

Diversity, Social Dominance, Likability and Leader Effectiveness

Doerr Innovation Award Report

Jensine Paoletti

Eduardo Salas

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Project Objectives | 3 |
| Importance of Topic | 3 |
| Methods | 4 |
| Study One | 4 |
| Sample | 4 |
| Materials | 5 |
| Procedure | 5 |
| Study Two | 5 |
| Sample | 5 |
| Materials | 5 |
| Procedure | 6 |
| Results and Discussion | 6 |
| Criterion Validity | 6 |
| Group Stereotypes and Subsequent Guidelines | 7 |
| Culture | 7 |
| Gender | 8 |
| Training | 9 |
| References | 11 |

Executive Summary

Two studies were designed and executed to understand the relationship between social dominance, likability, and leader effectiveness. The quantitative component sought to find psychometric evidence for social dominance and likability as two factors of popularity, to match theories from developmental psychology. The results indicated that popularity was only one factor for the measure tested. The qualitative component followed a Rice engineering internship longitudinally and studied the leaders' emergence and their teammates' subsequent effectiveness evaluations. The qualitative analysis uncovered gendered and cultural stereotypes that resulted in lower emergence and effectiveness of non-traditional (i.e. non-American men) leaders. Practical guidelines were developed and are summarized in Table 3. These guidelines are also the basis for a training program aimed at developing women leaders. Training competencies are listed in Table 4. The training program seeks to communicate what is traditionally considered "masculine" and "feminine" leadership and instruct trainees to capitalize on both types of leadership for optimal performance.

Introduction

Project Objectives

Addressing Rice University's mission and the Vision for the Second Century for "leadership development for our students" and to "produce leaders across the spectrum of human endeavor", this proposed project will bolster the literature of leaders' effectiveness while providing equity for women and minorities in leadership, where they are historically underrepresented.

Importance of Topic

Popularity has been a topic of study with a long history in developmental and social psychology; however, it has been studied in organizational contexts as well. Historically, it has been defined as a group-level likability variable. During this time, the literature did not suggest that popularity and leadership are related constructs. However, in 1985, Eder's study changed the definition of popularity to equate to group-level social dominance. Once this change in definition occurred, research conducted within schools indicated that socially dominant children and adolescents are viewed by others as leaders and thus are some of the most influential members of their peer groups (e.g., Babad, 2001; Lease, Kennedy, & Axelrod, 2002). According to Parkhurst and Hopmeyer (1998), socially dominant students who behave as leaders in empathic and prosocial ways continue to hold their positions as leaders. Evidence in emerging adulthood indicates that likability and social dominance function as different constructs, while social dominance is more predictive of leadership compared to likability (Lansu & Cillessen, 2012).

Within the organizational context, popularity has been defined as a combination of the two components social dominance and likability; popular employees are liked and socially visible (Scott, 2013; Scott & Judge, 2009). In his conceptual framework for studying popularity in the workplace, Scott (2013) proposed that popular employees are more likely to emerge as leaders within their groups. He argued that they represent the prototype of their groups (p. 175), reflecting social identity theory of leadership which states "leaders may emerge, maintain their position, be effective, and so forth, as a result of basic social cognitive processes" (Hogg, 2001, p. 186). Processes like prototypicality within the group, the attraction and the attention resulting from the prototypicality allow prototypical group members to emerge as leaders (Hogg, 2001). A highly visible, impactful, and widely known individual (i.e., one that fits the definition of

popularity) will be considered prototypical within the group, as they will be the first person considered within the group due to their visibility. They will benefit from the inherent attraction and attention provided to prototypical group members that allow a popular individual to emerge as leaders and subsequently be effective in those roles.

In the context of leadership, where both women and minorities are significantly underrepresented, it is important to investigate potential mitigations for this discrepancy from many angles, including the study of popularity. In fact, women only make up 26.4% of college presidents, 20.2% of Fortune 500 board members, and 5.4% of Fortune 500 CEO (Brown, 2017). Black men make up 6.5% of the private sector workforce but only 1.6% of senior-level executives positions, with an even more marginal representation of women of color in leadership (Zarya, 2016). Within America, about 17% of workers is foreign-born, indicating the non-trivial proportion of the workforce that may experience cultural challenges (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018). Foreign-born workers are underrepresented in management occupations relative to native-born workers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018). Research has uncovered many reasons for why women and cultural minorities are not represented in leadership to the same extent as white men, with one idea being a difference in behavioral expectations between prototypical leaders, i.e. assertive American men, and those outside this stereotype. The leadership information processing theory says that recognition-based processes help us to form leadership perceptions both from automatic and controlled processes. The automatic processes are based on the extent of the followers' perception of prototype matching (Baumgardner, Lord, & Maher, 2005). One study found that women needed to show both strength and sensitivity to be considered an effective leader, but men only needed to demonstrate strength for the label of effectiveness (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008). Overall, leaders from a minority group such as cultural minorities are expected to behave like leaders from the majority group (Eagly & Chin, 2010). While there are strong prototypes of men in leadership roles, another way to think about prototypes is through popularity. Can a popular woman or a popular minority group member overcome the stereotyped disadvantage to become a leader? Research was done marrying these fields of research to understand how popularity interacts with perceptions of leaders, including women and cultural minority leaders. I took a qualitative, bottom-up approach to investigate the role of popularity, gender and culture within engineering team leadership.

Methods

Study One

Sample

The participants in this study were fifteen undergraduate engineering students. These students worked in interdisciplinary, interdependent teams for a seven-week period in the summer for an internship where they solved engineering problems by partnering with organizations in the community. This group of engineering students represented three different nationalities, as half of the participants were from either Brazil or Malawi, living in America for the purpose of the internship. The first team had two American men, one Brazilian man and one Malawian man as members. Another team had two Malawian women members, one American man member and one Brazilian man member. Team three had two American women, one American man, and one Malawian man as members. The fourth team's members were two American women and one Brazilian man. This sample is perfect for studying cultural majority

(American) and minority (Brazilian and Malawian) individuals in a setting where any team member can emerge as a leader.

Materials

The participants were interviewed for fifteen minutes weekly during the seven-week internship. One participant was absent during the third week. This resulted in a total of 104 interviews. The content of the interview questions shifted weekly. Some examples of interview questions include “What does popularity in a work setting mean to you?”, “who is the team’s most liked member and why?”, “Who on your team stands out as having their voice/opinions/ideas heard? Who is central to decision-making? Why?”, and “Has anyone emerged as a leader? If you had to pick one person as the leader, who?”. A software called ATLAS.ti was used for coding the interviews. The codesheet used for the coding draws from the popularity and leadership literatures. Leadership codes are derived from Yukl, Gordon, and Taber’s (2002) taxonomy of leader behavior, while popularity and likability codes are derived from the breath of popularity literature, pulling heavily from Cillessen, Schwartz, and Mayeux’s (2011) book.

Procedure

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-step method was used to complete the thematic analysis (TA). The coding occurred inductively using a contextualist framework, which assumes “people’s words provide access to their particular version of reality; research produces interpretations of this reality” (Clarke, Braun, & Hayfield, 2015, p. 224). Familiarization with the data is important for creating a codesheet. The data set was double-coded to ensure accurate representation of the data. Step three involves creating possible themes by putting all the relevant quotes together. There were 9 initial themes at this stage. According to Clarke and colleagues (2015), a common misconception is that themes should naturally “emerge” from the data set. Rather, the researcher should take an active role in organizing the quotes and forming themes. The coders gathered for a meeting to discuss the initial list of themes. The themes were rearranged and further organized, but 9 final themes resulted. Ultimately, themes are organized into a group to explain the findings in a comprehensible way.

Study Two

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of Rice students in an introductory engineering design course, ENGI 120 class. The students in this class are assigned to project teams. These teams partner with organizational clients throughout the Houston area to solve real-world design problems. The stable membership, real-world, longitudinal nature of the project makes it an ideal sample, as the students all know each other well and can accurately assess their teammate’s popularity and leadership. There was a total of $N = 106$ participants, including 67 men and 39 women.

Materials

The leader effectiveness scale included three items: “The team’s emergent leader is effective”; “The team’s emergent leader is successful in our group”; “The team’s emergent leader improved performance in our group”. The scales had high internal consistency ($\alpha = .87$). For the scale, participants were asked to indicate their responses on a scale of 1–7 ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”.

For the likability measure, each respondent rated each of their teammates and rated them on a four-item measure by Wayne and Ferris (1990) with a five-point scale. Previous studies

have found a Cronbach's alpha of .94. One of the items in the measure includes "I get along well with this person."

Popularity was measured with Scott and Judge's (2009) eight-item scale. Similar to the likability measure, it relied on participants to rate each of their teammates from 1 to 5, where 1 represented "strongly disagree" and 5 represented "strongly agree". Instructions dictated that respondents report the team's collective opinion of the teammate in question and rate the teammate on items like "[the teammate] is quite accepted" and "[the teammate] is popular". Previous studies found a Cronbach's alpha of .92. More information is in the criterion validity section.

Procedure

Students in the ENG 120 class took surveys at multiple times for a longitudinal study design. All surveys were posted on the course Canvas site. Students were required to participate in the surveys as a course requirement, but they had the option to opt-out of their data being used within this study. The first survey was administered soon after the semester began and assessed stable personality traits and initial likability of their teammates. Likability, popularity, leader emergence, and leader effectiveness were assessed later in the semester once the teams had been working together for several months. Each of these variables were assessed using the round-robin approach. In other words, a participant would rate each of their teammates on these scales.

Results and Discussion

Criterion Validity

From data collected in study two, we investigated a two-factor model of popularity with likability and popularity as separate factors; note that here "popularity" refers to social dominance while later references combine social dominance and likability into one factor called "popularity". According to the developmental psychological research on popularity, the two constructs, likability and popularity, are correlated to different extents throughout development with an average of $r = .4$ throughout childhood (Parkhurst & Hopmeyer, 1998). However, the two constructs begin to diverge in adolescence, particularly for girls, for whom it's more challenging to be both popular and well-liked, and remain separate through early adulthood (Cillessen, 2011; Lansu & Cillessen, 2012).

However, in organizational science, there has been factor analytic evidence demonstrating popularity as a one-factor construct (Scott & Judge, 2009). Scott and Judge (2009) developed an 8-item scale. Their comparative fit index (CFI) = .94 and the root-mean-square residual (SRMR) = .054 for the student sample. Per Kline (2005), model fit is acceptable when the CFI is above .9 and SRMR is less than .10. Their study one student sample ($N = 116$) had a Cronbach's alpha of .92, and their study two employee sample ($N = 139$) had the same Cronbach's alpha of .92.

For my own analysis, we used a student sample ($N = 99$) from an introductory Rice engineering course. The correlation between likability and popularity, broken apart by gender, can be seen below in Table 1. We ran a CFA for a one-factor model and a two-factor model of popularity. The one-factor model of popularity has a CFI of .93, Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) of .90, an Akaike's information criterion (AIC) of 1481.79, a Schwarz's Bayesian information criterion of 1472.46, a Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .15, and a SRMR of .04. The two-factor model of popularity has a CFI of .96, a TLI of .95, an AIC of 1460.06, a BIC of 1450.15, an RMSEA of .1, and a SRMR of .04. The results are summarized in Table 2 below. **While this seems to indicate uncertainty in the fit for the model, the Chi squared**

difference test demonstrated a clear preference for the one-factor model over the two-factor model with a $\chi^2 = 23.73, p = .00$. As there is theoretical support for a one-factor model of popularity in organizational contexts (Scott & Judge, 2009; Scott, 2013), these results support a conceptualization of popularity as a one-factor construct.

Table 1

Correlation of Study Variables by Gender

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-------|------------------|-------|-------|---|
| Men | Likability | | | |
| | Popularity | .71** | | |
| | Leader Emergence | .46** | .46** | |
| Women | Likability | | | |
| | Popularity | .53** | | |
| | Leader Emergence | .50** | .59** | |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2

Fit Indices for Popularity Measurement

| | <u>Fit Indices</u> | <u>Guidelines</u> | <u>One-factor model</u> | <u>Two-factor model</u> |
|-------|--------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| CFI | | Above .9, higher is better | .93 | .96 |
| TLI | | Above .9, higher is better | .90 | .95 |
| AIC | | Lower is better | 1481.79 | 1460.06 |
| BIC | | Lower is better | 1472.46 | 1450.15 |
| RMSEA | | Lower is better, includes a <i>p</i> -value | .15, <i>p</i> = .000 | .1, <i>p</i> = .02 |
| SRMR | | Less than .1 | .04 | .04 |

Group Stereotypes and Subsequent Guidelines

From study one's qualitative data, several themes emerged related to social dominance, likability, and leadership. These themes reflect socially constructed differences (both gendered and cultural) that affect participants' perceptions of their own leadership behavior and their teammates' leadership. Rice admits approximately equal portions of men and women, with 11% of their 2017 matriculating class as international students (Rice University Admission Statistics, 2017). This cultural and gender diversity highlights the importance of understanding the experiences of women and cultural minorities in leadership. The guidelines are mentioned below, followed by a summary in Table 3.

Culture

One noticeable trend in leadership emergence was social dominance predicting leader emergence. Socially dominant people are referred to as having "the biggest personality of our group, she's kind of the first to talk about something" and talking for longer amounts of time (ID 12). These attention-holding behaviors allowed for socially dominant team members to have their ideas heard. Socially dominant people who are also well-liked are described as "listened to

the most” (ID 4). Most notably, “Whenever we have a decision to make, [the socially dominant member’s] opinions are prioritized” (ID 14). **Popularity leads to someone’s ideas being artificially over-valued** (ID 13; ID 5), which has potentially harmful consequences in an engineering design team, which hinges on rational decision-making, particularly in the earlier brainstorming meetings.

However, the data also demonstrated that culture was distinctively linked to social dominance and leader emergence. Cultural minorities were at a disadvantage to Americans, as they were less likely to emerge as leaders, partially due to a lack of quick conversation-grabbing. In one team, all members were Americans except ID 14, who is described as “sweet” but “quiet”, referencing a lack of social dominance (ID 12). It is more difficult for Malawian and Brazilian students to be perceived as leaders early on because they tend to think and reflect before discussing during brainstorming meetings; this is explained as a cultural difference in the extent to which time is “valued” (ID 4). Unfortunately, the American majority team members interpret the extra contemplation as a teammate’s passivity. Outside of teamwork, there was not much multi-cultural interaction. This lack of interaction could have potentially negated the cultural differences in task work. For example, Malawian students have their own activities, including lunch outings and after-work social events (ID 9). The Brazilian students had their own network too, “the Brazilians are always like, the other two are always like going to me and asking stuff” (ID 1).

Ultimately, these cultural forces meant that there were no Malawian or Brazilian emergent leaders, and therefore no leadership effectiveness implications for non-American leaders. However, there was one instance where an American leader, who demonstrated low cultural sensitivity, had a conflict with a non-American teammate. This conflict, while later resolved, led to lower perceptions of the leader’s effectiveness, indicating a need for leaders of multi-cultural teams to behave in a culturally sensitive manner.

Practically, we are not suggesting that Doerr should force social interaction between minority-culture and majority-culture individuals. However, international students should understand that there are cultural norms associated with American leader emergence. Additionally, multi-cultural teams should consider setting explicit rules for how long to individually consider a topic before discussion begins. This may help create a more equitable discussion, where members can all have the opportunity to emerge as leaders. Lastly, leaders of multi-cultural teams should develop cultural sensitivity.

Gender

While there were no Malawian or Brazilian emergent leaders in study one’s participants, there were an equal number of men and women who behaved as leaders. However, there were differences in what men and women leaders were called. On one team with a woman leader, a team member continuously insisted that their team had no leader (ID 11). Even the emergent woman leader referred to her role as “organizing” or “planning”; in contrast, men emergent leaders referred to their behavior as “leading” (ID 10). Women leaders sometimes referred to the team’s leadership structure as “shared” because they had not been given a formal leadership title (ID 15). Importantly, there was no difference in behaviors that men and women leaders demonstrated as both groups of leaders clarified task objectives and roles, participated in short-term planning, and monitored performance on tasks as their main leadership roles. These roles fit within Yukl and colleagues’ (2002) leadership taxonomy and are therefore valid leadership behaviors. Women should not be afraid to call themselves leaders when they are enacting crucial team leadership, as organizing and planning are a manifestation of leadership in leaderless teams.

When women leaders are being evaluated in decision-making contexts, they are considered most effective when they **(1) share their perspective and (2) solicit their teammates' opinions**. If women leaders fail to do one of these, they are not considered as high-performing as the leaders who do both. For example, one leader recognized that in brainstorming situations “sometimes I feel like I try too hard to play more of an observing role, rather than always contributing... So, we can do something that I might not agree with because I've asked for what they thought” (ID 2). One woman did not emerge as a leader due to her lack of consideration for the team's perspectives: “I wouldn't necessarily consider how she, like her role on the team necessarily like much of a leadership position... [because she] seems to talk a lot about her own opinions and advises on things rather than generally what's best for the team” (ID 2). In contrast, one effective woman leader in brainstorming sessions would “prompt it out of them to get their opinions” while still expressing her views (ID 7). These input-seeking behaviors may reflect a greater expectation for women to behave communally and be team-oriented. Women leaders more commonly use democratic forms of leadership (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), however, we propose that leaders of all genders should remember to (1) share their evaluation and (2) seek their teammates' contributions for the most effective decision-making. In fact, empowering members to take initiative in problem-solving is a Yukl et al (2002) leadership behavior; empowerment is also one of the most effective for team performance quality and team learning (Burke et al., 2006).

Table 3

Guidelines for Women and Cultural Minorities in Leadership

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Cultural Minorities | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand there are American cultural norms in discussion settings that disadvantage more reflective cultures. 2. Don't be afraid to jump into discussions even if you haven't thought through an idea completely. 3. Teams should consider setting explicit “reflection time” to think about an idea before discussing as a group 4. Leaders should develop cultural sensitivity and express concern for cultural minority's teamwork experiences. |
| Women | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand that there are biases against women in leadership. 2. It is ok for women who find themselves taking on a leadership role to call themselves leaders. 3. In decision-making contexts team leaders should (A) share their perspective and (B) solicit their teammates' opinions |

Training

Training competencies were developed, as well as a training program. The competencies are below in Table 4. The training program is self-directed, so students can be given the program and advance at their own pace. The training is in the form of a Google slides presentation, [which is linked here](#) and located in the Appendix. The training program focuses on women in leadership. Most of the information in the training program comes from the literature of gender and leadership, with examples taken from study one's qualitative analysis. As women in leadership are still underrepresented (i.e. Brown, 2017; Cook & Glass, 2014), we thought that this approach could be the most valuable to Doerr and the Rice student population.

The goals of the training program are to build knowledge of two forms of leadership, agentic and interpersonally sensitive leadership. These two forms of leadership reflect gendered behaviors that men and women, respectively, tend to enact as leaders. Men tend to be more assertive and behave in a more agentic manner, while women tend to be more communal and behave in an interpersonally sensitive manner (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). The training program goal is for students to understand that both types of leadership are valid and are strongest when enacted together. Stated differently, both men and women leaders can be effective leaders when they incorporate aspects of agentic and communal behavior. The last component, which we called “managing stereotypes” is related to addressing the subtle and overt discrimination that women tend to experience in the workplace. For example, women are given less challenging assignments, which allows for less opportunities for learning and growth (King et al., 2012). Therefore, we suggest that individuals who wish to be leaders take initiative and seek out challenging assignments for their continued development.

Table 4

Competencies for Women in Leadership Training Program

| <u>Theme</u> | <u>Competencies</u> | <u>Exemplary Behavioral Markers</u> |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Emergent Leadership | Agentic leadership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading discussions • Making decisions • Setting goals |
| | Interpersonally sensitive leadership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building strong relationships with employees • Collaborating with others • Taking care of employees through coaching and development |
| | Managing stereotypes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking out challenging developmental opportunities • Seizing opportunities for gaining leadership experience (e.g., self-managed team structures) • Confronting sexism in the workplace |

References

- Babad, E. (2001). On the conception and measurement of popularity: More facts and some straight conclusions. *Social Psychology of Education*, 5(1), 3–29.
- Baumgardner, T. L., Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (2005). Perceptions of Women in Management. In *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Brown, A. (2017, March 17). The Data on Women Leaders. Retrieved May 31, 2017, from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/03/17/the-data-on-women-leaders/>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). *Labor Force Characteristics of Foreign-born Workers Summary 2017* (Economic News Release No. USDL-18-0786). Washington, DC.
- Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 288–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.02.007>
- Cillessen, A. H. N. (2011). Toward a theory of popularity. In A. H. N. Cillessen, D. Schwartz, & L. Mayeux (Eds.), *Popularity in the peer system* (pp. 273–299). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Cillessen, A. H., Schwartz, D., & Mayeux, L. (2011). *Popularity in the peer system*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Clarke, V., Braun, V., & Hayfeild, N. (2015). Thematic Analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (3rd ed., pp. 222–248). London, England: Sage Publications, Ltd.

- Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2014). Women and top leadership positions: Towards an institutional analysis. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(1), 91–103.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12018>
- Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 216.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 781–797. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00241>
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 233.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 184–200.
- Johnson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., Zewdie, S., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 106(1), 39–60.
- King, E. B., Botsford, W., Hebl, M. R., Kazama, S., Dawson, J. F., & Perkins, A. (2012). Benevolent sexism at work: Gender differences in the distribution of challenging developmental experiences. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1835–1866.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310365902>
- Lansu, T. A., & Cillessen, A. H. (2012). Peer status in emerging adulthood: Associations of popularity and preference with social roles and behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 27(1), 132–150.

- Parkhurst, J. T., & Hopmeyer, A. (1998). Sociometric Popularity and Peer-Perceived Popularity: Two Distinct Dimensions of Peer Status. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 18(2), 125–144.
- Rice University Admission Statistics. (2017, August 24). Retrieved March 25, 2017, from https://futureowls.rice.edu/futureowls/Freshman_Profile.asp
- Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2009). The popularity contest at work: Who wins, why, and what do they receive? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 20–33.
- Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 487–499. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.487>
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies; Flint*, 9(1), 15–32.
- Zarya, V. (2016, March 30). These Charts Explain the Lack of Minority Women Leaders. Retrieved May 31, 2017, from <http://fortune.com/2016/03/30/charts-minority-women-leaders/>


Appendix

Gender & Leadership

A Self-Administered
Research-Based Training
Program



Knowledge is Power



Women are treated differently than men in the workplace¹ and face unique challenges in attaining and maintaining leadership positions^{2,3}


This self-administered training program will provide you with evidence-based information to help you overcome these challenges and develop leadership skills

This Program Will Help You...




- Behave in proactive ways that help you seize leadership opportunities
- Learn specific behaviors important for effective leadership
- Recognize gender-based challenges in leadership
- Adopt strategies for contending with these challenges

This Training is Most Beneficial When...





- Understand why these skills are important
- Appreciate why these skills are relevant for **you**
- Understand the advantages of these skills


Instructions



Icon Meanings

 **Book:** This icon means you should carefully read the information that is presented in the following slides

 **Reflection:** This icon means you should think about how the information you've learned relates to you and applies to your life

 **Try this:** This icon means you should decide how you can implement the suggested tips and behaviors in your own life

The Problem



Women are underrepresented in leadership positions

This may stem from discrimination and/or misconceptions associated with women in leadership^{2,3}

Only 5.4% of CEOs at Fortune 500 Companies are Women²



RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Additional Underrepresentation

- **Women only represent:**
 - 19.4% of Congress³
 - 20% of C-Suite executives⁴
 - 21% of senior vice presidents⁴
 - 29% of vice presidents⁴
 - 33% of senior managers/directors⁴
 - 25% of U.S. State legislators⁴

RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Reasons for Underrepresentation

- Women get less support for advancement from top management⁵
- Women are not offered the same quality of developmental opportunities as men⁵
- Women feel less optimistic they can gain attain leadership positions⁶
- Women of different ethnic identities experience different stereotypes and barriers

RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Reasons for Underrepresentation

- Men and women both think women are better represented than they are⁵
- Expectations of women leaders are higher⁶
- Gender expectations⁶

RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

What Can You Do?

- To overcome these challenges, it is important to learn skills and engage in behaviors that promote effective leadership.
- It is also important to recognize specific situations where you may face challenges because of your gender and ethnic identity.
- **This program will help you with both.**

RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Agentic and Sensitive Leadership

This section will teach you the importance of "feminine" and "masculine" leadership styles and how you can use both

RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

The risk of adopting “masculine” leadership styles

Women are often viewed as ineffective leaders when they employ stereotypically masculine leadership strategies.

This is especially true for:

Autocratic behavior (discouraging subordinates from participating in decision-making)⁷



Self-Reflection: Think about your own leadership style

Take a few minutes to ask yourself the following:

Do you tend to enforce decisions you've made on your own

-OR-

Are you naturally a more democratic leader?

Make sure to allow everyone a chance to speak their mind



Gender Roles: Stereotypes and Bias

Women are expected to be interpersonally **sensitive** (i.e., kind, sensitive, sympathetic)

Men are expected to be **agentic** (i.e., assertive, independent, aggressive)⁸



Gender Roles: Stereotypes and Bias

Women demonstrating only **agentic** behaviors are viewed negatively because this behavior violates gender expectations


Women have to balance out **agency** with sensitive behaviors to be rated as effective leaders, men only need **agency**⁹



However...

Many of the same “feminine” traits that can pose obstacles in being selected for leadership positions are actually useful in when it comes to being an effective leader.¹⁰


This is a catch-22 of women in leadership that women should be prepared to address.




Sensitive Behavior and Leadership

In addition to **agentic** behaviors, effective leaders also need to demonstrate traditionally “feminine” or interpersonally **sensitive** behaviors to be a good leader.¹⁰ Some examples include:

- Building strong relationships with employees
- Collaborating with others
- Taking care of employees through coaching and development






Sensitive and Agentic Behavior Examples

- Some examples of **agentic** behaviors: leading discussions, keeping everyone on task, setting team goals, making decisions
- Some examples of **interpersonally sensitive** behaviors: encouraging participation from others, providing helpful feedback to someone, encouraging someone to pursue an idea, offering to collaborate with someone


TRY THIS!

 RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Self-Reflection: Sensitive and Agentic Behaviors

Take a few minutes to ask yourself the following:

- If you behave in ways that are mostly **agentic**, can you think of ways to incorporate more interpersonally **sensitive** behaviors?
- If you behave in ways that are mostly **sensitive**, can you think of ways to incorporate more **agentic** behaviors?

 RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Managing Expectations

This section will help you identify behaviors and situations that offer opportunities for leadership experience

 RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

The Importance of Challenging Developmental Experiences

Challenging, developmental experiences are critical for professional advancement

Women are offered the same amount of developmental opportunities as men, but they are offered *less* challenging opportunities¹¹

 RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Challenging, Developmental Experiences

- Make your willingness to take on difficult projects known
- You don't have to wait for an assignment - find one!
- Learn how to talk about your experiences in a meaningful way

TRY THIS!

 RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Self-Managed Teams: Seize Opportunities for Leadership

"The number one workforce trend of 2016 was the shift from traditional teams (whereby leadership and team member roles are clearly defined upon team inception) to self-managed teams (Kaplan et al., 2016). In addition to this, non-traditional leadership structures that result in emergent leaders may lend themselves to increases in gender diversity among leaders"¹²

 RICE DOERR
The Doerr Institute For New Leaders

Self-Managed Teams: An Opportunity for Leadership Experience

- Teams with no formally assigned leaders are becoming more common
- In these teams, an informal leader often emerges
- Yet, women are less likely to speak up and take advantage of this opportunity



A Real Vignette

In an undergraduate class, students were assigned to teams with no leaders. Students were asked to identify leaders on their team. In teams where male leaders were identified, those same male leaders often named themselves as leaders.

However, in teams where women were identified as leaders, those same women leaders often identified leadership as "shared."



A Real Vignette

This is an example of how gender stereotypes can influence our perceptions of leadership. This reluctance for women identify as a leader or even view themselves as a leader may stem from expectations of sensitive or feminine behavior.

It's **okay** to speak up and identify yourself as the leader (if the moment is right), even if you feel you don't fit the stereotypical mode



Being Proactive: How to be an Emergent Leader

- Be assertive yet respectful
- Set goals and direction for the team
- Offer your expertise and advice to other team members
- Remember the need for both interpersonally **sensitive** and **agentic** behaviors



Confronting Sexism in the Workplace

As you have learned today, sometimes women face unfair expectations.

There are often times when you will face unintentional (or even intentional) instances of sexism. Addressing sexism in an appropriate way is important¹³




Confronting Sexism in the Workplace

- Addressing sexism publicly more effectively reduces prejudice, but leads to more negative evaluations¹³
- Addressing sexism privately leads to more favorable evaluations but is less effective in reducing prejudice¹³
- Consider this tradeoff when deciding how to confront sexism




Quiz and Review

Test your knowledge by taking a self-administered quiz then end by reviewing the main takeaways of the program



Self-Administered Quiz


Instructions: Take a few minutes to complete the quiz on the next few slides. Write your answers down. This will ensure you've learned from the training today. After you've finished, check your work. The answers are presented after the quiz.



Self-Administered Quiz

1. Which of the following is considered agentive behavior?

- Offering helpful feedback to an employee
- Setting team goals
- Building relationships with employees
- Encouraging someone else to speak up and share their ideas



Self-Administered Quiz

2. Which of the following is true about gender and developmental opportunities?


- Women are offered the same amount of developmental opportunities as men, but are given more challenging opportunities
- Women are offered less developmental opportunities than men
- Women are offered the same amount of developmental opportunities as men, but are given less challenging opportunities
- Women are offered more developmental opportunities than men



Self-Administered Quiz

3. Women are often viewed as ineffective leaders when they use stereotypically masculine leadership strategies. Which of the following styles in particular leads to women being viewed as ineffective leaders?

- Autocratic
- Democratic
- Interpersonally sensitive
- Transformational



Self-Administered Quiz

4. Researchers have listed several reasons why women are underrepresented in leadership positions. Which of the following is not one of the reasons?

- Women get less support for advancement from top management
- Women feel less optimistic they can gain attain leadership positions
- Expectations of women leaders are higher
- Women tend to overuse interpersonally sensitive leadership behaviors



Self-Administered Quiz

5. What is the best approach for women hoping to be viewed as effective leaders?
- Avoid demonstrating any "masculine" leadership styles
 - Focus solely on demonstrating interpersonally sensitive leadership behaviors
 - Demonstrate both agentic and interpersonally sensitive leadership behaviors
 - Avoid demonstrating any "feminine" leadership styles



Self-Administered Quiz

Instructions: Time to check your work. The answers are provided over the next slides. If you missed any questions, return to the previous slides to review the material again.



Self-Administered Quiz

1. Which of the following is considered agentic behavior?
- Offering helpful feedback to an employee
 - Setting team goals
 - Building relationships with employees
 - Encouraging someone else to speak up and share their ideas



Self-Administered Quiz

2. Which of the following is true about gender and developmental opportunities?
- Women are offered the same amount of developmental opportunities as men, but are given more challenging opportunities
 - Women are offered less developmental opportunities than men
 - Women are offered the same amount of developmental opportunities as men, but are given less challenging opportunities
 - Women are offered more developmental opportunities than men



Self-Administered Quiz

3. Women are often viewed as ineffective leaders when they use stereotypically masculine leadership strategies. Which of the following styles in particular leads to women being viewed as ineffective leaders?
- Autocratic
 - Democratic
 - Interpersonally sensitive
 - Transformational



Self-Administered Quiz

4. Researchers have listed several reasons why women are underrepresented in leadership positions. Which of the following is not one of the reasons?
- Women get less support for advancement from top management
 - Women feel less optimistic they can gain attain leadership positions
 - Expectations of women leaders are higher
 - Women tend to overuse interpersonally sensitive leadership behaviors



Self-Administered Quiz


5. What is the best approach for women hoping to be viewed as effective leaders?

- Avoid demonstrating any "masculine" leadership styles
- Focus solely on demonstrating interpersonally sensitive leadership behaviors
- Demonstrate both agentic and interpersonally sensitive leadership behaviors**
- Avoid demonstrating any "feminine" leadership styles




Main Takeaways

Remember the key points you've learned and how you can implement these tips in practice.



Main Takeaways


- Display both **sensitive** and **agentic** behavior
- Be proactive!
 - Seek out **difficult** developmental opportunities
 - Take advantage of self-managed team structures to gain leadership experience
 - Confront sexism in the workplace but consider your approach



Self-Reflection

Take a few minutes to reflect on the following:

- What are some problems you've faced in the past in obtaining leadership positions, being seen as an effective leader, etc?
- How can you use what we've talked about today to respond to these problems in the future?



That Concludes Today's Training

Now go out and put what you've learned into practice!



References

¹Blahu, S. G., & Alkadi, M. G. (2017). A systematic review of the gender pay gap and factors that predict it. *Administration & Society*, 49(1), 65-104.

²Brown, A. (2017, March 17). *The Data on Women Leaders*. Retrieved May 31, 2017, from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/03/17/the-data-on-women-leaders/>

³Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2014). Women and top leadership positions: Towards an institutional analysis. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(1), 91-109

⁴Barriers and Bias: The Status of Women in Leadership. Retrieved June, 16, 2018 from <https://www.aesop.org/research/barriers-and-bias/>

⁵Samuelson, K. (2017, March 23). Women are still terribly underrepresented in business and politics. Retrieved June 13, 2018 from <http://time.com/4711005/women-underrepresented-business-political-leadership-roles/>

⁶McKinsey & Company. (2017). *Women in the workplace 2017*. Retrieved June 13, 2018 from <https://www.mckinsey.com/womenintheworkplace/>

References

- ⁷Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Kionsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(1), 3-22.
- ⁸Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 781-797.
- ⁹Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743-762.
- ¹⁰Rosette, A. S., & Tost, L. P. (2010). Agentic women and communal leadership: How role prescriptions confer advantage to top women leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 221-235.
- ¹¹King, E. B., Botaford, W., Hebl, M. R., Kazama, S., Dawson, J. F., & Perkins, A. (2012). Benevolent sexism at work: Gender differences in the distribution of challenging developmental experiences. *Journal of Management*, 38(5), 1835-1866.

References

- ¹²Lacenera, C. (2017, April). *Leader emergence in self-managed teams as explained by surface- and deep-level traits* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Rice University Electronic Theses and Dissertations.
- ¹³Dervels, S. J., & Hillard, A. L. (2014). Confronting sexism as persuasion: Effects of a confronter's recipient, source, message, and context. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 653-667.