K. (1999) " 'Rhymes with Rich': 'Bitch' as a Tool of Containment in Contemporary American Politics," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2(4): 599–623.

Anderson, N. (1993) "Benazir Bhutto and Dynastic Politics: Her Father's Daughter, Her People's Sister," in M. Genovese (ed.) *Women as National Leaders* (London: Sage).

Bachmann, I. (2009) *Emotional Traits in News Story Descriptions and the Public's Opinion of Political Candidates: An Exploratory Analysis*, paper retrievable at http://cim.anadolu.edu.tr/pdf/2009/3.%20Ingrid%20Bachmann.pdf.

Bacque, R. and Chemin, A. (2007) *La Femme Fatale* (Paris: Albin Michel).

Baird, J. (2007) "The Pursuit of Power Isn't Pretty," *Newsweek*, 17 March 2007, 37.

Barber, B. (1984) *Strong Democracy* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Bard, C. (2010) *Une Histoire Politique du Pantalon* (Paris: Edition du Seuil).

Barins, S. (2009) "From Online Candidate to Online President," *International Journal of Public Administration* 32(9): 753–58.

Barotte, N. (2007) "Ségolène Royal, des Regionales à la victoire sur le PS," *Le Figaro*, 16 January 2007.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J. and Atwater, L. (1996) "The Transformational and Transactional Leadership of Men and Women," *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 45(1): 5–34.

Berstein, C. (2007) *A Woman in Charge: The Life of Hillary Rodham Clinton* (New York: Alfred Knoff).

Best, D. and Williams, J. (1990) *Measuring Sex Stereotypes* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).

Blondel, J. and Thiebault, J. -L. (eds) (2010) *Political Leadership, Parties and Citizens*: *The Personalization of Citizenship* (London: Routledge).

Bourdieu, P. (2001) *Masculine Domination* (Cambridge: Polity Press); original French ed. 1998.

Boy, D. and Chiche, J. (2007) *L'image des candidats dans la décision électorale, Le Panel Électoral Français 2007, 1ère Vague*. Cevipof, www.cevipof.mhs-paris.fr.

Braden, M. (1996) *Women Politicians and the Media* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky).

Brown, M. E. and Gardetto, D. (2000) "Representing Hillary Clinton: Gender, Meaning, and News Media," in A. Sreberny and L. van Zoonen (eds) *Gender, Politics and Communication* (Cresskill: Hampton Press).

Burns, N., Lehman Schlozman, K. and Verba, S. (2001) *The Private Roots of Public Action* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Bystrom, D. (1995) "Candidate Gender and the Presentation of the Self," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Bystrom, D. (2006) "Advertising, Websites and Media Coverage: Gender and Communication along the Campaign Trail," in S. Carroll and R. Fox (eds) *Gender and Elections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Bystrom, D., Robertson, T., Banwart, M. and Kaid, L. (2004) *Gender and Candidate Communication: Videostyle, Webstyle, and Newsstyle* (New York: Routledge).

Cain, B., Dalton, R. and Scarrow, S. (2003) *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Democracies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Campbell, K. K. (1995) "The Rethorical Presidency: A Two-Person Career," in M. J. Medhurst (ed.) *Beyond the Rethorical Presidency* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press).

Campus, D. (2010a) "L'immagine della leadership nella presidenza francese," in G. Pasquino and S. Ventura (eds) *Una splendida cinquantenne: La quinta repubblica francese* (Bologna: Il Mulino).

Campus, D. (2010b) *Antipolitics in Power: Populist Language as a Tool for Government* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press); original Italian ed. 2006.

Campus, D. (2010c) *L'immagine della donna leader* (Bologna: Bononia University Press).

Cantor, D. and Bernay, T. with Jean Stoess (1992) *Women in Power* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin).

Cantrell, T. H. and Bachmann, I. (2008) "Who Is the Lady in the Window? A Comparison of International and National Press Coverage of First Female Government Heads," *Journalism Studies* 9(3): 429–46.

Carli, L. and Eagly, A. (2007) "Overcoming Resistance to Women Leaders: The Importance of Leadership Style," in D. Rhode and B. Kellerman (eds) *Women and Leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons).

Carlin, D. B. and Winfrey, K. L. (2009) "Have You Come a Long Way, Baby? Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and Sexism in 2008 Campaign Coverage," *Communication Studies* 60(4): 326–43.

Carroll, S. (2009) "Reflections on Gender and Hillary Clinton's Presidential Campaign: The Good, the Bad, and the Misogynic," *Politics & Gender* 5: 1–20.

Castells, M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing).
Castells, M. (2007) "Communication, Power and Counter-Power in the Network Society," *International Journal of Communication* 1: 238–66.
Chadwick, A. (2006) *Internet Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press).
Chait Barnett, R. (2007) "Women, Leadership and Natural Order," in D. Rhode and B. Kellerman (eds) *Women and Leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons).
Childs, S. (2004) "A Feminized Style of Politics? Women MPs in the House of Commons," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 6(1): 3–19.
Clift, E. and Brazaitis, T. (2000) *Madame President: Shattering the Last Glass Ceiling* (New York: Scribner).
Cogburn, D. and Espinoza-Vasquez, F. (2011) "From Networked Nominee to Networked Nation: Examining the Impact of Web 2.0 and Social Media on Political Participation and Civic Engagement in the 2008 Obama Campaign," *Journal of Political Marketing* 10(1–2): 189–213.
Col, J. -M. (1993) "Managing Softly in Turbulent Times: Corazon Aquino: President of Philippines," in M. Genovese (ed.) *Women as National Leaders* (London: Sage).
Coleman, S. (2003) "A Tale of Two Houses. The House of Commons, the Big Brother House and the People at Home," *Parliamentary Affairs* 53: 733–58.
Coleman, S. and Blumler, J. (2009) *The Internet and Democratic Citizenship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Collins, J. and Singh, V. (2006) "Exploring Gender Leadership," in D. McTavish and K. Miller (eds) *Women in Leadership and Management* (Cheltenham: Elgar).
Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J. and Pascale, L. (1975) "When Stereotypes Hurt: Three Studies of Penalties for Sex-Role Reversals," *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology* 11: 520.
Crane, D. (2000) *Fashion and Its Social Agendas: Class, Gender, and Identity in Clothing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Crumley, B. (2011) "Marine Le Pen: Her Father's Daughter," *Time*, 3 February 2011; http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2040141,00.html.
Dahlgren, P. (2009) *Media and Political Engagement: Citizens, Communication, and Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Dalton, R. (2004) *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices: The Erosion of Political Support* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Dalton, R. (2008) *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics* (Washington, DC: CQ Press).
Davis, F. (1992) *Fashion, Culture, and Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Deacon, D. (2004) "Politicians, Privacy and Media Intrusion in Britain," *Parliamentary Affairs* 57(1): 9–23.
De Michelis, L. (2010) "Margaret Thatcher: Le maschere multiple del femminile," in D. Campus (ed.) *L'immagine della donna leader* (Bologna: Bononia University Press).

De Paulo, B. (2011) "Does Piers Morgan Ask Why Condi Rice Is Single? Let Me Count the Ways," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bella-depaulo/does-piers-morgan-ask-why_b_812416.html.

Delli Carpini, M. X. and Williams, B. A. (2001) "Let Us Infotain: Politics in the New Media Environment," in W. L. Bennett and R. Entman (eds) *Mediated Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Devere, H. and Davies, S. G. (2006) "The Don and Helen New Zealand Election 2005: A Media A-Gender?" *Pacific Journalism Review* 12(1): 65–85.

Devitt, J. (1998) "Framing Gender on the Campaign Trail: Women's Executive Leadership and the Press," http://198.65.255.167/v2/researchandreports/framinggender/Framing_Gender_Report.pdf.

Devitt, J. (2002) "Framing Gender on the Campaign Trail: Female Gubernatorial Candidates and the Press," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 79(2): 445–63.

Dolan, K. (2004) *Voting for Women* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Dolan, K. A. (2005) "Do Women Candidates Play to Stereotypes? Do Male Candidates Play to Women? Candidate Sex and Issue Priorities on Campaign Websites," *Political Research Quarterly* 58(1): 31–44.

Dolez, B. and Laurent, A. (2007) "Une primaire a la Francaise: La designation de Segolene Royal par le parti socialiste," *Revue Francaise de Science Politique* 57(2): 133–61.

Duerst-Lahti, G. and Kelly, R. M. (eds) (1995) *Gender, Power, Leadership and Governance* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Smith, M. C. and Van Engen, M. L. (2003) "Transformational, Transactional and Laissez Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men?" *Psychological Bulletin* 129(4): 569–91.

Ekman, P. (1985) *Telling Lies: Clues to Deceit in the Marketplace, Politics, and Marriage* (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company).

Ekman, P. and Friesen, W. V. (1982) "Felt, False, and Miserable Smiles," *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 6(4), 238–52.

Ertel, M. (2009) "Cleaning up the Men's Mess: Island Women Reach for Power," *Spiegel Online*, 24 April 2009; http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/0,1518,620544,00.html.

Everett, J. (1993) "Indira Gandhi and the Exercise of Power," in M. Genovese (ed.) *Women as National Leaders* (London: Sage).

Falk, E. (2010) *Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press).

Fallaci, O. (1974) *Intervista con la storia* (Milano: Rizzoli).

Fallows, D. (2005) *How Women and Men Use the Internet* (Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project), 28 December 2005.

Foschi, M. (2000) "Double Standards for Competence: Theory and Research," *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 21–42.

Fowler, L. L. and Lawless, J. L. (2009) "Looking for Sex in All the Wrong Places: Press Coverage and the Electoral Fortunes of Gubernatorial Candidates," *Perspectives on Politics* 7(3): 519–36.

Fox, R. (2007) "The Future of Women's Political Leadership: Gender and the Decision to Run for Elective Office," in D. Rhode and B. Kellerman (eds) *Women and Leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons).
Fraser, A. (1990) *The Warrior Queens* (New York: Random House); 1st ed. 1988.
Freedman, J. (1997) *Femmes Politiques: Mythes et Symboles* (Paris: L'Harmattan).
Friedman, J. -P. (2012) *Du Pouvoir et des femmes. Martine, Sègoléne, Marine et les autres* (Paris: Michalon edition).
Genovese, M. (1993) "Margaret Thatcher and the Politics of Conviction Leadership," in M. Genovese (ed.) *Women as National Leaders* (London: Sage).
Gibson, R. K., Nixon, P. and Ward, S. J. (2003) *Political Parties and the Internet* (London: Routledge).
Gidengil, E. and Everitt, J. (2003) "Conventional Coverage/Unconventional Politicians: Gender and Media Coverage of Canadian Leaders' Debates, 1993, 1997, 2000," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 559–77.
Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
Givhan, R. (2007) "Hillary Clinton's Tentative Dip into New Neckline Territory," *Washington Post*, 20 July.
Glick, P. and Fiske, S. (2001) "An Ambivalent Alliance: Hostile and Benevolent as Complementary Justifications for Gender Inequality," *American Psychologist* 56(2): 109–18.
Graham, T. (2011) "Chicago Tribune Ombud: Using Hillary's First Name in Headlines Is Sexist, 'Diminishing' Reports on Media Concerns and Puzzles about Calling a Female Presidential Candidate by Name," http://newsbusters.org/node/13374; accessed on 2 June 2011.
Grint, K. (2010) *Leadership: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Gutgold, N. (2009) *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton Won in 2008* (Lanham: Lexington Books).
Harnden, T. (2008) "Hillary Clinton's Failed Strategy Inspired by Margaret Thatcher," *The Daily Telegraph*, 12 August.
Hart, R. (1999) *Seducing America: How Television Charms the Modern Voter* (London: Sage).
Hartley, J. (2007) "'Reality' and the Plebiscite," in K. Riegert (ed.) *Politicotainment: Television's Take on the Real* (New York: Peter Lang).
Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D. and Platow, M. J. (2011) *The New Psychology of Leadership. Identity, Influence and Power* (Howe and New York: Psychology Press).
Haslam, S. A. and Ryan, M. K. (2008) "The Road to the Glass Cliff: Difference in the Perceived Suitability of Men and Women for Leadership Positions in Succeeding and Failing Organization," *Leadership Quarterly* 19: 530–46.
Healy, P. (2007) "Clinton Plans Major Appeal to Women," *New York Times*, 6 March.
Hegelsen, S. (1990) *The Female Advantage: Women's Way of Leadership* (New York: Doubleday).

Heldman, C., Carroll, S. J. and Olson, S. (2005) "'She Brought Only a Skirt:' Print Media Coverage of Elizabeth Dole's Bid for the Republican Presidential Nomination," *Political Communication* 22: 213–335.

Heldman, C., Oliver, S. and Conroy, M. (2009) "From Ferraro to Palin: Sexism in Media Coverage of Vice Presidential Candidates," paper presented at the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada, 3–6 September.

Herrnson, P. S., Lay, J. C. and Stokes, A. (2003) "Women Running 'as Women': Candidate Gender, Campaign Issues, and Voter-Targeting Strategies," *The Journal of Politics* 65(1): 244–55.

Hillman, J. (2009) *Gli stili del potere* (Milano: RCS libri SPA).

Holtz-Bacha, C. (2004) "Germany: How the Private Life of Politicians Go into the Media," *Parliamentary Affairs* 57(1): 41–52.

Holtz-Bacha, C., Koch, T. and Leidemberg, J. (2009) "Bambi et le gran mechant loup: Merkel-Schroeder, Royal-Sarkozy, genre et eletions vus par la presse allemande et francaise," in P. Maarek (ed.) *La communication politique de la presidentielle de 2007* (Paris: L'Harmattan).

Hoogensen, G. and Solhein, B. (2006) *Women in Power: World Leaders Since 1960* (Westport, CT: Praeger).

Houchin Winfield, B. (1997) "The Making of an Image: Hillary Rodham Clinton and the American Journalists," *Political Communication* 14: 241–53.

Huddy, L. and Terkildsen, N. (1993a) "Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates," *American Journal of Political Science* 37(1): 119–47.

Huddy, L. and Terkildsen, N. (1993b) "The Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office," *Political Research Quarterly* 46(3): 503–25.

IFOP (2007) "Le quatre ingredients de l'equation Royal," http://www.ifop2007.fr/cms/analyses.

Ivaldi, G. (2007) "Presidential Strategies, Models of Leadership and the Development of Parties in a Candidate-Centred Polity: The 2007 UMP and PS Presidential Nomination Campaigns," *French Politics* 5(3): 253–78.

Iyengar, S. and McGrady, J. (2007) *Media Politics. A Citizen's Guide* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company).

Iyengar, S., Valentino, N. A., Ansolabehere, S. and Simon, A. F. (1997) "Running as a Woman: Gender Stereotyping in Political Campaigns," in P. Norris (ed.) *Women, Media, and Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Jalalzai, F. (2008) "Women Rule: Shattering the Executive Glass Ceiling," *Politics & Gender* 4: 205–31.

Jamieson, K. H. (1988) *Eloquence in an Electronic Age: The Transformation of Political Speechmaking* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Jamieson, K. H. (1995) *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Jones, J. P. (2005) *Entertaining Politics: New Political Television and Civic Culture* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).

Jost, J. and Kay, A. (2005) "Exposure to Benevolent Sexism and Complementary Gender Stereotypes: Consequences for Specific and Diffuse Forms

of System Justification," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88(3): 498–509.
Jung, C. G. (1953) *The Collected Works* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
Kahn Fridkin, K. (1992) "Does Being Male Help? An Investigation of Gender and Media Effects in U.S. Senate races," *Journal of Politics* 54(2): 497–517.
Kahn Fridkin, K. (1996) *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman: How Stereotypes Influence the Conduct and Consequences of Political Campaigns* (New York: Columbia University Press).
Kahn Fridkin, K. (2003) "Assessing the Media's Impact on the Political Fortunes of Women," in S. Carroll (ed.) *Women and American Politics: New Questions, New Directions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Kane, J. (2001) *The Politics of Moral Capital* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Karvonen, L. (2010) *The Personalization of Politics* (Colchester: ECPR Press).
Keohane, N. (2010) *Thinking about Leadership* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
King, A. (1986) *The British Prime Minister* (London: McMillan).
King, A. (2002) "The Outsider as Political Leader: The Case of Margaret Thatcher," *British Journal of Political Science* 32: 435–54.
Kittilson, M. C. and Fridkin, K. (2008) "Gender, Candidate Portrayals and Election Campaigns: A Comparative Perspective," *Politics & Gender* 4(3): 371–92.
Koch, S., Luft, R. and Kruse, L. (2005) "Women and Leadership 20 Years Later: A Semantic Connotation Study," *Social Science Information* 44(1): 9–39.
Kotler, P. and Kotler, N. (1999) "Political Marketing: Generating Effective Candidates, Campaigns and Causes," in B. Newman (ed.) *Handbook of Political Marketing* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
Kuhn, R. (2004) " 'Vive la Différence'? The Mediation of Politicians' Public Images and Private Lives in France," *Parliamentary Affairs* 57/1: 24–40.
Lakoff, R. (1990) *Talking power: The Politics of Language in Our Lives* (New York: Basic books).
Lakoff, R. (2003) "Language, Gender, and Politics: Putting 'Women' and 'Power' in the Same Sentence," in J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff (eds) *The Handbook of Language and Gender* (Oxford: Blackwell).
Lawless, J. L. (2004) "Women, War, and Winning Elections: Gender Stereotyping in the Post-September 11th Era," *Political Research Quarterly* 57(3): 479–90.
Lawless, J. and Fox, R. L. (2005) *It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Lawrence, R. (2000) "Game-Framing the Issues: Tracking the Strategy Frame in Public Policy News," *Political Communication* 17(2): 93–114.
Lawrence, R. and Rose, M. (2010) *Hillary Clinton's Race for the White House: Gender Politics and the Media on the Campaign Trail* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Publishers).
Leclerc, G. (2006) *Le regard et le pouvoir* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France).

Lehman Schlozman, K., Verba, S. and Brady, H. (2010) "Weapon of the Strong? Participatory Inequality and the Internet," *Perspectives on Politics* 8(2): 487–509.
Leibovich, M. (2007) "Clinton Shapes Her Image for '08 Race," *New York Times*, 6 March.
Levy, C. (2007) "'The Braid' Is Crowning glory for the Ukranian Politician Yulia Tymoshenko," *New York Times*, 7 October 2007; http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/07/world/europe/07iht-hair.4.7786675.html.
Louw, E. (2005) *The Media and Political Process* (London: Sage).
Ludwig, A. (2002) *King of the Mountain: The Nature of Political Leadership* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky).
Maarek, P. (2011) *Campaign Communication & Political Marketing* (Chichester: Wiley and Sons).
MacGregor Burns, J. (1978) *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row).
MacGregor Burns, J. (2003) *Transforming Leadership* (New York: Grove Press).
Malounines, M. E. and Meeus, C. (2007) *Ségolène Royal, l'insoumise* (Paris: Fayard).
Mancini, P. (2008) "Non son solo berlusconate," paper presented at the SISP Conference, Pavia, Italy, 4–6 September.
Manin, B. (1996) *Principes du gouvernement representative* (Paris: Flammarion).
March, J. and Weil, T. (2005) *On Leadership* (Oxford: Blackwell).
Margetts, H. (2010) "The Internet in Political Science," in C. Hay (ed.) *New Directions in Political Science* (London: Palgrave MacMillan).
Marx Ferree, A. (2006) "Angela Merkel: What Does It Mean to Run as Woman?" *German Politics and Society* 24(1): 93–107.
Mazzoleni, G. and Sfardini, A. (2009) *Politica Pop* (Bologna: Il Mulino).
Mazzoleni, G. and Shultz, W. (1999) "Mediatization of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy?" *Political Communication* 16: 247–61.
Mebane, M. (2008) *Psicologia delle pari opportunità* (Milano: Unicopli).
Mény, Y. and Surel, Y. (2000) *Par le peuple, pour le peuple* (Paris: Libraire Arthème Fayard).
Meyer, T. (2002) *Media Democracy* (Oxford: Blackwell)
Miller, K. (2006) "Women in Leadership and Management Progress Thus Far?" in D. McTavish and K. Miller (eds) *Women in Leadership and Management* (Cheltenham: Elgar).
Mitchell, K. (2004) "She Is Our Mother: Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and the National League for Democracy," paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association, Illinois, 14 April 2004.
Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. and McNeal, R. (2008) *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation* (Cambridge: MIT Press).
Mossuz-Lavau, J. (2010) "Ségolène Royal: Prima donna in corsa per la presidenza francese," in D. Campus (ed.) *L'immagine della donna leader* (Bologna: Bononia University Press).
Mumford, M. (2006) *Pathways to Outstanding Leadership. A Comparative Analysis of Charismatic, Ideological and Pragmatic Leaders* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).

Muxel, A. (2007) "Les jeunes nouveaux électeur face a l'election presidentielle de Printemps 2007," CEVIPOF, Le Barometre Politique Français (2006–2007) Fevrier 2007.

Negrine, R. and Stanyer, J. (eds) (2007) *The Political Communication Reader* (London: Routledge).

Newman, B. (1999) *The Mass Marketing of Politics* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).

Nicolau-Smokoviti, L. (2004) "'Business Leaders' Work Environment and Leadership Styles," in M. Vianello and G. Moore (eds) *Women & Men in Political & Business Elites*, 83–101 (London: Sage).

Norris, P. (1997) "Women Leaders Worldwide: A Splash of Color in the Photo Op," in P. Norris (ed.) *Women, Media and Politics*, 149–65 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Norris, P. (ed.) (1999) *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Nunn, H. (2002) *Thatcher, Politics and Fantasy: The Political Culture of Gender and Nation* (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Nye, J. (2004a) *Soft Power* (New York: Public Affairs).

Nye, J. (2004b) "Soft Power and Leadership," *Compass: A Journal of Leadership*, Spring; http://hbswk.hbs.edu/archive/4290.html.

Oakley, J. G. (2000) "Gender-Based Barriers to Senior Managers Positions," *Journal of Business Ethics* 27(4): 321–32.

Oshagbeni, T. and Gill, R. (2003) "Gender Differences and Similarities in the Leadership Styles and Behavior of UK Managers," *Women in Management Review* 18(6): 288–98.

Parry-Giles, S. and Parry-Giles, T. (2002) *Constructing Clinton Hyperreality and Presidential Image-Making in Post-Modern Politics* (New York: Peter Lang).

Patterson, T. (2000) "The United States: News in a Free-Market Society," in R. Gunther and A. Mughan (eds) *Democracy and the Media: A Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Perrinau, P. (2011) "L'extreme droite en France: Le retour fu Front National," in *Les extremes droites en Europe: Le retour*, Les Cahiers du CEVIPOF, Avril 2011/53, 5–12.

Peters, H. and Kabacoff, R. (2002) *A New Look at the Glass Ceiling: The Perspective from the Top* (Munich and Portland: Management Research Group).

Pew Research Center for People and the Press (2008) "Obama Has the Lead, But Potential Problems Too," Pew Research Center for People and the Press Report, 28 February 2008.

Pharr, S. and Putnam, R. (eds) (2000) *Disaffected Democracies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Pittinsky, T., Bacon, L. and Welle, B. (2007) "The Great Women Theory and Leadership? Perils and Positive Stereotypes and Precarious Pedestals," in D. Rhode and B. Kellerman (eds) *Women and Leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons).

Poguntke, T. and Webb, P. (eds) (2005) *The Presidentialization of Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Rhode, D. and Kellerman, B. (2007) "Women and Leadership the State of Play," in D. Rhode and B. Kellerman (eds) *Women and Leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons).

Riegert, K. (2007a) "Introduction," in K. Riegert (ed.) *Politicotainment: Television's Take on the Real* (New York: Peter Lang).

Riegert, K. (2007b) "The Ideology of the West Wing: The Television Show That Wants to Be Real," in K. Riegert (ed.) *Politicotainment: Television's Take on the Real* (New York: Peter Lang).

Rosener, J. (1990) "Ways Women Lead," *Harvard Business Review* 68(6): 119–25.

Rosenthal, C. S. and Peters, R. M., Jr. (2008) "Who Is Nancy Pelosi?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41: 57–62.

Ross, K. and Sreberny, A. (2000) "Women in the House: Media Representations of British Politicians," in A. Sreberny and L. van Zoonen (eds) *Gender, Politics and Communication* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press).

Rushdie, S. (1980) *Midnight's Children* (New York: Alfred Knopf).

Ryan, M. K. and Haslam, S. A. (2005) "The Glass Cliff: Evidence That Women Are Overrepresented in Precarious Leadership Positions," *British Journal of Management* 16: 81–90.

Ryan, M. K. and Haslam, S. A. (2007) "The Glass Cliff: Exploring the Dynamics Surrounding the Appointment of Women to Precarious Leadership Positions," *Academic of Management Review* 32: 549–72.

Sabato, L. (1991) *Feeding Frenzy* (NewYork: Free Press).

Sabato, L., Stencel, M. and Lichter, S. R. (2000) *Peepshow: Media and Politics in an Age of Scandal* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).

Saint-Germain, M. (1993) "Women in Power in Nicaragua: Myth and Reality," in M. Genovese (ed.) *Women as National Leaders* (London: Sage).

Salmon, C. (2007) *Storytelling* (Paris: La Decouverte).

Sanbonmatsu, K. (2006) "State Elections: Where Do Women Run? Where Do Women Win?" in S. Carroll and R. Fox (eds) *Gender and Elections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Schein, V. E. (1973) "The Relationship between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57: 95–100.

Schein, V. E. (1975) "The Relationship between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics among Female Managers," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60: 340–44.

Schein, V. E. and Mueller, R. (1992) "Sex Role Stereotyping and Requisite Management Characteristics: A Cross Cultural Look," *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13: 439–47.

Schein, V., Mueller, R., Lituchy, T. and Liu, J. (1996) "Think Manager—Think Male: A Global Phenomenon?" *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 17(1): 33–41.

Schnoebelen, J., Carlin, D. and Warner, B. (2009) "Hillary, You Can't Go Home Again: The Entrapment of the First Lady Role," in T. Sheckels (ed.) *Cracked But Not Shattered: Hillary Clinton's Unsuccessful Campaign for the Presidency* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).

Schwartzenberg, R. (1980) *Lo Stato spettacolo* (Roma: Editori riuniti); original French ed. 1977.
Seelye, K. and Bosman, J. (2008) "Was Clinton Coverage in Media Sexist or Fair?" *International Herald Tribune*, 13 June.
Seymour-Ure, C. (2003) *Prime Ministers and the Media: Issue on Power and Control* (Oxford: Blackwell).
Shapiro, R. and Mahajan, H. (1986) "Gender Difference in Policy Preferences," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50: 42–61.
Shils, E. (1975) *Centre and Periphery. Essays in Macrosociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Sineau, M. (2001) *Profession: femme politique: Sexe e pouvoir sous la Cinquieme République* (Paris: Presses de Science Po).
Sineau, M. (2007a) *Le vote hommes/femmes au premier tour de la présidentielle 2007, Le Panel Électoral Français 2007, 1ère Vague,* April 2007, Cevipof, www.cevipof.mhs-paris.fr.
Sineau, M. (2007b) *Ségolène Royal: fin ou retour du politique?* CEVIPOF, Le Barometre Politique Français, www.cevipof-science-po.fr.
Smith, K. (1997) "When All's Fair: Signs of Parity in Media Coverage of Female Candidates," *Political Communication* 14: 71–82.
Solheim, B. (2000) *On the Top of the World: Women's Political Leadership in Scandinavia and Beyond* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).
Spiker, J. (2009) "It Takes a Village to Win: A Rhetorical Analysis of 'Hillary for President,'" in T. Sheckels (ed.) *Cracked But Not Shattered: Hillary Clinton's Unsuccessful Campaign for the Presidency* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).
Sreberny-Mohammadi, A. and Ross, K. (1996) "Women MPs and the Media: Representing the Body Politic," *Parliamentary Affairs* 49(1): 103–15.
Stanford, J. H., Oates, B. and Flores, D. (1995) "Women's Leadership Styles: A Heuristic Analysis," *Women in Management Review* 10(2): 9–16.
Stanyer, J. (2007) *Modern Political Communication* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
Stanyer, J. and Wring, D. (2004) "Public Images, Private Lives," Special Issue, *Parliamentary Affairs* 57(1), 1–8.
Stein, K. (2009) "The Cleavage Commotion: How the Press Covered Senator Clinton's Campaign," in T. Sheckels (ed.) *Cracked But Not Shattered: Hillary Clinton's Unsuccessful Campaign for the Presidency* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).
Steinberg, B. (2008) *Women in Power: The Personality and Leadership Styles of Indira Gandhi, Golda Meir, and Margaret Thatcher* (Montreal: McGill's Queens University Press).
Stephen, A. (2008) "Hating Hillary," *The New Statesman*; www.newstatesman.com.
Stevens, A. (2007) *Women, Power, and Politics* (Houndmills: Palgrave).
Stoker, G. (2010) "The Rise of Political Disenchantment," in C. Hay (ed.) *New Directions in Political Science* (London: Palgrave MacMillan).
Stokes, W. (2005) *Women in Contemporary Politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Stone, G. (2006) "Appearance and the Self," in A. Rose (ed.) *Human Behavior and Social Processes: An Interactionist Approach* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin); 1st ed. 1962.
Street, J. (1997) *Politics and Popular Culture* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
Street, J. (2003) "The Celebrity Politician: Political Style and Popular Culture," in J. Corner and D. Pels (eds) *Media and the Restyling of Politics* (London: Sage).
Strudel, S. (2006) "Les femmes a l'éléction présidentiel: 3ème Vague," www.cevipof.mhs-paris.fr.
Stuckey, M. (1991) *The President as Interpreter-in-Chief* (Chatham: Chatham House Publishers).
Sykes, P. L. (1993) "Women as National Leaders: Patterns and Prospects," in M. Genovese (ed.) *Women as National Leaders* (London: Sage).
Taguieff, P. (2007) *L'illusion populiste* (Paris: Berg International); original ed. 2002.
Tannen, D. (1990) *You Just Do Not Understand: Women and Men in Conversation* (London: Random House).
Thomas, S. (2003) "The Impact of Women in Political Leadership Positions," in S. Carroll (ed.) *Women and American Politics: New Questions, New Directions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Thompson, J. (1995) *Media and Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
Thompson, J. (2000) *Political Scandal: Power and Visibility in the Media Age* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
Thompson, S. (1993) "Golda Meir: A Very Public Life," in M. Genovese (ed.) *Women as National Leaders* (London: Sage).
Torrens, K. (2009) "Public Woman, Private Wife: Hillary Clinton Could Not Have Won," in T. Sheckels (ed.) *Cracked But Not Shattered: Hillary Clinton's Unsuccessful Campaign for the Presidency* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).
Traub, J. (2006) "La Femme," *New York Times*, 14 March.
Trimble, L. (2007) "Gender, Political Leadership and Media Visibility: *Globe* and *Mail* Coverage of Conservative Party of Canada Leadership Contests," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 40(4): 969–93.
Trimble, L., Treiberg, N. and Girard, S. (2007) "Joan of Arc and the Xena Princesses: Election Newspaper Coverage of Female and Male Prime Ministers in Canada and New Zealand," paper presented at the Canadian Political Science Association Conference, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 20 May 2007.
Vaccari, C. (2006) "Meet Silvio and Romano: Political Communication as Personal Storytelling," in J. frosini and G. Pasquino (eds) *For a Fistful of Votes. The 2006 Italian Elections* (Bologna: Clueb).
Vaccari, C. (2008) "Surfing to the Elysee: The Internet in the 2007 French Elections," *French Politics* 6(1): 1–22.
Vaccari, C. (2010) "'Tecnology Is a Commodity': The Internet in the 2008 United States Presidential Election," *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 7(4): 318–39.
Valenzuela, S. and Correa, T. (2009) "Press Coverage and Public Opinion on Women Candidates," *International Communication Gazette* 71(3): 203–23.

Van Zoonen, L. (2005) *Entertaining the Citizen: When Politics and Popular Culture Converge* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield).
Van Zoonen, L. (2006) "The Personal, the Political and the Popular: A Woman's Guide to Celebrity Politics," *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9(3): 287–301.
Vedel, T. (2007) *Comment devient-on Président de la Republique? Les Strategies des Candidates* (Paris: Laffont).
Vianello M. and Moore, G. (2004) "Conclusions," in M. Vianello and G. Moore (eds) *Women and Men in Political & Business Elites* (London: Sage).
Warner, J. (2007) "The Really Real Hillary," *New York Times*, 14 March.
Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press); original ed. 1922.
West, D. and Orman, J. (2003) *The Evolution of Celebrityhood* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall).
Wilcox, C. (2008) "Internet Fundraising in 2008: A New Model," *The Forum* 6: 1; http://bepress.com/forum/vol6/iss1/art6.
Willner, A. R. (1984) *Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
Wilson, M. (2007) "It's Woman Time," in D. Rhode and B. Kellerman (eds) *Women and Leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons).
Women on the Web (2010) "Women_on_the_Web_How_Women_are_Shaping_the_Internet," http://www.comscore.com/Press_Events/Presentations_Whitepapers/2010/Women_on_the_Web_How_Women_are_Shaping_the_Internet.
Young, R. (2011) *Power Dressing. First Ladies, Women Politicians & Fashion* (London: Merrell).
Zanatta, L. (2009) *Eva Peron: Una Biografia Politica* (Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino).
Zeh, R. (2010) "Angela Merkel e i media: Una donna che fa tendenza o un caso particolare," in D. Campus (ed.) *L'immagine della donna leader* (Bologna: Bononia University Press).
Zemmour, E. (2006) *Le Premier Sexe* (Paris: Edition Denoel).

Index

Aday, S., 43, 75, 76
Adelstein, S., 96, 128n
Alexander, D., 41
Alimo-Metcalfe, B., 16
Allen-Mills, T., 97
Alliot-marie, Michèle, 67, 85
Andersen, K., 41
Anderson, K., 70, 71
Aquino, Corazon, 8, 44, 48, 62, 104–6, 131

Bachelet, Michelle, 1, 42, 78
Bachmann, I., 42, 43, 44, 59, 63, 78, 97
Bacque, R., 67
Baird, J., 118
Bandaranaike, Sirimavo, 105
Barber, B., 122
Bard, C., 84, 85, 87
Barins, S., 128n
Barotte, N., 65
Bass, B. M., 19
benevolent sexism, 57
Berlusconi, Silvio, 24, 84, 103, 113
Bernay, T., 11, 53, 54, 58, 75, 126n
Bhutto, Benazir, 8, 104–5, 107–8, 129
Bhutto, Sulficar, 107
Blair, Cherie, 102
Blair, Tony, 24, 74–5, 84, 113
Blondel, J., 36, 112, 113
Blumler, J., 34, 121
Bosman, J., 70, 128n
Bourdieu, P., 7, 57, 92
Boy, D., 127n
Brazaitis, T., 17
Brown, M. E., 70, 71
Brundtland, Gro, 48, 83, 102, 116
Burns, N., 53
Bush, George W., 43, 74, 118, 123
Bystrom, D., 25, 39, 41, 50, 73, 74, 80, 82, 83, 127n

Cain, B., 111
Campbell, Kim, 78
Campus, D., 24, 69, 113
candidate viability, 6, 50–3, 74, 79
Cantor, D., 11, 53, 54, 58, 75
Cantrell, T. H., 42, 43, 44, 63, 78, 97
Carli, L., 11, 19, 116, 118, 119, 120
Carlin, D. B., 72, 76, 77, 87, 89, 90, 128n
Carroll, S., 76, 77
Castells, M., 26, 32, 34, 127n
celebrity politics, 8, 26, 79, 82, 98
Chacon, Carme, 83
Chadwick, A., 32, 120, 121
Chait Barnett, R., 44, 46, 50
Chamorro, Violeta, 44, 48, 62, 104–6
Chemin, A., 67
Chiche, J., 127n
Childs, S., 17, 74
Chirac, Bernadette, 102
Chirac, Jacques, 92
Ciller, Tansu, 80
Clark, Helen, 97
Clift, E., 17
Clinton, Bill, 71, 103
Clinton, Hillary, v, 1, 6, 8, 24, 28, 40, 43, 59, 64, 69–72, 74–8, 80–3, 85, 90, 95, 98, 100, 103, 105, 109–10, 118, 123, 128n, 129–30, 133–40
Cogburn, D., 123, 124
Coleman, S., 30, 34, 120, 121
Col, J.-M., 44, 62, 106
Collins, J., 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 126n
Correa, T., 78
Crane, D., 86

Cresson, Edith, 46, 89–90
Crumley, B., 108

Dahlgren, P., 28, 29
Dalton, R., 111, 114
Dati, Rachida, 87
Davies, S. G., 97
Davis, F., 83, 84, 85
Deacon, D., 27, 99
de Gaulle, Charles, 24, 68, 81
Delli Carpini, M. X., 102
De Medici, Caterina, 56
De Michelis, L., 91, 127n
De Paulo, B., 97
Devere, H., 97
Devitt, J., 39, 43, 74, 75, 76
Dolan, K., 41
Dole, Elizabeth, 43, 75–6, 129, 134
Dolez, B., 35
double bind, 1, 6, 54–64, 91, 115–16, 134
dress code, 82–8
Drudge, Matt, 81
Duerst-Lahti, G., 12, 126n

Eagly, A., 11, 19, 116, 118, 119, 120
Edwards, John, 83
Ekman, P., 80
Elisabeth I, Queen of England, 19, 56, 60, 126
emotions, 31, 58–60, 104, 114–18
Ertel, M., 48
Espinoza-Vasquez, F., 123, 124
Everett, J., 61, 63, 95, 127n
Everitt, J., 56

Fabius, Laurent, 65, 90, 96
Falk, E., 2, 40, 43, 50, 51, 52, 55, 59, 60, 70, 72, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 94
Fallaci, O., 128n
Fallows, D., 33
family
  dynastic politics, 8, 104–10
  privacy zone, 8, 27, 104
  private life, 27, 94–8, 102–4
Ferraro, Geraldine, 71, 77, 90, 95, 102, 134
Fiske, S., 57
Forbes, Steve, 43
Foschi, M., 2
Fowler, L. L., 41
Fox, R., 51, 52, 53
Fraser, A., 56, 61, 63, 92, 93, 95
Freedman, J., 46, 67, 78, 79, 80, 83, 85, 89, 90, 91
Fridkin, K., 41, 50
Friedman, J.-P., 99
Friesen, W. V., 80

Gandhi, Indira, 8, 45, 61–4, 95, 104–5, 107–8, 126n, 132, 139
Gandhi, Sonia, 8, 104
Gardetto, D., 70, 71
gender stereotypes, v, 2–3, 6, 11–12, 115–16
  cleaning-up politics, 47–9, 106, 114
  different character traits, 11
  different expertise, 41–2
  positive stereotypes, 44–8
  success in management, 12–14
  women as caretakers, 45, 49
  women as outsiders, 6, 45–9, 106, 114
  see also double bind
Genovese, M., 126n, 127n
Gibson, R. K., 35
Gidengil, E., 56
Gill, R., 17, 60
Girard, S., 41
Giscard D'Estaing
Givhan, R., 128n
Glick, P., 57
going personal, 26–8, 98–104
  see also personalization of politics
Grint, K., 12, 20, 115, 126n
Gutgold, N., 76, 77

Halonen, Tarja, 28, 63, 87, 97, 104
Harnden, T., 71
Hartley, J., 30

Hart, R., 22
Haslam, S. A., 11, 12, 115, 119, 124, 126n
Heath, Edward, 45
Hegelsen, S., 15
Heldman, C., 76, 77, 78, 90
Herrnson, P. S., 41
Hillman, J., 32, 127
Holtz-Bacha, C., 40, 67, 68, 104
Hoogensen, G., 64, 97, 102, 104, 108, 126n
horse race, 23, 43, 50–2
Houchin Winfield, B., 71
Huddy, L., 41, 42

infotainment, 5, 102
Internet, 31–8, 120–5
  communication models, 31–3
  interaction between leaders and followers, 5, 8, 34–5, 37, 121–5
  participation, 34–6, 114
  women leaders, 35–8, 120–1
Isabella, Queen of Spain, 56
Ivaldi, G., 35, 66
Iyengar, S., 23, 41, 51

Jalalzai, F., 126n
Jamieson, K. H., 1, 2, 25, 33, 44, 49, 54, 55, 82, 91, 92, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 127n
Johnson-Sirleaf, Ellen, 43–4, 63, 78
Jones, J. P., 28
Jospin, Lionel, 65
Jung, C. G., 55
Juppe, Alain, 74

Kabacoff, R., 16, 18
Kahn Fridkin, K., 39, 41, 50, 51, 126n
Kane, J., 63, 107, 128
Karvonen, L., 22, 23, 30, 112
Kellerman, B., 2, 14, 15, 37, 49, 50, 126n
Kelly, R. M., 12, 126n
Kennedy, John, 88, 92
Kennedy, John-John, 103
Kennedy, Robert, 88
Keohane, N., 10, 15, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 121, 122, 126n, 128n
King, A., 45, 46, 47, 61
Kirchner, Cristina, 1, 8, 86, 105–9
Kirchner, Nestor, 105, 109
Kittilson, M. C., 41, 50
Kiviniemi, Mari, 48
Koch, S., 13
Kotler, N., 23, 73
Kotler, P., 23, 73
Kuhn, R., 101, 102

Lakoff, R., 34, 55, 58, 74, 93
language
  double bind, 55
  female leaders, 56, 64
  gender difference of, 98–9, 135
  intimate style of communication, 25, 99
  populist, 113, 130
  sexist, 70
Laurent, A., 35, 65, 90, 96
Lawless, J., 41, 42, 51, 52, 53
Lawrence, R., 40, 43, 59, 60, 76, 82
Lay, J. C., 41
leadership
  degenderization of, 115–2
  female style of, 14–18, 32–3, 115–19
  Great Man model, 11–12, 49
  outsiders, 46–7, 113–14
  popular culture, 28–31
  role models, 6, 53
  transformational model, 4, 18–21, 118–21, 124
Leclerc, G., 100, 101
Lehman Schlozman, K., 33, 36
Leibovich, M., 70, 72
Le Pen, Jean Marie, 108
Le Pen, Marine, 86, 108, 131
Levy, C., 86
Limbaugh, Rush, 81
Livni, Tzipi, 85

Louw, E., 23, 73
Ludwig, A., 61, 92, 104, 106

Maarek, P., 23
MacGregor Burns, J., 18, 19, 118, 119
Mahajan, H., 41
Mancini, P., 84
Manin, B., 112
March, J., 10, 14, 15, 116, 119
Marcos, Ferdinando, 105–6
Margetts, H., 114
Marx Ferree, A., 51, 78, 84, 87, 97
Mazzoleni, G., 22, 28, 112
McCain, John, 43, 78, 82
McGrady, J., 23, 51
Mebane, M., 57
media coverage, 2, 3, 5–6, 30, 39–53, 67, 72, 76, 78, 89–1, 128n
  age, 81–2
  physical appearance, 5–6, 73–93
  quality, 39–43
  quantity, 39–40, 74
  sexism, 2, 40, 67, 71–2, 76–8, 89–91, 128n
mediatization, 4, 22–8
Meir, Golda, 63, 82, 95–6, 126n, 128n, 139–40
Mény, Y., 113
Merkel, Angela, 1, 24, 28, 40, 43, 48, 51, 78, 85, 87, 97, 101, 103, 134, 136, 141
Meyer, T., 22, 27
Miller, K., 12
Mitchell, K., 63, 107
Mitterrand, Francois, 46, 89, 90, 92
Mondale, Walter, 81
Moore, G., 16
Morgan, Piers, 128n
Moscoso, Mireya, 105
Mossberger, K., 114
Mossuz-Lavau, J., 67, 127n, 128n
Mueller, R., 13
Mumford, M., 20
Muskie, Edmund, 59
Mussolini, Benito, 92
Muxel, A., 36

Negrine, R., 25, 26, 100
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 107
Newman, B., 23, 73
new media, v, 3, 31–8, 120–5
  see also Internet
Nicolau-Smokoviti, L., 16, 60
Norris, P., 2, 40, 45, 47, 52, 62, 66, 80, 111
Nunn, H., 91
Nye, J., 117

Oakley, J. G., 54
Obama, Barack, 5, 35–7, 40, 59, 72, 82, 88, 103, 105, 109, 118, 121, 123–4, 128n, 131, 137
Olson, S., 76

Palin, Sarah, 75, 77–8, 86, 90
Parry-Giles, S., 25, 100
Parry-Giles, T., 25, 100
Patterson, T., 56
Pelosi, Nancy, 87, 96, 138
Penn, Mark, 71
Peron, Eva, 62, 105, 109, 141
Peron, Isabella, 105
Peron, Juan, 109
Perrinau, P., 108
personalization of politics, 4, 22–8
  female leaders' image, 73–82
  popularization, 28–30
  television, 24
  virtual intimacy, 25
Peters, H., 16, 18
Peters, R. M. Jr, 87, 96
Pharr, S., 111
Pittinsky, T., 3, 6, 8, 21, 44, 48, 49, 115, 118
Poguntke, T., 112
power
  female incompatibility, 55–6
  Iron ladies, v, 12, 60–2
  male model, 10–14

power – *continued*
Mothers of the nation, 60–4
sexuality, 7, 72, 88–93
Prodi, Romano, 103
Putnam, R., 111

Reagan, Ronald, 24, 81
Reno, Janet, 97
Rhode, D., 2, 37, 49, 50, 126n
Rice, Condoleezza, 97, 132
Riegert, K., 28, 30, 31
Romney, Mitt, 60
Rose, M., 40, 43, 59, 60, 82
Rosener, J., 15, 19
Rosenthal, C. S., 87, 96
Ross, K., 75, 81, 89, 113, 128n
Royal, Ségolène, v, 1, 5–6, 24, 34–7, 40, 64–9, 71, 80, 83, 90–1, 96, 99–101, 121, 123, 127n, 128n, 129, 132, 134, 136, 139
Ryan, M. K., 115

Sabato, L., 127n
Saint-Germain, M., 63, 105, 106
Salmon, C., 66, 80
Sanbonmatsu, K., 53
Sarkozy, Carla, 102–3
Sarkozy, Cecilia, 102–3
Sarkozy, Nicholas, 24, 40, 66–7, 102–3, 113, 118, 134
scandal politics, 26, 97, 127
Scarrow, S., 111
Schein, V., 13
Schnoebelen, J., 80, 109, 110
Schroder, Gehrard, 40, 84
Schwartzenberg, R., 60, 62, 64, 88
Seelye, K., 70, 128n
Seymour-Ure, C., 24
Sfardini, A., 28
Shapiro, R., 41
Shils, E., 100
Sineau, M., 67, 89
Singh, V., 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 126n
Smith, K., 52
Somoza, Anastasio, 105
Spiker, J., 60
Sreberny-Mohammadi, A., 75, 81, 89, 128n
Stanford, J. H., 16
Stanyer, J., 5, 25, 26, 27, 100, 102
Steinberg, B., 45, 63, 91, 95, 99, 108, 126n
Stein, K., 76, 85, 101
Stephen, A., 110
Stevens, A., 7, 11, 14, 74, 126n
Stoker, G., 112
Stokes, A., 41
Stone, G., 83
Strauss-Kahn, Dominique, 65
Street, J., 28
Strudel, S., 36
Stuckey, M., 100
Sukarno, 92
Surel, Y., 113
Suu Kyi, Aung San, 1, 48, 63, 104, 106–7, 136
Sykes, P. L., 54, 61

Taguieff, P., 113
Tannen, D., 34, 98, 101
Terkildsen, N., 41, 42
Thiebault, J.-L., 36, 112, 113
Thompson, J., 26, 31, 97, 127n
Thompson, S., 95
Torrens, K., 109
Traub, J., 127n
Treiberg, N., 41
Trimble, L., 41, 56, 78, 79
trivialization effect, 7, 74–6
Trudeau, Pierre, 88

Vaccari, C., 35, 103, 124
Valenzuela, S., 42, 78
Van Zoonen, L., 7, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 63, 78, 79, 80, 87, 96, 97, 98, 103, 104
Vedel, T., 67
Vianello, M., 16

Ward, S. J., 35
Warner, J., 70
Webb, P., 112
Weber, M., 20
Weil, T., 10, 15, 116, 119
Wilcox, C., 96, 128n
Williams, B. A., 102
Willner, A. R., 20, 92
Wilson, M., 47
Winfrey, K. L., 72, 76, 77, 87, 89, 90, 128n
Wring, D., 127

Young, R., 83, 85, 86, 87, 88

Zanatta, L., 62, 109
Zeh, R., 40, 87
Zemmour, E., 55, 59, 92, 102, 103, 117, 118