

6-2019

Does Gender Impact How Subordinates View Their Supervisors?

Megan Muras
megan.muras@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/psyc_etds

Recommended Citation

Muras, Megan, "Does Gender Impact How Subordinates View Their Supervisors?" (2019). *Culminating Projects in Psychology*. 14.
https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/psyc_etds/14

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Psychology at theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Culminating Projects in Psychology by an authorized administrator of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu.

Does Gender Impact How Subordinates View Their Supervisors?

by

Megan Muras

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Science

in Industrial-Organizational Psychology

May, 2019

Thesis Committee:
Daren Protolipac, Chairperson
Marcy Young-Illies
Joel Frederickson

Abstract

Past research has found that gender impacts how satisfied subordinates are with their leader. Leadership style, sexism, difference score between ideal supervisor and their supervisor, and leader member exchange (LMX) were assessed to understand the relationship between gender and satisfaction with supervisor. It was hypothesized that subordinates would be more critical of women than men because of views on gender roles, and that the gender of the subordinate would further impact how women were scored. The results of this study indicated that gender was not a significant indicator of how satisfied subordinates are with their supervisor. Furthermore, past research has found that women tend to have more transformational traits, while men tend to have more transactional traits; this was not supported by the data. LMX, followed by transformational leadership, followed by transactional traits were found to be the most predictive of satisfaction with subordinate's supervisor regardless of gender. Limitations, implications, and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: leader member exchange (LMX), gender roles, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, satisfaction with supervisor

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my family and friends who have been there for me through thick and thin the past two years. Your love and support mean the world to me!

“In the future, there will be no female leaders. There will just be leaders.” -Sheryl Sandberg

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	8
Chapter	
I. Introduction	9
Gender Roles.....	13
Role Congruity Theory	14
Ambivalent Sexism.....	17
Individual Versus Social Structural Problem.....	18
Barriers To Reaching Positions Of Leadership	21
The Glass Cliff.....	24
Likability-Penalty	27
Psychological Barriers	28
Leadership Styles	30
Leader-Membership Exchange Theory.....	32
How Women Lead	33
II. Method	35
Participants.....	35
Procedure	35

Chapter	Page
Scales	36
Transactional Vs. Transformational Scale	36
Bem Sex Role Inventory Scale	36
Leader-Member Exchange – 7 Scale	37
Satisfaction With My Supervisor Scale	38
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	38
III. Results.....	40
IV. Discussion.....	47
Findings Of The Current Study.....	47
Limitations Of The Study	49
Implications For Practice	50
Implications For Future Research.....	51
References.....	53
Appendix A.....	64
Appendix B	66
Appendix C	67
Appendix D.....	68

Chapter	Page
Appendix E.....	69

List of Tables

Table		Page
3.1	Descriptive Statistics and Correlations.....	38
3.2	Hierarchical Regression of ASI and LMX on SWMSS.....	42
3.3	Hierarchical Regression of BSRI and LMX on SWMSS.....	43
3.4	Hierarchical Regression of LMX, Transformational, and Transactional on SWMSS.....	44

Chapter I: Introduction

Throughout history, men have predominantly been in positions of leadership, as it was believed they embodied the ideal attributes of a leader (Kessler, 2014). A leader was someone who had to be strong, assertive, dominant, and achievement-oriented— very similar to the stereotype of the ideal man (Kessler, 2014). Men are often expected to be agentic in all of their roles (e.g. competitive, dominant, independent, assertive) (Badura, Grijalva, Newman, Yan, & Jeon., 2017). However, the definition and image of a leader has been evolving with the passage of time. While these traits remain essential, value is now also given to leaders who are strong communicators, relate well with others, and are highly collaborative. This stereotypically characterizes women. (Ayman, Korabik, & Morris, 2009). As a result, it is becoming more common to see women in positions of leadership; the gender gap between the number of women compared to men in positions of leadership has narrowed over time (Badura, et al., 2017). While there is an increase of women in positions of leadership, a vast disparity among women and men remains, especially at the executive level. According to Forbes magazine, as of May 2018, only 24 women were CEOs of Fortune 500 companies, which is below 5% of the total 500 companies (Fortune Editors, 2018).

A main reason discrepancy is still seen between the number of men and women in positions of leadership is due to a contemporary gap in thought (Badura et al., 2017). Mending the contemporary gap between men and women in leadership is not an easy feat. Historically men have been the ones who worked to provide for their family, and it was not common for women to work the same jobs as men (Acar & Sumer, 2018; Miner et al., 2018). The following paragraph will serve as a brief history of women in the workplace to provide a better

understanding of the barriers women have faced, not only in positions of leadership, but also simply for the right to work.

Women began to slowly enter the workforce in the late 1800's during the Industrial Revolution working in factories (Hur, 2017). However, it was not until World War II when many women began leaving the home to work out of necessity, filling the jobs men left when they went to war (Miner et al., 2018; Hur 2017). This period was a turning point in history. Many women realized they liked the feeling of being independent and working, and when the men came back from war wanting their jobs back, many women did not want to give up their positions (Hur, 2017). Men felt threatened by women taking jobs they believed to belong to men, and as a result, women faced a lot of pushback (Hur, 2017). It was not until 1964 that the Civil Rights Act was passed to protect these women who wanted to work. This new act outlawed discrimination in the workplace on the basis of sex, race, religion, color, and national origin (Hur, 2017). The protection of women's rights in the workplace is only 54 years old, and progress in equality continues to improve.

Furthermore, socio-historical events and interactions between genders have shaped gender roles significantly as we know them today (Eagly & Karau, 1995; Miner et al., 2018). Gender roles are defined as the norms to which a male or female is expected to adhere (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ayman, Korabik, & Morris 2009). As stated earlier, men are expected to be more competitive, dominant, independent, and assertive, while women are expected to be more communal (e.g. warm, nurturing, friendly, thoughtful of others) (Badura et al., 2017; Ferguson, 2017; Cuadradro, 2015).

When individuals do not match their prescribed gender roles, they will be met with resistance according to role congruity theory (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Descriptions of strong leaders are often dominant and assertive, which is not the description of a gender-conforming woman (Cuadrado, 2012). The roles of being a woman and a leader are inherently in conflict with each other (Cuadrado, 2012). Hannan, the 2004 director of the UN Division of the Advancement of Women, described why this issue is still prevalent, “Among the main constraints to moving forward on gender equality and empowerment of women are deeply entrenched negative attitudes and stereotypes, which are institutionalized in society” (Ayman et al., 2009, pg. 852).

The issue of women facing discrimination in leadership is often viewed from an individual lens or a social-structural lens (Miner et al., 2018). Looking through the lens of the individual, gender discrimination in the workplace is not really discrimination (Miner et al., 2018). This view explains a qualified woman being passed up for a promotion for a less qualified man because she is not as good of a fit or she needs to work harder (Kahneman, 2011; Miner et al., 2018). The social-structural lens considers the impact culture and gender roles have on the workplace and the barriers in place for women reaching positions of leadership (Miner et al., 2018).

Women face barriers in pursuit of the opportunity to earn a position of leadership that men do not (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ferguson, 2017), despite women often being more qualified and seeing more positive results. Compared to men, women have on average a higher education level (Klatt, Eimler, & Krämer, 2016), and the organizations where women have a stronger presence and influence tend to have stronger financial value, economic

growth, and higher innovativeness (Chisholm-Burns, Spivey, Hagermann, & Josephson, 2017). Men are seen as a more natural fit for positions of leadership by many members of society whether or not they consciously recognize their initial biases and assumptions.

For the women who have pushed past the barriers placed in front of them, plenty of issues still remain. Women face issues such as double standards, the likeability penalty, the glass cliff, and psychological issues that men in their same position do not face (Klatt et al., 2016; Haslam & Ryan, 2008).

There is not a clear definition of what an effective leader looks like, due in part to differing environments, personalities, and needs (Carmala, 2017; Jex & Britt, 2014). Good leaders are often described as being personable, getting the job done, creating positive change, and being able to make smart decisions (Carmala, 2017; Jex & Britt, 2014). Two common leadership styles are transformational and transactional leadership. Transactional leaders are task-oriented and develop employees with a clear goal leading to better performance (Zeb, Saeed, Rehman, Ullah, & Rabi, 2015). Transformational leaders are relationally-oriented, and intentionally create an environment with trust and transparency for their employees (Zeb et al., 2015).

Good leadership develops strong exchanges of relationship between subordinate and supervisor, creating employees who are satisfied with their supervisor (Imran Latif & Mehvish Sher, 2012). This in turn creates loyal and satisfied employees as well as higher productivity for the organizations in which they work (Zeb et al., 2015). Satisfaction with supervisors is developed when employees feel like they matter and are supported, know what is expected of them, and when clear communication is utilized (Imran Latif & Mehvish Sher, 2012).

The purpose of this paper is to examine whether gender roles may impact how subordinates perceive their leader's effectiveness, their satisfaction with their leader, and the perceived leadership style. The quality of the relationship between subordinates and their supervisor can lessen the impact of the gender on the supervisor.

The subsequent literature review seeks to do the following:

- 1) Understand how gender roles directly and indirectly impact how female leaders are seen, treated, and evaluated differently than male leaders.
- 2) Understand the relationship between ambivalent sexism and gender roles.
- 3) Understand barriers women in leadership face and how women commonly lead.
- 4) Demonstrate how quality of leader member exchange (LMX) impacts how subordinates view their boss.
- 5) Define transformational and transactional leadership styles.

Gender Roles

Gender is a cultural construction (Haake, 2017) and it "is the primary frame that people use in order to understand and perform social behavior" (Ridgeway, 2011 as cited in Ferguson, 2017 pg. 410). When meeting someone for the first time, one of the first things we notice about them is their gender, and subconsciously we already have expectations about how the other person should act (Kessler, 2014).

Men and women are explicitly and implicitly assigned gender roles. Gender roles are society's working beliefs about someone based upon their sex (Eisenclaus, 2013). Gender roles dictate what a person can and cannot do, including working, child-rearing, etc. (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ferguson, 2017). Men are told they should be more

masculine; they should be stronger, more competent, more assertive, and more achievement oriented than women (Eisenchlas, 2013). Women, on the other hand, are told they should be more feminine and relationship oriented. They are told they need to be caring, friendlier, more interdependent, less selfish, and warmer than men (Eisenchlas, 2013). Deviating from gender role expectations often is faced with resistance, which is explained by role congruity theory (Eisenchlas, 2013; Eagly & Diekmann, 2005).

Role Congruity Theory

Role congruity theory is the belief that when a woman or man is in a role that matches up with their assigned social role, they will be evaluated positively; if they are in a role that is incongruent, they will be evaluated negatively (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Anderson et al., 2015). For women in positions of leadership, role congruity theory proposes women may receive backlash from subordinates and coworkers as the identified characteristics of a leader are masculine and agentic (Ferguson, 2017).

Prescriptive and descriptive stereotypes impact how we see gender. Prescriptive stereotypes speak to how someone should act, while descriptive stereotypes impact how someone is described based on their gender, attributing feminine characteristics to women and male characteristics to men (Cuadradro, 2012). According to role congruity theory in the case of leadership, these stereotypes are present in the belief that women are not a fit for leadership (descriptive) and when women unfairly receive less favorable evaluations as leaders (prescriptive) (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Anderson et al., 2015).

The prescribed and described agentic nature of men depicts men as a more natural fit for a position of leadership (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Anderson et al., 2015; Ferguson, 2017). In fact,

studies that have asked participants to picture a leader discovered participants were more likely to picture a male leader than a female leader (as cited in Ferguson, 2017; Koenig et al. 2011; Schein, 2007). Women who are leaders are in a position that are incongruent with their stereotypical role, and often face discrimination at some point in their career (Cuadradro, 2012). Discrimination may be evident in how co-workers treat her, harsher judgements of her competence and satisfaction from subordinates, more critical descriptions, or exclusion from male peers to give a few examples (Katila and Erickson, 2011; Haake, 2017).

The role a gender is given is influenced by religious beliefs, cultural norms, familial values, and history (Remington & Kitterlin-Lynch, 2017). An example of a religious belief impacting roles women can take is in the Christian religion. There are some Christians who interpret the Bible verse 1 Timothy 2:12, “I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man; she must be quiet,” as women being required to be submissive to men in relationships. A study conducted by Wong, Worthy, Fung, and Chen (2017) examined how this interpretation has impacted women pastors in the Chinese-American church. The women pastors in this study felt limited and looked down upon by congregations and fellow male pastors, some female pastors were even barred from being ordained after completing seminary (Wong et al., 2017). Instead of being given the pastoral jobs for which they were qualified, the women pastors were given roles such as children’s ministry and administrative work - roles that fit their descriptive norms (Wong et al., 2017). Whether consciously or subconsciously, the women pastors in this study experienced ambivalent sexism because they were given supportive roles fitting their descriptive norms instead of leading their churches as they desired.

An example of cultural beliefs impacting individuals' work roles is in the male-dominated world of the police force. The police culture is conservative, highly racialized and sexualized, and macho (Haake, 2011). If men or women do not fit in with this male-culture, they are excluded (Haake, 2011). A study conducted in Sweden interviewed female and male police chiefs (Haake, 2011). The women reported feeling the need to prove their capability and trustworthiness and feeling objectified (Haake, 2011). It was noted that women were given jobs that were 'lower-class', as well as jobs that required the individuals to be more caring and softer (Haake, 2011). The men were given the 'real' police work - the jobs that required the officers to be risky, daring, and hard (Haake, 2011). When the police chiefs were asked why there was a vast disparity between men and women in leadership roles, men suggested the women lacked ability, drive, and confidence for leadership, and both sexes suggested lack of organizational support and mentoring for women seeking to attain positions of leadership (Haake, 2011). The results of these interviews reinforce the power of gender stereotypes. The women had to work harder to receive the same respect and treatment as their fellow male police chiefs, and even then they were not given the same job opportunities (Haake, 2011).

Both the Wong et al. (2017) and Haake (2011) studies show the power preconceived notions and stereotypes can have on women in the workplace. Even when women are qualified to be a leader, they are not viewed as favorably as men, and they must work much harder than men to prove their worth. Even if the prejudice is not as overt as that for the women pastors and chief of police cited in Wong et al. (2017) and Haake (2011), it is often evident in little ways. It is expected that similar beliefs will correlate to women being rated lower on competence and satisfaction scores in the present study.

Ambivalent Sexism

Sexism is the belief that women are “inferior, less valuable, and less competent than men” (Whisenant, Lee, & Dee, 2015). Ambivalent sexism is made up of two types of sexism: hostile and benevolent, and they are both correlated with each other and detrimental in different ways to women’s equality (Acar & Sumer, 2018). Hostile sexism is antagonistic of women, and it “conceives women as trying to control men by either feminism or sexuality. It is a reaction to women who challenge men’s authority by seeking a prestigious or powerful role inconsistent with traditional female roles” (Acar & Sumer, 2018, pg. 504). Benevolent sexism appears harmless next to hostile sexism, but in reality, it is just as damaging as hostile sexism. Benevolent sexism is a paternalistic attitude towards women, believing that women need to be protected and taken care of by men (Acar & Sumer, 2018; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Benevolent sexists do not have a problem with women when they are in positions that support male leadership or jobs that are communal in nature (Acar & Sumer, 2018). However, when women are in jobs that are agentic or in positions over men, benevolent sexists are no longer supportive (Acar & Sumer, 2018). For example, a benevolent sexist would have no problem with a woman being a nurse or a teacher, however they would have a problem with women working as a police officer or a CEO.

Benevolent sexism is partially responsible for some of the gender-stereotyping in industries like women as nurses, teachers, human resources personnel, social workers, and men as cops, financial and business professionals, and executive positions (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015; Acar & Sumer, 2018). Some people have questioned why this is an issue as both genders seem to be finding employment that match ‘their strengths’ (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015).

This response is an issue because it keeps talented individuals from pursuing careers in a field dominated by the opposite sex out of fear of exclusion, or the belief that they cannot or should not be there because of their gender (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015). This causes the cycle to repeat itself, reinforcing the stereotype and restricting everyone to their designated bubble (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015).

Sexism in the workplace is detrimental to female leaders and the environment in which they work (Whisenant et al., 2015). There is more harassment and disrespect of women leaders when sexism is present (Whisenant et al., 2015). Sexism may have a negative impact on how some individuals will rate their female leaders. In the second following hypothesis, the dyad with higher SWMSS scores was unable to be predicted due to differing results in previous research (Alghamdi et al., 2017; Ayman et al., 2009; Cuadadro et al., 2012; Haake, 2011; Katila & Erickson, 2017).

Hypothesis 1: Subordinates will have significantly lower Satisfaction with My Supervisor Scale (SWMSS) ratings of their female leaders than their male leaders.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant difference in the SWMSS scores amongst the four dyads (male subordinate and female supervisor; female subordinate and female supervisor; male subordinate and male supervisor; female subordinate and male supervisor).

Individual versus Social Structural Problem

Before discussing a few of the more common barriers to women reaching positions of leadership, it is pertinent to examine women's inequity from an individual lens and a social-structural lens. A study conducted by Miner et al. (2018) examined the issue of the small number

of women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). While Minor does not talk much about women in positions of leadership, her study is relevant to the present study, as in leadership, STEM is an area that is dominated by men, and women are not seen as a natural fit (2018).

Individuals who look at gender inequity as an individual problem see a woman not getting hired for a promotion as something that is wrong with the individual woman (Miner et al., 2018). In response to the smaller number of women in STEM careers, these individuals are more likely to say there are less women in the STEM world because women are less interested in STEM careers or men have a higher aptitude for STEM (Miner et al., 2018). This lens does not consider the whole picture including expectations of society and gender roles (Miner et al., 2018).

Miner et al. (2018) presents two explanations for both the lack of women in the STEM world and positions of leadership: using an individualistic lens is easier than looking into all of the cultural constraints imposed upon women, and it conforms to the individualistic values of the Western Culture. The first reason boils down to people looking for evidence that supports what they believe (Miner et al., 2018). Most judgements are automatic, and they are based on previous experiences. (Miner et al., 2018; Kahneman, 2011). It takes more time and energy to look for evidence which clashes with a previously held belief (Miner et al., 2018). A great example Miner et al. (2018) gave to explain this concept is someone who believes any woman can succeed “if they put enough effort in” is because they can think of successful, prominent women. It is true that these women most likely put in a lot of hard work to succeed, however this thought process fails to consider that these women are exceptions to the norm (Miner et al., 2018). The second

explanation to individuals adhering to the individual lens is this lens reinforces Western Culture of individualism (Miner et al., 2018; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). Western Culture focuses on individual success over communal success, and there is a belief that individual work ethic is the strongest predictor of individual success and wealth (Miner et al., 2018). This belief works for those who have success, but there are many women for whom this belief does not hold (Miner, 2018). Structural explanations as to the lack of women in the STEM world and leadership positions are complicated to understand, and it is easier for many to accept the simplistic answer: women are standing in their own way (Miner et al., 2018; Kahneman, 2011).

The social-structural lens allows for a more holistic view of what impacts women entering male dominated fields and positions of leadership (Flores, 2018; Miner et al., 2018). This view is based on three theories. The first theory is social constructionism, which posits that society defines what behavior is acceptable through social interactions (Miner et al., 2018). Miner et al. (2018) states that the limits put on accepted behaviors of women over time begin to be seen as natural and self-initiated rather than the “influence of society”, which keeps many women out of leadership roles and the STEM field. The last two important theories are social exchange theory and social dominance theory. These theories are all about reciprocation, and its relationship to status (Miner et al., 2018). In the working world, women do not have as high of status as men. As a result, they are seen as less competent, not the best fit for many jobs, and may be excluded by their male peers (Miner et al., 2018). Since men have more power in the working world, these issues are largely ignored because the men are looking at the situation through their own lens - they see these implications as a personal issue to the woman.

Barriers to Reaching Positions of Leadership

For many women, reaching a position of leadership is met with roadblocks men do not often face. Barriers women face are seen at the macro-, meso-, and micro-level of social systems (Diehl and Dzubinski, 2016). Macro barriers include topics that this paper discussed earlier such as gender stereotypes, perceptions of leadership, and cultural constraints (Diehl and Dzubinski, 2016). Meso barriers include lack of mentoring, lack of support, salary inequality, the glass cliff, exclusion from informal networks, discrimination, and unequal standards (Diehl and Dzubinski, 2016). Lastly, micro barriers include communication style constraints, psychological glass ceilings, the conscious unconscious to ignore and accept impact of gender stereotyping, and work-life conflict (Diehl and Dzubinski, 2016). The following subsections should be used to understand two things: uneven playing field of women reaching a position of leadership and the uphill battle that still remains for the women who do break the glass ceiling.

Standards to Which Women Leaders Are Held

Women in leadership are held to a different standard than men in leadership (Acar and Sumer, 2018; Klatt et al., 2016; Cuadrado et al., 2012; Kubu, 2017), and women often worry that they will be judged based on masculine values of leadership (Kessler, 2014). This quote from a female member of the clergy in Ferguson's study interviewing female pastors verbalizes the negative impact gender roles and stereotypes have on women in leadership,

“The stereotypes about women and men play out in subtle and insidious ways.

When a man is assertive, he is a strong leader to be reported and honorably reckoned with. An assertive woman is bitchy, controlling, and power-hungry, a force to be managed and curtailed...People expect women to be

empathetic and men to be critical. When the reverse occurs, men are considered sensitive, to be protected/supported, and women are considered cold (Zikmund et al., 1998 as cited in Ferguson, 2017, pg, 412 .”

When a woman is in a position of leadership, she is not acting in congruence with her prescribed role (Ferguson, 2017; Haake, 2001; Acar & Sumer, 2018). A study conducted in Finland with undergraduate business students gave participants identical stories with the only difference being the gender of the CEO in the story (Katila & Erickson, 2011). After the participants read the story, they were asked to describe and evaluate the CEO (Katila & Erickson, 2011). While the duties and responsibilities assigned to the CEOs were the exact same, the gender of the CEO acts as a lens through which the students saw them (Katila & Erickson, 2011). The male CEO in the scenario was described as being a great business manager and a competent leader of people, while the female CEO was described as doing well as a business manager, but she was seen as lacking interpersonal skills (Katila & Erickson, 2011). The results of this study are a clear example of the different standards society has for men and women in the workplace.

For women, there is a fight for respect and leadership, especially if their subordinates do not deem them competent (Hawkins, 1995). Women leaders receive backlash from not only males, but from females as well (Cuadrado et al., 2012; Ayman et al., 2009). A study conducted in Canada by Ayman et al. (2009) explored how male and female subordinates viewed their leader’s effectiveness. The study consisted of 109 dyads (male manager and female subordinate, female manager and female subordinate, etc.) for the manager to fill out the Multi-Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and subordinates to rate the effectiveness of the manager, and the results

were evaluated using gender as a moderator (Ayman et al., 2009). Significant findings of this study were when a female leader rated their transformational leadership style higher, male subordinates were more critical of them while female subordinates were not more critical; when the male leaders were being rated it did not matter how transformational of a leader they were, they were seen as effective (Ayman et al., 2009). The experimenters theorized the reason behind this was role incongruity of a woman as an effective leader. The study by Ayman et al. (2009) is similar to the study currently being conducted; with the difference being the current study also looks at satisfaction with management scores, leader membership exchange scores, and all of the surveys are done by the subordinate.

A similar study conducted in Saudi Arabia asked over 300 nurses to respond to two surveys keeping their manager in mind: the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the MLQ (Alghamdi, 2017). The results were then analyzed comparing the four dyads responses. Similar to the previous study, job satisfaction and perceived transformational leadership was higher when the manager was a male. This result was the case when the subordinates were male and female (Alghamdi, 2017).

When comparing Ayman's and Alghamdi's studies, they are vastly different culturally, yet they both have sexist attitudes towards women in leadership. Canada is very egalitarian, while Saudi Arabia is overwhelmingly male dominated and gender-segregated (Ayman et al., 2009; Alghamdi et al., 2017). In fact, according to businessinsider.com, Canada is the sixth best country to live in if you are a woman, while Saudi Arabia did not even make the list (Millington, 2018). Objectively, women exhibit more transformational leadership traits, but as research has shown, subordinates view female leaders with a different lens than their male leaders and have

different standards (Engen & Willemsen, 2004). For some it may be more of an outright disdain for women in leadership (Elsesser & Lever, 2011). A study asking participants their preference in the gender of their leader, for the many who answered male the number one reason was because they disliked female supervisors (74% of females and 50% of male respondents) (Elsesser & Lever, 2011).

A study conducted by Klatt et al. in 2016 found that not only are women held to different standards of behavior, but they are also held to a different standard in appearance. They asked 132 men and 212 women to evaluate 16 pictures of the same women (wearing either a skirt or pants, jewelry or no jewelry, hair in a braid or hair down, and wearing makeup or no makeup). This study, as well as previous similar studies, found that women were perceived as warmer when they appeared more feminine and as more competent when they dressed more masculine (Klatt et al., 2016). The theory Think-Manager-Think-Male (TMTM) suggests this is due to women dressing more masculine better aligns with preconceived perceptions of leadership (Von Rennenkampff Kuhnen, and Sczesny, 2003 as cited by Klatt et al., 2016; Forsythe, Drake and Cox, 1985 as cited by Klatt et al., 2016).

The Glass Cliff

The glass cliff is a unique barrier because it often goes unacknowledged. To comprehend the glass cliff, it is important to first understand the glass ceiling. The glass ceiling is a barrier that prohibits advancement of women (and minorities) beyond a certain point, and it has long been unofficially recognized by many as an issue (Pichler, Simpson, & Stroh, 2008; Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). In a study conducted by Remington & Kitterlin-Lynch (2017) exploring the causes of the glass ceiling, women in female dominated fields were asked why they believed

there was a disproportionate number of males in higher leadership positions. Their response was lack of organizational support, inadequate support from mentors, few female role models, and that most of the child-rearing responsibilities still fell on them (Remington & Kitterlin-Lynch, 2017). A similar study by Chisholm-Burns et al. (2017) found similar results, as well as conscious and unconscious bias from self and others, and a lack of challenging work that would give women the chance to prove themselves. The glass cliff is when it is more likely for a woman to get a job than a male because the chance of failure for the company or position is higher than the chance of success (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). The glass cliff inherently sets women up to fail in these positions of leadership, which contributes to the continued presence of the glass ceiling.

With a cursory look at women in leadership positions, everything appears to be fair. They have positions of leadership, and people are satisfied with them and see them as competent (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). However, when the actual position is examined closer, the harm caused by the glass cliff is seen (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). The glass cliff was developed to explain the women who had broken the glass ceiling, but still face discrimination (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). When women attain leadership positions, they tend to involve more risk than when a man attains a leadership positions (Acar & Sumer, 2018; Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010; Haslam & Ryan, 2008). This sets women up for failure, and can negatively impact their future career. Studies have found that women are more likely to be seen as a good fit for a company when it is facing crisis or experiencing a decrease in success, one even finding that 75% of people see women as a better fit for a failing company (Haslam & Ryan, 2008;

Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). Males on the other hand are more often seen as a better fit when a company is improving, however some studies have found minimal difference between preference when a company is improving (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010).

The glass cliff is not thought to be caused by blatant sexism, women not having other job options, or women wanting more of a challenge (Ryan, Haslam, & Postmes, 2007). One thought process given is when a company is doing well, there is no need to change the status-quo of men being the leaders. When a company begins to fail, the characteristics that make a strong leader change (Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). The leader often needs to be a stronger communicator, sensitive and compassionate to the feelings of subordinates, and sympathetic to concerns (Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). Women being selected for high-risk positions of leadership may have more to do with what men are perceived to lack interpersonally, rather than women being seen as a strong fit (Bruckmuller & Branscombe, 2010). It is possible that some of the women in positions of leadership being rated in the present study by their subordinate may have reached their position because of the glass cliff, and this phenomenon could impact the scores given by subordinates, as the women leadership may be receiving the blame for company failures.

The glass-cliff is challenging to address because not everyone believes this is an issue (Ryan et al., 2007). A study conducted by Ryan et al. (2007) gave men and women a website to read about the glass cliff phenomenon, and their reactions were recorded. Women were more likely to agree with the existence and harm of this phenomenon, as well as present possible contributing factors (Ryan et al., 2007). Men were not as keen on the results of the study

presented to them on the website. They were more likely to question the validity of the study, and less likely to believe in the existence and harm of the glass cliff (Ryan et al., 2007).

Likability-Penalty

Women in the working world often face the dilemma of being well-liked or being competent and/or a leader (Kubu, 2017). Throughout literature this issue goes by a few different names: ‘the likeability penalty’, ‘the agency penalty’, and ‘the double-bind’ to name a few (Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012; Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). A study conducted in 1986 by Owen (as cited in Hawkins, 1995) found women felt compelled to take a leadership role to ensure group success, however they avoided the label because they didn’t want to alienate others, to avoid coworkers treating them differently or liking them less than before they took the leadership position. A study conducted in 2012 looking into the treatment of black women leaders in the workplace surprisingly found that in that particular study the black women did not face the same backlash that white women did. However, they did find once again that women walked a fine-line between showing they could be a good leader and being too leader-like for fear they would not be as well-liked (Livingston et al., 2012).

A strong example of this is Hillary Clinton in the 2016 Presidential election race (Schlehofer, Casad, Bligh, & Grotto, 2011). In fact, Hillary Clinton being a woman was a tactic Republicans used to suggest that she would not be fit to be president of the United States because she may become “too emotional” and did not have the “stamina” needed (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). She did not match many people’s view of what a woman should be and their view of what a leader should be (Schlehofer et al., 2011). While every politician faces a lot of scrutiny, Secretary Clinton, had to walk an even finer-line in the public’s eye because of her gender. She

needed to be warm, however she also needed to prove she would be a strong and capable leader (Schlehofer et al., 2011). This quote by journalist Leah Eichler (2017) states well the dilemma women face,

“Put simply, women in leadership roles are damned if they do and damned if they don't. If they act like women in the traditional sense, they come off as too soft; if they act like men, they break social norms and leave many feeling uncomfortable (pg. 1).”

Psychological Barriers

The belief that females should be nice and likable and are not as smart as males begins forming in girls' (and boys') brains at a very young age. A study conducted by Bian, Leslie, and Cimpian (2017) found that girls as young as six started realizing that certain activities were not for them, and they believed boys were smarter than girls. The children in this study were told a story about a “really, really smart person” and a “really, really nice person,” and then were asked to say who they thought was a boy and a girl in the study (Bian et al., 2017). The kids who were five were equally as likely to attribute intelligence to their own gender, however the girls who were six in the study were much less likely to attribute intelligence with their own gender, but when asked who they would guess got better grades in school, girls were more likely to choose the girls in the story (Bian et al., 2017). In other words, even though the young girls recognized that girls tend to do better in school, they still saw boys to be inherently smarter. Lastly the study presented two different board games to six and seven years old, one was for children who were “really smart” and one was for children who “try really hard” (Bian et al., 2017). The girls were less likely than boys to choose the game for children who were “really smart” and were more

likely to choose the game for children who “try really hard” (Bian et al., 2017). Young children pick up on social cues, and they begin to conform to how they believe society deems appropriate for them.

Many women have absorbed the lies about what they are and are not capable of accomplishing, and how they can and cannot act. Women prevent themselves from even trying so they can be certain they will not fail. A study conducted by Owuamalam and Zagefka (2014) examined how activating a negative stereotype could impact an applicant’s view of how employable they were. The results of the study showed the negative stereotypes negatively impacted their self-esteem and their view of how employable they were (Owuamalam & Zagefka, 2014).

Beliefs in negative stereotypes like this is what keeps many women out of positions of leadership (Chisholm et al., 2017; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015; Acar & Sumer, 2018). Women are given fewer chances to voice their opinions and are less likely to receive recognition for good work (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). This negatively impacts women’s self-esteem, which in turn negatively impacts some women’s drive to seek out positions of leadership. The lack of females in positions of leadership also negatively impacts women’s ability to picture themselves in a position of leadership, which in turn develops a cycle that has fewer women than men in positions of leadership (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). The lack of females in positions of leadership negatively impacts women’s ability to picture themselves in a position of leadership. This creates and perpetuates a toxic cycle in which fewer women hold leadership positions. (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017).

Leadership Styles

Despite barriers in place, many women reach positions of leadership. Leadership is an interaction between the leader and their subordinate (Jex & Britt, 2014; Basu & Green, 1997). Leadership is difficult to define because every leader is a little bit different, and the environments they are in vary (Jex & Britt, 2014). A leader is someone who influences and motivates others, and is in charge of seeing tasks to their completion (Jex & Britt, 2014).

There are many styles and theories of leadership. Three leadership styles widely researched and recognized are transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant leadership (Jex & Britt, 2014). Transformational leadership is defined as a style that inspires change by working with subordinates to identify needs and create change (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014). Employees have better psychological well-being because these leaders are able to evoke positive emotions and feel more meaning from their job (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014). Transformational leaders also tend to have better, more effective communication styles. The communication is more transparent, more frequent, and employees are encouraged to initiate conversation and bring forward concerns to their managers (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014).

A study conducted by Basu and Green (1997) examined the impact of leader-membership exchange (LMX) and transformational leadership theories on innovation. Member-subordinate dyads participated in the study, and stronger LMX and transformational leadership led to positive outcomes for subordinates and managers (Basu & Green, 1997). More LMX and transformational leadership correlated with employees who were more committed to the company, experienced more autonomy, felt more support from their managers, and contributed

more innovative ideas to the organization (Basu & Green, 1997). This study shows the impact of the transformational style of communication and support has on employees.

Transactional leadership is focused more on maintaining, rather than creating and inspiring change. It is defined as a style of leadership that focuses on supervision, organization, and group performance (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014). Transactional leaders focus on maintaining positive organizational norms and reaching goals, and employees know what is expected of them. (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014). Their communication style is very clear and direct (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014).

Passive-avoidant leadership is the third leadership style included on the MLQ, however for the purpose of this study, this will not be focused on beyond the basic definition. Passive-avoidant is a leadership style that is less direct and effective than transformational and transactional styles. Passive-avoidant leaders wait until it is absolutely imperative for them to step-in, and they avoid making decisions and responsibilities (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014). They are often unavailable to subordinates, and their communication is minimal and often vague (Mullen & Kelloway, 2014).

Transformational leadership is the leadership style seen as most impactful and effective. According to Bass and Avolio's 1993 article (as cited in Ayman et al., 2009) the marks of a strong transformational leader are charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Findings from a 2003 study examining the relationship between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence found a positive correlation between the two (Mandell & Perwhani, 2003). These results emphasize the significant impact the

ability to communicate, read the social cues of others, relate, and empathize with others are all critical for effective leadership.

Women statistically and stereotypically have higher emotional intelligence (Mandell and Perwhani, 2003), are more relationally oriented, and have stronger communication skills than men. These communal traits play into women scoring higher on transformational traits than men (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006). Men on the other hand, score higher on transactional traits than women (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006). This is impacted by a lot of the transactional traits being more agentic, such as being outcome oriented rather than people oriented (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006). There have been mixed results in the literature related to women being seen as effective leaders, especially when compared to men despite scoring higher on transformational skills (Cuadradro et al., 2012; Ayman et al., 2009).

Hypothesis 3a: Women will score higher on overall Transformational traits than men.

Hypothesis 3b: Men will score higher on overall Transactional traits than women.

Hypothesis 4: Transformational skills will be positively related to SWMSS scores of supervisors.

Leader-Membership Exchange Theory

Leader-membership exchange theory suggests the quality of a relationship between a leader and subordinate is unique to each dyad because of exchanges that take place at work (Caliskan, 2015). LMX posits that there is an in-group and out-group, and people in the in-group will feel more satisfied with the leadership of their boss (Caliskan, 2015; Jing, 2017). In-groups often form because of perceived similarities like gender, age, personality, and common interests (Caliskan, 2015; Jing, 2017). They also may be a member of the in-group because their boss deems them a competent worker (Caliskan, 2015; Jing, 2017). Members who have a higher LMX

with their leader and are in the “in-group” have more positive feelings towards their boss. They are going to be more productive workers, be more committed to their boss and the organization, be more satisfied with their boss, and view their leader as having higher competence than members who have a low LMX (Jing, 2017).

A study conducted by Basu and Green (1997) examined the impact of leader-membership exchange (LMX) and transformational leadership theories on innovation for 225 leader-member dyads. Stronger LMX and transformational leadership led to positive outcomes for subordinates and managers (Basu & Green, 1997). More LMX and transformational leadership correlated with employees who were more committed to the company, experienced more autonomy, felt more support from their managers, and contributed more innovative ideas to the organization (Basu & Green, 1997). This study shows the impact of the transformational style of communication and high LMX has on employees. Employees who feel they are valued and treated well by their managers will in-turn speak more highly of their manager.

Hypothesis 5: The LMX score will moderate the relationship between the subordinates' Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) score and their SWMSS score. The higher the LMX score is, the higher the SWMSS score will be.

How Women Lead

Now that I have listed many of the barriers of women reaching leadership and being scrutinized once they reach a position of leadership, this section is meant to help understand how women typically lead. As was stated earlier, women on average possess more transformational leadership characteristics than men (Cuadradro et al., 2012; Ayman et al., 2009; Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). Highly correlated with transformational leadership styles, women have a more

participative leadership style which is a style that encourages employees to share their opinions, are highly team-focused, and may often make decisions based on what the majority wants (Lin, Pham, Li, & Lin, 2015). In fact, when a female leader's team does a good job, women are 50% more likely to give their team credit rather than take the credit themselves (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). It has been found that both transformational leadership and participative leadership have a positive relationship with job satisfaction and satisfaction with their boss (Alghamdi et al., 2017; Lin et al., 2015).

Leadership and decision-making are changing from top-down leadership and becoming more horizontal and participative in nature (Grisoni & Beeby, 2007). Open-communication, emotional intelligence, and collaboration are becoming traits that are valued higher in leadership (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). Coincidentally these are descriptive of the average female leader, and while it is expected that men will be judged less harshly than female managers, the disparity in ratings between genders will likely be less drastic than studies conducted previously.

Hypothesis 6: The LMX score will moderate the effect of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) difference score on the SWMSS score given to a manager by their subordinate. The higher their LMX score, the higher their SWMSS score will be.

Chapter II: Method

Participants

Data was collected through Amazon Mechanical Turk (M-Turk), an online platform that allows individuals and businesses access to a wide variety of individuals willing to take surveys for research (www.mturk.com). A total of 454 people took the survey, however only 34.8% of participants completed the survey because many did not meet the qualifications stipulated in the consent form. To qualify for the study, participants were required to be at least 18 years old, have a full-time job, work directly with others, be physically present at their office three days a week, required to have a direct supervisor, and live in the United States. Participants were also eliminated if they did not answer at least 95% of the survey.

Participants ranged in age from 21 to 60, with the average age of participants was 32.9. Of the 158 participants, 44% were male and 56% were female. The participants were also asked the gender of their supervisor: 63% reported their supervisor to be male, while 37% reported their supervisors to be female.

Procedure

Through M-Turk, the study survey was displayed on a web page where participants are then able to select and respond to the study. Participants were incentivized to participate with a 10-cent payment upon completion. Participants were asked their gender, the gender of their supervisor their age, and in which industry they work. Participants who voluntarily chose to participate in this study answered the Jensen et al. Transactional vs. Transformational Scale (2019) that was based on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), the Bem Sex-Role

Inventory (BSRI) twice (once so they can mark traits they believe make a strong leader and once so they can mark traits they believe their leader has), the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), and the Satisfaction With my Supervisor Scale (SWMSS).

Scales

Transactional vs. Transformational Scale

The Transactional vs. Transformational scale was designed by Ulrich Jensen and 11 other researchers based on the MLQ to measure a leader's transactional and transformational leadership style (Jensen et al., 2019). The scale was broken down into four parts: one transformational and three transactional (Pecuniary Rewards, Nonpecuniary Rewards, Contingent Sanctions) (Jensen et al., 2019). The transformational section is made up of seven questions, while the transactional is made up of 12 questions with four questions in each section. The scale was scored on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. Participants were asked to rate their direct supervisor. An example item is: "Has a clear sense of where he or she believes our organization should be in 5 years." In this study, strong Cronbach alphas were found overall ($\alpha = .92$) and for each section: Transformational ($\alpha = .92$), Pecuniary Rewards ($\alpha = .87$), Nonpecuniary Rewards ($\alpha = .73$), and Contingent Sanctions ($\alpha = .77$).

Bem Sex Role Inventory Scale

The Bem-Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was designed in the 1970's by Dr. Sandra Bem as a means to evaluate the gender expression and gender roles expressed through masculinity and femininity of the individuals (Smith, 2017). Since the inventory's inception 50 years ago,

cultural views of gender roles have evolved (Smith, 2017). Studies have evaluated and confirmed the current validity and reliability of the measure (Vafaei, Alvarado, Tomas, Muro, Martinez, & Zunzunegui, 2015).

The inventory is made up of a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 20 masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 gender neutral traits, however the current study used the masculine and feminine facets only. Similar to a study done by Eriksson, Smith, and Smith (2017), in this study the BSRI will be used to create a difference score to determine how closely one's actual supervisors' traits aligns with their ideal supervisors' traits. The first set of BSRI questions ask, "On a scale of 1-7 (1 being not at all important and 7 being very important), rate how important the following traits are for you in a supervisor." The second set of BSRI questions ask, "On a scale of 1-7 (1 being not at all important and 7 being very important), how well do the following traits describe your supervisor?" To calculate the difference score, actual traits were subtracted from ideal traits in a supervisor with a negative score indicating a supervisor who does not meet subordinates' expectations of an ideal supervisor, a neutral score (0) indicating a supervisor who meets their subordinates' expectations, and a positive score indicating a supervisor who exceeds the subordinates' expectations of their ideal supervisor. The alpha levels for both sets of BSRI inventories and their feminine and masculine subsets were strong: First set of BSRI overall ($\alpha = .95$), masculine ($\alpha = .91$), and feminine ($\alpha = .91$), and second set of BSRI overall ($\alpha = .95$), masculine ($\alpha = .93$), and feminine ($\alpha = .91$).

Leader-Member Exchange – 7 Scale

The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX-7) was made up of 7 questions meant to evaluate leader membership exchange quality. The items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale. Two

sample items and responses are, “Do you know where you stand with your leader...do you usually know how satisfied your leader is with what you do? Rarely, Occasionally, Sometimes, Fairly Often, Very Often,” and “How well does your leader understand your problems and needs? Not a bit, A little, A fair amount, Quite a bit, A great deal.” A high score on the LMX-7 indicates a strong relationship between a subordinate and supervisor, while a low score indicates a weaker exchange of relationship. In this study the LMX-7 had strong reliability ($\alpha = .88$). See Appendix C for the full LMX-7.

Satisfaction With My Supervisor Scale

The Satisfaction With My Supervisor Scale (SWMSS) consisted of 18 questions assessing a subordinate’s satisfaction with their supervisor (Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987).

The scale was assessed on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly dissatisfied* and 5 = *strongly satisfied*). A sample item from the scale is: “The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say.” The reliability of the SWMSS in this study was strong ($\alpha = .96$). See Appendix D for the full SWMSS.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) is a 22-item scale assessing sexist attitudes towards women. The participants scored each question on a 6-point Likert scale from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale is made up of 2 sub-facets, benevolent and hostile sexism, containing 11 questions each (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 2001). A sample item from this scale is, “When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.” The ASI had strong reliability overall ($\alpha = .86$), and when broken down

into its two sub-facets of benevolent ($\alpha = .77$) and hostile ($\alpha = .82$). See Appendix E for the full ASI.

Chapter III: Results

All statistics were conducted using IBM SPSS version 25.0. Descriptive statistics correlations are provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.SWMSS	3.73	.84								
2.Transformational	3.69	.85	.69**							
3. Transactional Overall	3.48	.87	.64**	.74**						
4. Pecuniary Rewards	3.55	.96	.61**	.70**	.89**					
5. Non-Pecuniary Rewards	3.51	.87	.68*	.61**	.76**	.66**				
6. Contingent Sanctions	3.41	.87	.10	.35**	.59**	.31**	.05			
7. BSRI	.03	.61	-.12	-.02	-.09	-.12	-.14	.05		
8. ASI	2.44	.76	.07	.02	.17*	.15	-.08	.31**	-.07	

Note: Descriptive statistics and correlations reported without outliers.
N = 146-156; *p<.05, two tailed. **<.01, two tailed.

H1: It was hypothesized participants would rate their satisfaction with their supervisor significantly lower if their supervisor was a female versus if their supervisor was a male. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in supervisor satisfaction ratings due to the gender of the subordinate's supervisor. Hypothesis 1 was not supported; there were no significant differences in supervisor satisfaction ratings due to the gender of the supervisor, ($F(1,148) = .61, p = .437$).

H2: It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between employee satisfaction with their supervisor ratings due to gender dyad differences, (male subordinate, male supervisor; female subordinate, female supervisor; male subordinate-female supervisor, and female subordinate and male supervisor). An ANOVA was conducted to test this hypothesis. Hypothesis 2 was not supported, ($F(3,146) = .99, p = .397$). However, even though there was no significant difference on satisfaction with my supervisor rating scores between the dyads, male subordinates rated their female supervisors the lowest ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.06, n = 17$), compared to the female subordinate with a male supervisor dyad ($M = 3.80, SD = .81, n = 46$), female supervisor with a female supervisor dyad ($M = 3.78, SD = .84; n = 38$), and male subordinate with male supervisor dyad ($M = 3.74, SD = .78; n = 49$).

H3a: It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference on transformational leadership skills due to gender of the supervisor, such that females would score higher than males on transformational leadership skills. It was found that there were no significant differences between males ($M = 3.68, SD = .84$) and females ($M = 3.71, SD = .87; (F(1,154) = .03, p = .867$).

H3b: It was hypothesized that males would score higher than females on transactional leadership traits. It was found that there were no significant differences overall between males ($M = 3.49, SD = .69$) and females ($M = 3.47, SD = .64$), ($F(1,152) = .02, p = .878$). There was also no significant differences on any of the subfacets: pecuniary rewards for males ($M = 3.52, SD = .96$) and females ($M = 3.59, SD = .96$); ($F(1,153) = .18, p = .674$), non-pecuniary rewards ($M = 3.52, SD = .83$) and females ($M = 3.48, SD = .92$); ($F(1,155) = .05, p = .816$), and contingent rewards ($M = 3.47, SD = .89$) and females ($M = 3.32, SD = .82$); ($F(1,156) = 1.07, p = .302$).

H4: It was hypothesized that employees who have supervisors with higher transformational scores would have higher satisfaction with SWMSS scores. This hypothesis was tested using a multiple regression analysis with supervisor transformational ratings scores as a continuous predictor and satisfaction with my supervisor ratings as the continuous criterion variable. Hypothesis 4 was supported ($R^2 = .48, F(1,146) = 131.21, p < .001$) showing a positive relationship between transformational leadership and SWMSS.

H5: It was hypothesized that leader member exchange would moderate the impact of ambivalent sexism on the satisfaction with supervisor scores, such that when LMX is higher the impact of high ASI scores on SWMSS will decrease. A moderated multiple regression was conducted. Both ASI and LMX variables were centered, an interaction term was created (centered ASI x centered LMX), and the file was split so that the output would compare by the gender of supervisor. This Hypothesis was not supported for male supervisors with LMX alone being the only variable with significance ($\beta = .86, p < .001$) with ASI ($\beta = .05, p = .438$) and the interaction term ($\beta = .07, p = .244$) resulting in no significance. Both regressions were significant despite the interaction being insignificant (Regression 1: ($R^2 = .73, F(2, 84) = 115.65$,

$p < .001$), Regression 2: ($\Delta R^2 = .004$, $F(3, 83) = 77.91$, $p < .001$)). This hypothesis was also not supported for female supervisors with LMX ($\beta = .86$, $p < .001$) and ASI ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .05$) being significant predictors, while the interaction term was insignificant ($\beta = -.12$, $p = .153$). Both regressions were significant despite the interaction being insignificant (Regression 1: ($R^2 = .80$, $F(2, 43) = 84.48$, $p < .001$), Regression 2: ($\Delta R^2 = 0.01$, $F(3, 42) = 58.49$, $p < .001$)). See Table 3.2 for the regression table.

Table 3.2

Hierarchical Regression of ASI and LMX on SWMSS

		IV	R ²	ΔR ²	<i>β</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Males	Model 1		.73**			115.65	.001**
		ASI			.07		
		LMX			.86**		
	Model 2		.74**	.004		77.91	.001**
		ASI			.05		
		LMX			.86**		
		ASI x LMX			.07		
Females	Model 1		.80**			84.48	.001**
		ASI			-.17*		
		LMX			.93**		
	Model 2		.81**	.01		58.49	.001**
		ASI			-.15*		
		LMX			.86**		
		ASI x LMX			-.12		

Notes: N for males = 86 and N for females = 45

***p* < .001, **p* < .05

H6: It was hypothesized that the LMX score would moderate the relationship between BSRI difference scores and the satisfaction score, such that SWMSS will be higher for those with high BSRI scores when LMX is higher. To test this hypothesis a multiple regression was conducted. Both BSRI and LMX variables were centered and an interaction term was created (centered BSRI x centered LMX). This hypothesis was not supported. While both the BSRI ($\beta = -.11, p < .05$) and LMX ($\beta = .87, p < .001$) were significant the interaction term was not ($\beta = .001, p = .989$). Both steps of the regression were significant despite the interaction being insignificant (Regression 1: ($R^2 = .76, F(2,121) = 194.26, p < .001$), Regression 2: ($\Delta R^2 = 0, F(3,120) = 128.44, p < .001$)). See Table 3.3 for the regression table.

Table 3.3

Hierarchical Regression of BSRI and LMX on SWMSS

	IV	R ²	ΔR^2	β	F	p
Model 1		.75**			207.70	.001**
	BSRI			.09*		
	LMX			.84**		
Model 2		.75**	.001		138.21	.001**
	BSRI			.10*		
	LMX			.84**		
	BSRI x LMX			.04		

Notes: N = 139

** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$

LMX & Leadership Style Variables on SWMSS

Since SWMSS, LMX, Transformational Leadership Style, and Transactional Leadership style all had significant correlations, a regression was run to evaluate how strongly each variable predicted SWMSS ($F(3,130) = 160.0, R^2 = .78, p < .001$). LMX carried the greatest weight ($\beta = .69, p < .001$), followed by Transformational Leadership ($\beta = .15, p < .05$), and lastly followed by Transactional Leadership ($\beta = .13, p < .05$). See Table 3.4 for the regression table.

Table 3.4

Hierarchical Regression of LMX, Transformational, and Transactional on SWMSS

	IV	R ²	β	F	p
Model 1		.78**		160.00	.001**
	LMX		.69**		
	Transformational		.15*		
	Transactional		.13*		

Notes: N = 133

** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$

Chapter IV: Discussion

Findings of the Current Study

The findings of this study seem to contradict much of the previous literature about the impact of gender on leadership. Past research found that males are more likely to be critical of women who are in positions of power (Cuadradro et al., 2012; Ayman et al., 2009), however in this study, gender of the supervisor did not significantly impact how supervisors were rated on satisfaction with their supervisor or leadership style.

Hypothesis 1 and 2 both expected males supervisors' ratings of satisfaction be higher than female supervisors, however these results were not substantiated. While hypothesis 1 ran an ANOVA comparing only gender of supervisor, hypothesis 2 broke down the groups to assess both the gender of the subordinate and the gender of the supervisor, creating four groups to compare within the ANOVA (male subordinates with male supervisors, female subordinates with female supervisors, female subordinates with male supervisors, and male subordinates with female supervisors). While the findings were not significant, women were rated less favorably by their male subordinates than any other dyad. Theoretically, the insignificant findings may be due to progressive changes in society for women (Smith, 2017). While sexist attitudes still exist, these attitudes are not as strong as they were in previous generations (Smith, 2017). It is no longer an anomaly to have a woman as a direct supervisor, and it may be that exposure towards women in positions of leadership has decreased people's prejudice towards women in leadership (Smith, 2017; Acar & Sumer, 2018). It is also possible if the sample size had been larger, a significant difference may have been found which will be discussed further in the limitations section.

Neither of the predicted moderations had significant results. One possible explanation for this may be because neither ASI nor BSRI had very many significant relationships with the other variables. Specifically, ASI did not have a significant impact on SWMSS no matter the gender of the supervisor. Similar to the possible explanation from the previous paragraph, this could be due in part to the progressive steps women have been making in the workforce (Smith, 2017).

Another explanation could be that it is no longer socially acceptable to say that “men are better than women” or “women shouldn’t lead” (Vernier & Vala, 2018). Vernier and Vala (2018) suggest sexism has not truly decreased over time, rather legislation and policies put in place at work have made it is no longer acceptable for individuals to display their sexist ideals.

In previous research, men have scored higher on transactional traits overall, while women scored higher on transformational traits (Druskat, 1994; Eagly and Karau, 2009; Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra, 2006). Contrary to previous research, the transformational ($M = 3.68$ and $M = 3.71$) and transactional scores ($M = 3.49$ and $M = 3.47$) were almost exactly the same for males and females respectively. In the results of this study and previous studies (Silins, 1994), possession of transformational and transactional leadership traits are highly correlated ($r = .74, p < .001$). It has been suggested by Hamstra, Yperen, Wisse, and Sassenberg (2014) that effective leaders know when and how to use both transformational and transactional leadership styles. While transformational traits are more communal in nature and transactional are more agentic, both are needed at different times to be effective (Cuadrado et al., 2012). It is possible that the results of the present study reflect leaders’ who know how to effectively use each leadership style, rather than leader who conform to one style over the other.

The results of the regression indicate that LMX is an important predictor of a subordinates' satisfaction with their supervisor, accounting for 69% of the variance. Transformational and transactional leadership were also found to be a factor in satisfaction scores accounting for 15% and 13% of the variance respectively. This suggests the quality of a relationship between a subordinate and supervisor is likely due, in part, to the quality of LMX and the type of leadership style the supervisor exhibits, unrelated to the gender of a supervisor.

Limitations of the Study

The first limitation of this study was the sample size. A power analysis run prior to the distribution of the surveys suggested 212 participants would be needed to find results of significance. While 454 people finished the survey, only about one-third of the participants met the prerequisites. In the consent form, the qualifications to participate in the study were explicitly laid out. There seemed to be an issue with individuals not reading the consent form completely to see if they were qualified to participate. As a result, the sample size was smaller than would have been preferred. In the future it would be beneficial to either distribute through a different platform (such as an organization or social media), or use a filter that would only allow someone to select the survey if they met the prerequisites.

Secondly, it was hard to verify that participants were being honest. For participants that may have been dishonest, there are two likely reasons. The first reason participants may have been dishonest was so they could participate in the study for financial gain. While Mturk has a few tools in place to try and verify demographics of participants, it is difficult for researchers to be certain participants are being honest about demographic information. In the future some ways to get the best participants from Mturk is to only allow participants who Mturk considers better-

performing and more reliable (Bauhoff, Montero, and Scharf, 2017). Research has found that when participants believe the pay is appropriate for the amount of time required for completion, and they notice open-ended questions that require Mturk workers to pay attention, they are more likely to spend more time on the survey and answer honestly (Lovett, Bajaba, Lovett, and Simmering, 2018). In the future, more open-ended questions could be included in the survey to encourage honesty. The second reason participants may have been dishonest is self-report has the potential to reveal negative information about the participants, if answered honestly (Holtgraves, 2017). Rather than answering honestly to these types of questions, it is common for individuals to bend the truth favorably towards themselves to remain socially desirable (Holtgraves, 2017).

Lastly, common method variance was a limitation of this study. All the responses were online, multiple choice surveys, and self-response, which are all common causes of common method variance (Tehseen, Ramayah, and Sajilan, 2017). To minimize this effect, surveys were chosen with minimal ambiguity and all responses were kept anonymous. To further eliminate common method variance in the future, surveys could be given to a supervisor and multiple subordinates rather than from only one subordinate's perspective (Tehseen et al., 2017).

Implications for Practice

While this research did not show a significant gap in how supervisors were rated when compared by gender, there was a gap between the number of males and females as supervisors. Organizations have put in policies that have helped eliminate some of the sexual discrimination women have faced, but there is more they can do (Flippin, 2017; Warner & Corley, 2017). Putting resources in place such as executive coaching, mentoring, leadership development

programs, and creating an environment that helps women feel supported and empowered are all positive steps towards more women being present in positions of leadership (Flippin, 2017).

Furthermore, results did suggest leadership style and the quality of LMX between leader and subordinate impact a subordinate's satisfaction. Because of this, companies should be intentional about who they put in positions of leadership, choosing individuals who they believe would utilize both transactional and transformational leadership styles and would have positive and effective communication with subordinates.

Implications for Future Research

Women have made great strides towards equality, yet men still hold more positions of leadership as was seen with this study with 100 of the supervisors being male and only 58 being female. The number of women in positions of leadership decreases the higher and higher up one goes in an organization (Badura et al., 2017; Warner & Corley, 2017). Women are being promoted, but only to a certain point before hitting the glass ceiling (Warner & Corley, 2017). Future research should seek to better understand how women at different levels of leadership (first-level, mid-level, senior-level, executive-level) are perceived by their subordinates. Simon and Hoyt (2008) propose that the higher a women's leadership role is, the more likely they are to be negatively impacted by role incongruity.

Furthermore, to understand how gender impacts perceptions of leaders, future studies should be inclusive of not only cis-gender individuals, but transgender individuals as well. Cis-gender individuals are those who identify with their gender assigned at birth, while transgender individuals do not identify with the gender assigned to them at birth (Broussard & Warner, 2019). Transgender individuals face significant backlash for not conforming to gender norms,

and many encounter the negative impacts of prejudice from others (Broussard & Warner, 2019). Because of this, it may be likely that transgender supervisors would have subordinates that are more critical of them. Moving forward, to better understand the differences between gender in relation to leadership, it is important to recognize and include transgender individuals in the research.

References

- Acar, F. P., & Sümer, H. C. (2018). Another Test of Gender Differences in Assignments to Precarious Leadership Positions: Examining the Moderating Role of Ambivalent Sexism. *Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 498-522. doi:10.1111/apps.12142
- Alghamdi, M. G., Topp, R., & Alyami, M. S. (2017). The effect of gender on transformational leadership and job satisfaction among Saudi nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 74(1), 119-127. doi:10.1111/jan.13385.
- Anderson, A. J., Ahmad, A. S., King, E. B., Lindsey, A. P., Feyre, R. P., Ragone, S., & Kim, S. (2015). The effectiveness of three strategies to reduce the influence of bias in evaluations of female leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 45(9), 522-539. doi:10.1111/jasp.12317.
- Ayman, R., Korabik, K., & Morris, S. (2009). Is Transformational Leadership Always Perceived as Effective? Male Subordinates Devaluation of Female Transformational Leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(4), 852-879. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00463.x.
- Aziz, F., Kalsoom, Q., Quraishi, U., & Hasan, S. (2017). Perceptions on gender-based differences in educational leadership. *Management in Education*, 31(2), 75-81. doi:10.1177/0892020617696628.
- Badura, K. L., Grijalva, E., Newman, D., Taiyi Yan, T., & Jeon, G. (2018). Gender and Leadership Emergence: A meta-analysis and explanatory model. *Wiley Personnel Psychology*.

- Basu, R., & Green, S. G. (1997). Leader-Member Exchange and Transformational Leadership: An Empirical Examination of Innovative Behaviors in Leader-Member Dyads. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(6), 477-499. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb00643.x.
- Bauhoff, S., Montero, A., & Scharf, D. (2017). Perceptions of e-cigarettes: a comparison of adult smokers and non-smokers in a Mechanical Turk sample. *American Journal of Drug & Alcohol Abuse*, 43(3), 311–323. doi:10.1080/00952990.2016.1207654.
- Bian, L., Leslie, S., & Cimpian, A. (2017). Gender stereotypes about intellectual ability emerge early and influence children’s interests. *Science*, 355(6323), 389-391. doi:10.1126/science.aah6524.
- Broussard, K. A., & Warner, R. H. (2019). Gender Nonconformity Is Perceived Differently for Cisgender and Transgender Targets. *Sex Roles*, 80(7/8), 409–428. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1007/s11199-018-0947-z>.
- Bruckmüller, S. & Branscombe, N. R. (2010). The glass cliff: When and why women are selected as leaders in crisis contexts. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(3), 433-451. doi:10.1348/014466609x466594.
- Caliskan, G. (2015). An Examination of Coach and Player Relationships According to the Adapted LMX 7 Scale: A Validity and Reliability Study. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 19(1), 22-33. doi:10.1080/1091367x.2014.977996
- Chisholm-Burns, M. A., Spivey, C. A., Hagemann, T., & Josephson, M. A. (2017). Women in leadership and the bewildering glass ceiling. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, 74(5), 312–324. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.2146/ajhp160930>.

- Cuadrado, I., García-Ael, C., & Molero, F. (2015). Gender-typing of leadership: Evaluations of real and ideal managers. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*,*56*(2), 236-244. doi:10.1111/sjop.12187.
- Cuadrado, I., Navas, M., Molero, F., Ferrer, E., & Morales, J. F. (2012). Gender Differences in Leadership Styles as a Function of Leader and Subordinates Sex and Type of Organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,*42*(12), 3083-3113. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00974.x.
- Diehl, A. B., & Dzubinski, L. M. (2016). Making the Invisible Visible: A Cross-Sector Analysis of Gender-Based Leadership Barriers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*,*27*(2), 181-206. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21248.
- Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *The Leadership Quarterly*,*5*(2), 99-119. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90023-x.
- Eagly, A. H. & Diekmann, A. B. (2005). What is the Problem? Prejudice as an Attitude-in-Context. *On the Nature of Prejudice*,17-35. doi:10.1002/9780470773963.ch2.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*,*117*(1), 125-145. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.117.1.125.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*,*109*(3), 573-598. doi:10.1037//0033-295x.109.3.573.

- Eichler, L. (2017). The double standard women face in politics and business. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/careers/career-advice/life-at-work/the-double-standard-women-face-in-politics-business/article32570434>.
- Elsesser, K. M., & Lever, J. (2011). Does gender bias against female leaders persist? Quantitative and qualitative data from a large-scale survey. *Human Relations*, 64(12), 1555-1578. doi:10.1177/0018726711424323.
- Engen, M. L. & Willemsen, T. M. (2004). Sex and Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis of Research Published in the 1990s. *Psychological Reports*, 94(1), 3-18. doi:10.2466/pr0.94.1.3-18.
- Eriksson, T., Smith, N., & Smith, V. (2017). Gender Stereotyping and Self-Stereotyping Attitudes: A Large Field Study of Managers. IZA Institute of Economics.
- Ferguson, T. W. (2017). Female Leadership and Role Congruity within the Clergy: Communal Leaders Experience No Gender Differences Yet Agentic Women Continue to Suffer Backlash. *Sex Roles*, 78(5-6), 409-422. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0803-6.
- Flippin, C. S. (2017). The Glass Ceiling Is Breaking, Now What? *Generations - Journal of American Society of Aging*.
- Flores, C. (2018). Spotlight on Women of Color in STEM. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 11(2), 291-296. doi:10.1017/iop.2018.17.
- Fortune Editors (2017). These Are the Women CEOs Leading Fortune 500 Companies. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2017/06/07/fortune-500-women-ceos/>.

- Garcia-Retamero, R. & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against Women in Male-congenial Environments: Perceptions of Gender Role Congruity in Leadership. *Sex Roles*, 55(1-2), 51-61. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9068-1.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491–512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent stereotypes as legitimizing ideologies: Differentiating paternalistic and envious prejudice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grisoni, L. & Beeby, M. (2007). Leadership, Gender and Sense-making. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 14(3), 191-209. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00339.x.
- Haake, U. (2017). Conditions for gender equality in police leadership – making way for senior police women. *Police Practice and Research*, 19(3), 241-252. doi:10.1080/15614263.2017.1300772.
- Hamstra, M. R. W., Van Yperen, N. W., Wisse, B., & Sassenberg, K. (2014). On the perceived effectiveness of transformational-transactional leadership: The role of encouraged strategies and followers' regulatory focus. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(6), 643–656. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1002/ejsp.2027>.
- Haslam, S. A. & Ryan, M. K. (2008). The road to the glass cliff: Differences in the perceived suitability of men and women for leadership positions in succeeding and failing organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 530-546. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.011.

- Hawkins, K. W. (1995). Effects of Gender and Communication Content on Leadership Emergence in Small Task-Oriented Groups. *Small Group Research*, 26(2), 234-249. doi:10.1177/1046496495262004.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The Weirdest People in the World? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1601785.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. & Baker, S. (2015). Sex, Gender and Work Segregation in the Cultural Industries. *The Sociological Review*, 63(1_suppl), 23-36. doi:10.1111/1467-954x.12238.
- Holtgraves, T. (2017). Social Desirability and the Interpretation of Uncertainty Terms in Self-Report Questions. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 31(6), 623–631. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1002/acp.3364>.
- Hur, J. (2017, November 17). History of Women in the Workforce. Retrieved from <https://bebusinessed.com/history/history-of-women-in-the-workforce/>.
- Imran Latif, K. & Mehvish Sher. (2012). Perceived Organizational Support, Pay Satisfaction, and Supervisor Satisfaction Impact on Career Satisfaction. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 32–48.
- Jensen, U., Andersen, L., Bro, L., Bollingtoft, A., Erickson, T., Holten, A., . . . Wurtz, A. (2019). Conceptualizing and Measuring Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *SAGE Journals*, 51(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399716667157>.
- Jex, S. M. & Britt, T. W. (2014). *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*(3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Jon Wiley and Sons.

- Jing, Jiang. (2017). Mean Leader–Member Exchange and Team Voice: Roles of Team Task Reflexivity and Perspective Taking. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 45(7), 1221–1231. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.2224/sbp.6451>
- Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow. *Farrar, Straus and Giroux*.
- Katila, S. & Eriksson, P. (2011). He is a Firm, Strong-Minded and Empowering Leader, but is She? Gendered Positioning of Female and Male CEOs. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20(1), 71-84. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2011.00570.x.
- Kessler, M. (2014). Female leaders in the 21st century in a masculine world. *Koers - Bulletin for Christian Scholarship*, 79(2). doi:10.4102/koers.v79i2.2117.
- Klatt, J., Eimler, S. C., & Krämer, N. C. (2016). Makeup your mind: The impact of styling on perceived competence and warmth of female leaders. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 156(5), 483-497. doi:10.1080/00224545.2015.1129303
- Kubu, C. S. (2017). Who does she think she is? Women, leadership and the ‘B’(ias) word. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 32(2), 235-251. doi:10.1080/13854046.2017.1418022.
- Lin, P., Pham, B. T., Li, S., & Lin, P. (2015). Impacts of leadership styles, job satisfaction, and job characteristics on public servants organizational commitment. *2015 12th International Conference on Service Systems and Service Management (ICSSSM)*. doi:10.1109/icsssm.2015.7170256.
- Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). Can an Agentic Black Woman Get Ahead? The Impact of Race and Interpersonal Dominance on Perceptions of Female Leaders. *Psychological Science*, 23(4), 354-358. doi:10.1177/0956797611428079.

- Lovett, M., Bajaba, S., Lovett, M., & Simmering, M. J. (2018). Data Quality from Crowdsourced Surveys: A Mixed Method Inquiry into Perceptions of Amazon's Mechanical Turk Masters. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 67(2), 339–366. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1111/apps.12124>.
- Mandell, B. & Pherwani, S. (2003). Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Style: A Gender Comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(3).
- Millington, A. (2018). The 21 best countries in the world to live in if you're a woman. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/the-best-countries-for-women-us-news-world-report-2018-3>.
- Miner, K. N., Walker, J. M., Bergman, M. E., Jean, V. A., Carter-Sowell, A., January, S. C., & Kaunas, C. (2018). From “Her” Problem to “Our” Problem: Using an Individual Lens Versus a Social-Structural Lens to Understand Gender Inequity in STEM. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 11(2), 267-290. doi:10.1017/iop.2018.7
- Mullen, J. & Kelloway, E. (2014). Occupational Health and Safety Leadership. In *Occupational Health Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 357-374). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Owuamalam, C. K. & Zagefka, H. (2014). On the psychological barriers to the workplace: When and why metastereotyping undermines employability beliefs of women and ethnic minorities. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 20(4), 521-528. doi:10.1037/a0037645.

- Pichler, S., Simpson, P. A. & Stroh, L. K. (2008). The glass ceiling in human resources: Exploring the link between women's representation in management and the practices of strategic human resource management and employee involvement. *Human Resource Management, 47*(3), 463-479. doi:10.1002/hrm.20227.
- Remington, J., & Kitterlin-Lynch, M. (2017). Still pounding on the glass ceiling: A study of female leaders in hospitality, travel, and tourism management. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 17*(1), 22-37. doi:10.1080/15332845.2017.1328259
- Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., & Postmes, T. (2007). Reactions to the glass cliff. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 20*(2), 182-197. doi:10.1108/09534810710724748.
- Scarpello, V. & Vandenberg, R. J. (1987). The Satisfaction With My Supervisor Scale: Its Utility for Research and Practical Applications. *Journal of Management, 13*(3), 447-466. doi:10.1177/014920638701300302.
- Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: Reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review, 22*(1), 6-18. doi:10.1108/09649420710726193.
- Schlehofer, M. M., Casad, B. J., Bligh, M. C., & Grotto, A. R. (2011). Navigating Public Prejudices: The Impact of Media and Attitudes on High-Profile Female Political Leaders. *Sex Roles, 65*(1-2), 69-82. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9965-9.
- Silins, H. C. (1994). The Relationship Between Transformational and Transactional Leadership and School Improvement Outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5*(3), 272-298. doi:10.1080/0924345940050305.

- Simon, S., & Hoyt, C. L. (2008). Exploring the Gender Gap in Support for a Woman for President. *Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy*, 8(1), 157–181. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2008.00167.x>.
- Smith, D. G. (2017). Progress and paradox for women in US higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(4), 812–822. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1080/03075079.2017.1286813>.
- Tehseen, S., Ramayah, T., & Sajilan, S. (2017). Testing and Controlling for Common Method Variance: A Review of Available Methods. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(2), 142-168. doi:10.20547/jms.2014.1704202.
- Vafaei, A., Alvarado, B., Tomas, C., Muro, C., Martinez, B., & Zunzunegui, M. (2015). The Validity Of The 12-Item Bem Sex Role Inventory In Older Spanish Population: An Examination Of The Androgyny Model. *The Gerontologist*, 55(Suppl_2), 693-693. doi:10.1093/geront/gnv352.08.
- Verniers, C., & Vala, J. (2018). Correction: Justifying gender discrimination in the workplace: The mediating role of motherhood myths. *Plos One*, 13(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0201150.
- Warner, J., & Corley, D. (2017). Women's Leadership by The Numbers. Center for American Progress.:10.1371/journal.pone.0201150.
- Whisenant, W., Lee, D., & Dees, W. (2015). Role Congruity Theory: Perceptions of Fairness and Sexism in Sport Management. *Public Organization Review*, 15(4), 475–485. <https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1007/s11115-014-0281-z>

Wong, M. S., Worthy, P., Fung, J., & Chen, E. C. (2017). A Qualitative Analysis of the Experience of Female Chinese American Church Leaders: Associations with Gender Role, Culture, and Work-Family Balance. *Pastoral Psychology*, 66(5), 657-674.
doi:10.1007/s11089-017-0773-1.

www.mturk.com.

Zeb, A., Saeed, G., Rehman, S. ur, Ullah, H., and Rabi, F. (2015). Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles and its Impact on the Performance of the Public Sector Organizations in Pakistan. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1), 37–46.

Appendix A

Transactional vs. Transformational Scale by Jensen

1. Concretizes a clear vision for the organization's future
2. Makes a continuous effort to generate enthusiasm for the organization's vision
3. Has a clear sense of where he or she believes our organization should be in 5 years
4. Seeks to make employees accept common goals for the organization
5. Strives to get the organization to work together in the direction of the vision
6. Strives to clarify for the employees how they can contribute to achieve the organization's goals
7. Rewards the employees' performance when they live up to the leader's requirements
8. Rewards the employees' dependent on how well they perform their jobs
9. Points out what employees will receive if they do what is required
10. Lets employees' effort determine received rewards
11. Gives individual employees positive feedback when they perform well
12. Actively shows his or her appreciation of employees who do their jobs better than expected
13. Generally does not acknowledge individual employees' even though they perform as required
14. Personally compliments employees when they do outstanding work
15. Gives negative consequences to the employees if they perform worse than their colleagues
16. Makes sure that it has consequences for the employees if they do not consistently perform as required

17. Takes steps to deal with poor performers who do not improve
18. Gives negative consequences to his on her employees if they do not perform as the leader requires

Appendix B*Bem Sex Role Inventory*

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Self-reliant | 21. Makes decisions easily |
| 2. Yielding | 22. Compassionate |
| 3. Defends own beliefs | 23. Self-sufficient |
| 4. Cheerful | 24. Eager to soothe hurt feelings |
| 5. Independent | 25. Dominant |
| 6. Shy | 26. Self-spoken |
| 7. Athletic | 27. Masculine |
| 8. Affectionate | 28. Warm |
| 9. Assertive | 29. Willing to take a stand |
| 10. Flatterable | 30. Tender |
| 11. Strong personality | 31. Aggressive |
| 12. Loyal | 32. Gullible |
| 13. Forceful | 33. Acts as a leader |
| 14. Feminine | 34. Childlike |
| 15. Analytical | 35. Individualistic |
| 16. Sympathetic | 36. Does not use harsh language |
| 17. Leadership Ability | 37. Competitive |
| 18. Sensitive to other's needs | 38. Loves children |
| 19. Willing to take risks | 39. Ambitious |
| 20. Understanding | 40. Gentle |

Appendix C

Leader Membership Exchange – 7 (LMX) Survey

1. Do you know where you stand with your leader...do you usually know how satisfied your leader is with what you do?

Rarely, Occasionally, Sometimes, Fairly Often, Very Often

2. How well does your leader understand your problems and needs?

Not a bit, A little, A fair amount, Quite a bit, A great deal

3. How well does your leader understand your potential?

Not a bit, A little, A fair amount, Quite a bit, A great deal

4. Regardless of how much formal authority he has built into his position, what are the chances that your leader would use his power to help you solve problems in your work?

None Small Moderate High Very high

5. Again, regardless of how much formal authority your leader has, what are the chances that he would “bail you out,” at his expense?

None Small Moderate High Very high

6. I have enough confidence in my leader that I would defend and justify his decision if he were not present to do so.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Disagree Agree

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?

Extremely worse than average, Worse than average, Average, Better than average, extremely better than average

Appendix D

Satisfaction With my Supervisor Scale (SWMSS)

1. The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say.
2. The way my supervisor sets clear goals.
3. The way my supervisor treats me when I make a mistake.
4. My supervisor's fairness is appraising my job performance
5. The way my supervisor is consistent in his/her behavior toward subordinates.
6. The way my supervisor helps me to get the job done.
7. The way my supervisor gives me credit for my ideas.
8. The way my supervisor gives me clear instructions.
9. The way my supervisor informs me about work changes ahead of time.
10. The way my supervisor follows through to get problems solved.
11. The way my supervisor understands the problems I might run into doing the job.
12. The way my supervisor shows concern for my career progress.
13. My supervisor's backing me up with other management.
14. The frequency with which I get a pat on the back for doing a good job.
15. The technical competence of my supervisor.
16. The amount of time I get to learn a task before I'm moved to another task.
17. The time I have to do the job right.
18. The way my job responsibilities are clearly defined.

Appendix E

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
5. Women are too easily offended.
6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
13. Men are complete without women.
14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.
22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.