Navigating the Glass Ladder: A Qualitative Exploration of the Challenges
Women Leaders Experience throughout the Process of Promotion in the Manufacturing Industry

by

Jamie Birdwell

A dissertation submitted to the Nathan M. Bisk College of Business at Florida Institute of Technology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Melbourne, Florida

May 2020
We the undersigned committee hereby recommend that the attached document be accepted as fulfilling in part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Business Administration

“Navigating the Glass Ladder: A Qualitative Exploration of the Challenges Women Leaders Experience throughout the Process of Promotion in the Manufacturing Industry”

a dissertation by Jamie Birdwell

________________________________________________
Emily Martinez-Vogt, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Management
Nathan M. Bisk College of Business
Major Advisor

________________________________________________
Theresa Domagalski, Ph.D.
Adjunct Faculty, Management
Nathan M. Bisk College of Business

________________________________________________
James Glenn, DBA
Adjunct Faculty, Management
Nathan M. Bisk College of Business

________________________________________________
Lisa A. Steelman, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Psychology

________________________________________________
Theodore Richardson, Ed.D.
Professor and Dean
Nathan M. Bisk College of Business
Abstract

Title: Navigating the Glass Ladder: A Qualitative Exploration of the Challenges Women Leaders Experience throughout the Process of Promotion in the Manufacturing Industry

Author: Jamie Birdwell

Advisor: Emily Martinez-Vogt, Ph.D.

Keywords: gender roles, gender stereotypes, job promotion, male-dominated industry, power, power tactics, influence tactics, role congruity theory

As the presence of women in the workplace continues to increase and significant strides have been undertaken to ensure fair and equitable treatment of women in industry, a considerable gap remains in the representation of women in leadership roles in male-dominated industries (Saraçoğlu, Memiş, Voyvoda, & Kızılırmak, 2018). Gender discrimination brought on by stereotypical gender beliefs regarding “men’s work” versus “women’s work” is pervasive in the male-dominated industry of manufacturing (Levine, 2009; Massey, 2014; Sweida & Reichard, 2013).

This study explored the experiences of women as they navigated promotion in the manufacturing sector. Through the lens of role congruity theory, this study investigated if the experiences women faced are similar to those of men. Additionally, this study examined the tactics women used to garner promotion and whether or not these tactics related to constructs of power as compared to French and Raven’s (1959) bases of social power and Raven’s (1992, 2008) interpersonal power interaction model. Hermeneutic
interpretive phenomenology was used to explore the lived experiences of both men and women in manufacturing.

Findings indicated that women's experiences in manufacturing are markedly disparate from those of their male counterparts. Because of work and job culture expectations, women, with a few exceptions, were relegated to more clerical type roles and achieved opportunities for advancement differently and more slowly than men. For those who were not in clerical roles, each possessed college degrees. Further findings in the study indicated that women utilized power tactics to gain promotion, and those tactics varied subject to the gender of the power holder.

This research presents models that illustrate how women and men may use power tactics to influence the power holder’s promotion decisions. Women appeared to use expert power, coercive power (with reward power), and referent power when the power holder was male. If the power holder were female, women used expert and referent power. As expected, men took advantage of networks in addition to expert, legitimate, and referent power. This study, then, discussed the implications of its research, elucidated the study’s limitations, and prescribed future areas for further investigation.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview

Despite much progress towards equality between men and women, women continue to encounter more difficulties in business environments than their male counterparts (Hearn, 2019; Knights, 2019). Significant research exists regarding leadership styles and differences between men and women (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Robert, Library, Denise, & Porter, 2009; van der Boon, 2003; Vinkenburg, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011). Management research has characterized female managers with more communal characteristics than men; for example, women encourage and empower (Brenner, Tomkiewicz, & Schein, 2008; Buttner, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 2002) and often provide more positive feedback for performance as aligned with strategic goals (Brush, Carter, Gatewood, Greene, & Hart, 2004; Neider, 1987).

Commonly associated with assertiveness, toughness, risk-taking, and ambition, masculinity is perceived as more work and career-focused than femininity (Brescoll, Uhlmann, & Newman, 2013; Hofstede, 1980). Masculinity is regarded to be necessary for the workplace in most industrial societies (Fischer & Manstead, 2000). Most business owners and senior leadership are traditionally male, with the general perception (role congruity theory and social identity theory) that agentic, masculine characteristics are required, regardless of gender (Goktan & Gupta, 2013). Further, much research has been undertaken to explore wage gaps between men and women.
(Bielby, 2000; Cohen & Huffman, 2007; Islam & Jantan, 2017; Kongar, 2008; Paolo Merlino, Pozzoli, & Parrotta, 2018; Petersen & Saporta, 2004; Tate & Yang, 2015).

Even though research (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Robert, Library, Denise, & Porter, 2009; van der Boon, 2003; Vinkenburg, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011) has been undertaken in the disciplines of psychology, education, and leadership, industrial and organizational behavior regarding gender bias, gender inequalities, gender, roles, and gender stereotyping, it is under-researched in business. My research adds value to the understanding of gender disparities in the promotion of women in manufacturing and other male-dominated industries. These inequities may result from gender stereotypes, gender bias, and role incongruity as related to gender roles in business research.

Recent feminist research contends in part that firms should empower women and provide opportunities for women to occupy higher levels of leadership (Bartunek, Walsh, & Lacey, 2000; Baxter, 2015; Fontana, 2007; Gardiner, 2012; Hechavarria & Ingram, 2016; Knights, 2019; Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013; Richards, 2011; Saraçoğlu et al., 2018). “As long as companies do not go beyond the usual measures […] they will only address the symptoms” of the problem (Festing, Knappert, & Kornau, 2015, p. 74).

Among the greatest socio-cultural threats to leadership gender equality, especially in the highest levels of leadership, may be the lingering stereotypes and implicit biases regarding the gendered idea of leadership roles (Pfaff et al., 2013).
Pfaff et al.'s (2013) research showed that women in middle management are perceived as being prepared both cognitively and behaviorally for ascension to the most elite levels of firm leadership. However, despite those perceptions, women are not ascending to higher levels of leadership (Pfaff et al., 2013). Beaman, Chattopadhyay, Duflo, Pande, and Topalova (2009) found that prior exposure to female leaders improves perceptions of leader effectiveness for women in general, in addition to reducing the influences of gender stereotypes.

**Background and Rationale of the Study**

Gender roles create opportunities for the proliferation of gender-based discrimination brought on by stereotypical beliefs (Vinkenburg et al., 2011). Stereotypes are easily activated and accessible cognitively (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011). Stereotypes influence behaviors and attitudes from those inside and outside the stereotyped group (Sweida & Reichard, 2013). Socialization, decision-making, self-perception, values, and behaviors reflect gender-roles, and, according to gender-role theory, gender roles are affected by stereotypes (Keshet, Kark, Pomerantz-Zorin, Koslowsky, & Schwarzwald, 2006; Seong & Hong, 2013; Sweida & Reichard, 2013).

Gender roles are the collection of descriptive (consensual expectations of what actual group members do) and injunctive (consensual expectations of what group members should do) norms associated with men and women (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011; Leicht, Randsley de Moura, & Crisp, 2014). Sweida & Reichard (2013) argued that gender stereotypes influence and burgeon differences between men and women in areas such as achievement orientation.
and internal beliefs (Ahl, 2006; Díaz-García, 2010; Gupta, Turban, & Bhave, 2008; Lewis, 2006; Sweida & Reichard, 2013).

Eagly and Carli (2003) suggested that, as leader roles evolve, modern methods of leadership indicate a reduction in hierarchy, primarily top-down, emphasizing the role of the leader as a collaborator and coach. Eagly and Carli (2003) recognized that male-dominated industry places pressure on women to conform to more socially accepted, male, agentic gender traits to succeed. However, as women engaged in leadership behaviors opposite of socially accepted female stereotypes, they encountered social rejection, poor evaluation from subordinates, backlash, and adverse effects to promotion (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007).

In a meta-analysis, Farré (2013) contended that men in both the developed and developing world continued to maintain significant control over many aspects of women’s lives, from education to healthcare. A meta-analytic review by O’Neil (2004) found that women tend to use “weaker” upward influence tactics of acquiescence, ingratiation, and altruism while men generally used manipulation and reason (p. 128).

Litzky and Greenhaus (2007) identified several factors that may contribute to why women are underrepresented in the upper ranks of corporate leadership: (1) out-group status in leader-member dyadic exchange, (2) restricted access to leadership/career development, (3) career interruptions (family/work conflict), (4) lack of experience in lower to mid-level management experiences, (5) gender and stereotype biases, (6) agentic and organizational cultures and expectations. As a
result, Litzky and Greenhouse (2007) asserted that women may not desire to accede to the most senior levels of leadership and are less likely to enter “contest mobility tournaments” with men in women’s promotability (p. 638). Thus, women may not desire to reach the upper echelons of leadership because they wish to avoid self-perceived conflict(s) to advance, or they feel they may not possess the requisite qualifications. Both of those conditions contributed to the purpose of the study.

**Statement of the Problem**

Even though research has been conducted in the areas of leadership and differences between how men and women lead across a variety of sectors (Arvate, Galilea, & Todescat, 2018; Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr, 2014; Szymanska, Rubin, & Rubin, 2018), the promotion of women is under-researched in business (Bosley, 2018; Wilmuth, 2016). The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore the experiences women face throughout the promotion process.

Among the most significant issues women face in achieving leadership positions within male-dominated industries is the lingering stereotypical gender roles (Litzky & Greenhaus, 2007). Women may be hindered from promotion to the highest levels of leadership in male-dominated sectors as long as they do not possess or exhibit the perceived requisite skills to be promoted (Lawrence, Lonsdale, & Le Mesurier, 2018). By examining the lived experiences of women in manufacturing, this research sought to contribute to the extant literature by analyzing how a female leader may use power to navigate the glass ladder. If power is a factor in such
navigation, this research sought a clearer understanding of the nature and characteristics of power utilized to garner the desired promotion.

**Purpose of the Study**

Much research exists in leadership differences between men and women (Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly, 2005; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Eagly & Heilman, 2016; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Hernandez Bark, Escartín, Schuh, & van Dick, 2016; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Wang, Chiang, Tsai, Lin, & Cheng, 2013), gender-based stereotypes (Brenner et al., 1989; Cuadrado, Navas, Molero, Ferrer, & Morales, 2012; Haslam & Renneboog, 2011; Jacobs, 2007; Katila & Eriksson, 2013; Koenig & Eagly, 2014; Koenig et al., 2011; Lawrence et al., 2018; Schein, 1973), and leader effectiveness (Gandolf & Stone, 2016; Girdauskiene & Eyvazzade, 2015; Newman & Butler, 2014; Pafford & Schaefer, 2017; Prime, Carter, & Welbourne, 2009; Ragins, 1988; Rosser, 2003). Little research in business, however, has been undertaken into the promotion of women to leadership positions within male-dominated industries and what success factors women use to climb the glass ladder (Bosley, 2018; Darouei & Pluut, 2018; Hoover, Hack, Garcia, Goodfriend, & Habashi, 2019). This study explored the experiences of women as they sought promotions at three levels of management (entry-level, middle level, or senior level). Additionally, an exploration of their male counterparts showed if the experiences of women in the manufacturing sector differed from that of men.
Questions that Guide the Research

RQ1. What are the experiences of women leaders in their promotability in the manufacturing industry?

RQ2. Do women encounter similar or disparate challenges in job promotion as their male counterparts?

RQ3. What are the success factors contributing to the process of promotion for women in the manufacturing industry? Are such factors connected to constructs of power?

Definition of Terms

Female/Woman

The term sex may be used to classify whether one is male or female, but gender represents the masculinity or femininity of an individual (Botes, 2014; Haralambos & Holborn, 2008). Merriam Webster (2019) defines a female as “of, relating to, or being the sex that typically has the capacity to bear young or produce eggs,” and Dictionary.com (2019) states that a female is “a person bearing two X chromosomes in the cell nuclei and normally having a vagina, a uterus, and ovaries, and developing at puberty a relatively rounded body and enlarged breasts, and retaining a beardless face.” In this study, female/woman, therefore, relates to biological sex.

Male/Man

A male is one who possesses “an X and Y chromosome pair in the cell nuclei and normally having a penis, scrotum, and testicles, and developing hair on the face at
adolescence” (Dictionary.com, 2019). Merriam Webster (2019) defines a male as “an individual of the sex that is typically capable of producing small, usually motile gametes (such as sperm or spermatozoa) which fertilize the eggs of a female.” Male/man, therefore, relates to biological sex for the purposes of this research.

Gender

For the purpose of this study and following research by psychologists Ellemers (2014, 2018) and Ramos et al., (2016), gender will be regarded as the observations of how men and women behave as explained by inherent biological differences between them. Whereas biological sex is used to define a person as male or female, gender denotes the masculinity or femininity of an individual (Botes, 2014; Haralambos & Holborn, 2008).

Gender Roles

Gender roles are “beliefs…expectations…in that they are normative and…describe qualities or behavioral tendencies believed desirable for each sex,” and there is a perception inferred between the role and the people who are engaged in that role as possessing traits or characteristic of the needs of that specific role (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574).

Glass Cliff Phenomenon

Ryan and Haslam (2005) contended that women are afforded previously unavailable opportunities for leadership positions because women “are seen to have
particular skills and traits that make them particularly suited to dealing with these
crisis situations” (p. 449).

**Glass Ladder**

Among the first mentions of the glass ladder, *The Economist* (1996) described
the process women experience in promotion as the rungs of a glass ladder that become
more slippery and fragile as women ascend to the most senior leadership levels.

**Leader**

A leader is one who has or exercises authority over a person, group, or people
(Eagly & Carli, 2007).

**Social Role Theory**

A foundational predecessor of role congruity theory, social role theory details
the behavioral sex differences that occur from the disparate social roles inhabited by
men and women, particularly as those occur in labor (Porter, 2009). According to
social role theory, perceivers infer a correspondence between a person's actions and
that person's inner dispositions; therefore, the descriptive nature of gender roles
originates in the beliefs of others rather than in the person demonstrating the behavior
(Cenkci, & Ozcelik, 2015; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007;
Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004).

**Role Congruity Theory**

Role congruity theory contends that women (1) may be disadvantaged in
securing leadership positions because they are not perceived as qualified as they lack
the necessary leadership skills, and (2), even if a woman occupies a leadership
position, she may be unfavorably evaluated because she “may be perceived as violating the gender norm ascribed to women” (Peachey & Burton, 2011, p. 418).

Role congruity and role incongruity are used interchangeably (Porter, 2009).

**Social Identity Theory**

According to Ashforth & Mael (2011) and Ashforth (1989), people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories. Prototypical characteristics that are abstracted from the members define the categories or social classifications (Turner, 1985). Social classification serves two functions. First, cognitively, the classification segments order the social environment, providing the individual with a systematic means of delineating others (Ashforth, 1989). Second, social classification allows the individual to locate or define him/herself within the social environment (Ashforth & Mael, 2011; Ashforth, 1989).

**Power**

Liu, Liu, and Wu (2010) defined power “as the degree of discretion that individuals possess in deciding the allocation and usage of personal or organizational resources in their work” (p 1438).

**Power Holder**

One who has the ability or authority to control and influence other individuals in meaningful ways (Guinote, Weick, & Cai, 2018).

**Social Power Theory**

According to French & Raven (1959), leaders may use a variety of bases of power, or sources of power, to influence their subordinates. Those bases of power,
categorized as harsh or soft, may not be effective in altering subordinate’s organizational commitment, dependent upon the restrictions placed on the subordinate’s autonomous ability to comply (Blois & Hopkinson, 2013; Elias, 2008; Pierro, Raven, Amato, & Belanger, 2013).

**Significance of the Study**

According to role congruity theory, women may suffer hindrances in leadership because of prejudice against them and opposition when they occupy leader roles (Eagly, 2007; Peachey & Burton, 2011). As a result, women face a paradox and double bind in that, to be seen as being effective and valid, they must enact agentic traits; however, when women display agentic characteristics, they are perceived as ineffective because they are viewed as inauthentic, having given up their feminine, communal traits (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Koenig et al., 2011). The study sought to explore how women navigated promotion in the wake of gender stereotypes, gender discrimination, and role incongruity. The final goal of the research was to contribute to the extant literature by analyzing the lived experiences that women have faced in their promotions to more senior leadership levels in manufacturing.

By examining how women may use power and how that power usage might contribute to promotion, this study further extends research into the lack of women leaders in management within the manufacturing industry. Further, though quantitative research has been undertaken of French and Raven’s (1959) social power bases (Bélanger, Pierro, & Kruglanski, 2015; Drea, John, Bruner, Gordon, & Hensel,
Paul, 1993; Elias, 2008; French & Raven, 1959; Pierro et al., 2013; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Raven, 1965; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, & Ochana-Levin, 2004; Wilson, Erchul, & Raven, 2008), a qualitative inquiry into their research in the business discipline is lacking.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

Chapter Two encompasses a review of the literature surrounding the topic and covers the history and relevant theoretical developments and frameworks such as gender roles, stereotypes, social role theory, social identity theory, role incongruity/incongruity theory, glass cliff phenomenon, and power constructs. Research methodology is within Chapter Three, including the philosophical worldview, research approach, research design, research methods, and procedures for data collection, analysis, and reporting. In Chapter Four, the findings, profiles of the participants, and the contribution of this study to applied practice are presented. Chapter Five provides the implications of the research, its contribution to research, four models, limitations of the research, and areas for future research. Finally, and after Chapter Five, the references used in the study and all the appendices complete the dissertation.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Overview

Chapter Two presents an overview of the relevant framework, models, and theories alongside key research associated with female leadership, gender roles, gender stereotypes, gender-related job promotion, and power. The history of female workers in the manufacturing industry in the United States is offered. The literature review’s purpose was to garner a better theoretical understanding of the topic and explored the associated topics that emerged within the data analysis (Grant, 2017).

Organization of the Remainder of the Chapter

The chapter’s first section reiterates the research questions guiding this study. The second section of the chapter reviews the historical development of women in manufacturing and leadership. The final section of this chapter presents the relevant theoretical frameworks.

Questions that Guide the Research

Recent research (Bono et al., 2017; Buttner, 2001; Cobb-Clark & Dunlop, 1999; Eagly, 2005; Eagly et al., 1995; Elprana et al., 2015; Hernandez Bark et al., 2016; Hoover et al., 2018; Kariv, 2012; Ko, Kotrba, & Roebuck, 2015; Kusterer, Lindholm, & Montgomery, 2013; Lammers & Gast, 2017; Miller, Eagly, & Linn, 2015; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Richards, 2011; Roebuck & Smith, 2011; Rosette, Koval, Ma, & Livingston, 2016; Santos, 2016; Wang et al., 2013) has been undertaken in the disciplines of psychology, education, leadership, and industrial and
organizational behavior regarding gender bias, gender inequalities, gender roles, and gender stereotyping. My research, however, adds value to better understanding the gender disparities in the promotion of women in manufacturing and other male-dominated industries resulting from gender stereotypes, gender bias, and role incongruity as related to gender roles within business research. To reiterate, the research questions utilized for this study were as follows:

RQ1. What are the experiences of women leaders in their promotability in the manufacturing industry?

RQ2. Do women encounter similar or disparate challenges in job promotion as their male counterparts?

RQ3. What are the success factors contributing to the process of promotion for women in the manufacturing industry? Are such factors connected to constructs of power?

**Historical Development**

**History of Women in the Workplace and Manufacturing**

Working women did not occupy essential places within the American labor movement, yet women have been quite active on their own since the earliest days of the factory system during the American Industrial Revolution (Foner, 1987). Women began joining the American workforce in significant numbers in the early 1800s when U.S. industrial production increased, mainly because of the introduction of improved textile machinery in factories (“Women in the Workplace,” 2015). In the 1820s and 1830s, many thousands of women began work in craft industries, needle trades, and
textile factories (Foner, 1987). The most common profile of the female employee in the U.S. for more than 150 years has been identified as young (between eighteen and twenty-five) and single until the onset of World War II when married women joined the industrial and factory workforces (Blackwelder, 1997; “Women in the Workplace,” 2015).

Economic growth and the emergence of new technology that shifted the needs of an agrarian society to factories decreased the share of human capital from the production of goods and services from farming and associated goods and services (Blackwelder, 1997). Between the end of the Civil War and World War I, the United States emerged as the world leader in industrial power (Blackwelder, 1997). By 1900, manufacturing, communication, and transportation encompassed more than twice the amount of dollar value to the U.S. economy than agriculture, forestry, and fishing combined (Blackwelder, 1997).

After the turn of the twentieth century, another shift out of the Industrial Revolution of the 1800s led to postindustrial demands for labor throughout the United States (Blackwelder, 1997; “Women in the Workplace,” 2015). Employers began seeking skilled women laborers; thus, at the time, women began to take on roles that had formerly been exclusively male. According to historical research by Blackwelder (1997), the quiet revolution bringing women into the post-industrial workforce was demonstrated by this statistic: in 1900, one in five American women worked for wages, but by 1990 three out of five did so. Further, in the early 1890s, five million women were employed in the labor workforce, but in the 1980s, that number grew to
fifty-six million (Blackwelder, 1997). Over the last century, wage labor for women evolved from atypical behavior to expected; outlooks of long-term work for women grew from only the poorer classes to middle class; married women dominated the female workforce; most two-parent households depend upon the wages of both spouses; and the range of occupations occupied by women vastly grew (Blackwelder, 1997; “Women in the Workplace,” 2015).

Historical researchers differ in their explanations about why women entered the prevenient workforce. “Constrained by conventions of gender and by notions of sexual differences (Blackwelder, 1997, introduction),” those espousing the necessity for higher wages contended that women had to work to supplement the male’s monetary familial contribution. Opposing views (employers, critics) argued that women sought “pin money,” discretionary income so that vital money would not be taken from the household needs, virtually ignoring vicissitudes as widowhood, abandonment, divorce, or male unemployment (Blackwelder, 1997; Walby & Bagguley, 1990).

Under the economic pressures of the Great Depression and World War II, women entered the manufacturing workplace to meet both the economic turnaround and American war needs. However, with the return of men from World War II, women found themselves isolated from the jobs they recently held. Manufacturing had enlarged and expanded the services sector’s needs, depending on commercial vendors to supply and market their products, financial and lending institutions, along with other requirements to meet the demands of a public with growing buying power.
White-collar jobs such as research and development, bookkeeping, management, and merchandising developed (Blackwelder, 1997). The service sector continued to grow in education and medicine, and women found themselves being relegated to jobs in those industries (“Women in the Workplace,” 2015).

Gender conventions linked to patriarchy discouraged employers from hiring women where they would supervise men (Blackwelder, 1997; Carli & Eagly, 2016; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafría, 2006). Stereotypical ideas of the physical differences between men and women promulgated the idea that industrial managers should not hire women in roles where they would operate blast furnaces, for example, but allowed women to work without much restraint or resistance in textile mills because of the traditional role of women as home textile producers (Blackwelder, 1997). Further exacerbating the perception of women in manufacturing were the beliefs that women lacked the mental prowess or power coupled with the physical requisites for manufacturing (Blackwelder, 1997; Dewey, 1971; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafría, 2006; Hatmaker, 2013).

In the 1950s and beyond, the service sector continued to grow, outpacing the manufacturing industry. Women emerged as the majority workforce in mid- to lower-level jobs in the service sector; however, employers continued to maintain gender role expectations and segregation (Albrecht & Goldman, 1985; Blackwelder, 1997; Strom, 2006). Oppenheimer (1970) argued that occupational gender segregation kept women in inferior positions as compared to men and ensured that some employers preferred
women to men in some positions, primarily service-related industries (Walby & Bagguley, 1990). Indeed, a study conducted by Adshade & Keay (2010) that focused on manufacturing firms in Ohio between 1914-1937, found, while female employment increased rapidly and wages rose consistent with men during that period, women were mainly employed in clerical roles within those firms.

Women did not regain entry into male-dominated industries and male-dominated skilled craft occupations, such as manufacturing, in significant numbers until equal opportunity training programs began in earnest in the 1970s (Blackwelder, 1997). Further, women in the 1960s and 70s found themselves locked into low wage jobs, particularly in textile mills, because they lacked the education to enter into skilled roles within manufacturing (Blackwelder, 1997). Demeaning working conditions persisted in areas where women did find work in the manufacturing industry, and women suffered from sexual harassment while filling the most undesirable jobs in the sector (Blackwelder, 1997; Dewey, 1971; Strom, 2006). Having felt unaided by the Women’s Liberation Movement and equal opportunity legislation in the 1970s, female blue-collar and low-level service workers saw their workplace situation remain stagnant, and their sense of resentment grew as they were passed over for promotion and working conditions remained unchanged (Carli & Eagly, 2016; Cooke & Xiao, 2014; Eagly & Carli, 2007; “Women in the Workplace,” 2015).

Federal legislative action (Civil Rights Act of 1964, 1964; Education Amendments Act of 1972, 1972) and affirmative action influenced the education and
socialization of girls and young women, thereby creating broader opportunities for women in higher education (Blackwelder, 1997). Women began in the 1970s to reject the education track chosen for them based on the curricula of the 1950s (Blackwelder, 1997; Dewey, 1971; Strom, 2006). By the 1980s, women began training for and entering into traditionally held non-female occupational roles, specifically in manufacturing (Dewey, 1971; Eagly & Carli, 2007). Women’s employment in the 1980s grew at more than double the rate of men, showed growth in precision production or craft positions, made gains in managerial and professional pursuits, and experienced three times the growth than men in specific male-dominated industries such as engineering, medicine, and law (Blackwelder, 1997). In highly male-dominated industries such as manufacturing, women made slow progress to senior positions and no progress into high-level management positions until companies developed “voluntary affirmative action” policies (Blackwelder, 1997; Dewey, 1971; Gray, 1987; “Women in the Workplace,” 2015). Even when women make strides into the senior levels of manufacturing, their wage rate was markedly lower than that of their male counterparts (Bielby, 2000; Blackwelder, 1997; Dewey, 1971; Meuris & Leana, 2015; Tate & Yang, 2015).

Global trade and production networks and expansions into emerging markets in developing countries have affected manufacturing greatly (Saraçoğlu et al., 2018). Manufacturing in the United States from the 1980s to the years immediately following the global financial crisis of 2008 shrank as many companies off-shored manufacturing to developing countries in Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America
Early globalization research (Joekes, 1999; Seguino, 2000) associated manufacturing opportunities in developing economies as “feminization of employment” (Saraçoğlu et al., 2018, p. 2) and specialized low-cost and labor-intensive sectors of manufacturing stimulated employment (Joekes, 1999; Seguino, 2000). Berik, (2000) and Fontana (2007) found that changing trade structures influenced men’s and women’s labor asymmetrically since ownership conditions of the factors of production, factor mobility, and factor market distortions are gendered (Fussell, 2000; Saraçoğlu et al., 2018).

Where the feminization of employment appears to be particularly active in semi-industrialized economies, as long as women workers remain relegated to stereotypical female-dominated work, with little chance of employment within male-dominated sectors, any gain women may realize may prove temporary (Fussell, 2000; Saraçoğlu et al., 2018). Research conducted by Saraçoğlu et al. (2018) of changes in women’s employment in manufacturing in thirty countries from the period of 1995-2011 found that women still tended to be employed in low technology manufacturing zones. Further, they found that adverse effects of changes in women’s employment are predominantly associated with gender bias in both developed and developing countries, exacerbated in developing countries post-financial crisis in 2008 (Saraçoğlu et al., 2018). However, developed countries lagged developing economies in female employment in mid-high and high-technology manufacturing, yet any gain women’s
employment made in those areas was largely offset by gains made in male employment in global manufacturing (Saraçoğlu et al., 2018).

**History of Female Leadership**

Both public and private organizations have historically been led by men (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Elprana, Felfe, Stiehl, & Gatzka, 2015; Hernandez Bark et al., 2016; Wood & Eagly, 2015). Much of the history associated with female leadership throughout the world has consisted of rules, even laws, and explicit, clear-cut norms (Eagly & Carli, 2007). As women began entering the workforce at the turn of the twentieth century, they were not allowed to vote and did not carry the equivalent legal and political protections and powers as men (Blackwelder, 1997; Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly & Carli, 2007). Access to education, especially higher education, was limited or unavailable until the 1970s, further disqualifying women from specific areas of male-dominated industries (Beeson et al., 2012; Carli & Eagly, 2016; Dewey, 1971; Diekman, Eagly, & Kulesa, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Heilman, 2016; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Eagly and Carli (2007) showed this pervasive attitude in an unguarded comment captured on White House audiotapes of then-President Nixon as he said

I don’t think a woman should be in any government job whatsoever [...] The reason why I do is mainly because they are erratic. And emotional. Men are erratic and emotional, too, but the point is a woman is more likely to be. (p. 3)

Historically, gender hierarchies formed around new economies, as humanity began to turn from hunting and foraging to agrarian and more complex economies
Men’s physical attributes, and their freedom from childbearing, allowed them greater access to wealth, wealth gaining, and power as compared to women (Eagly & Carli, 2007). As societies became more patriarchal, women were relegated to more domestic and nurturing roles such as cooking, sewing, weaving, and child-rearing (Blackwelder, 1997; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly, 1995; Eagly et al., 1995; “Women in the Workplace,” 2015).

Leadership in the United States is typically associated with masculinity (Beeson et al., 2012; Eagly, Wood, Diekman, 2000; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hernandez Bark et al., 2016; Jogulu & Wood, 2006; Koenig & Eagly, 2014; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Sojo, Wood, Wood, & Wheeler, 2016; Wang et al., 2013; Wood & Eagly, 2015). Gender stereotypes are automatically triggered cognitively because of the perception of the gender of the person (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Haslam & Renneboog, 2011; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2003). Milner (1993), a scholar of business management, in the 1950s identified six characteristics necessary for the successful manager:

1. Competing with peers;
2. Imposing wishes on subordinates;
3. Behaving assertively;
4. Standing out from the group;
5. Performing routine administrative functions; and
Although contemporary literature and its descriptions of managerial roles do include some stereotypically feminine elements (being helpful, understanding) and gender-neutral stereotypes (intelligent, dedication), most qualities are as demonstrably masculine as they were in the 1950s (Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Elprana, Felfe, Stiehl, & Gatzka, 2015; Hearn, 2019; Vinkenburg et al., 2011).

Particularly in male-dominated industries such as manufacturing, engineering, construction, and law enforcement, many leadership roles retain markedly masculine images (Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hatmaker, 2013; Kiser, 2015; Rowley, 2016). Research suggests that if a man or woman believes that a suitable female candidate cannot be a good leader, then that woman will face heightened degrees of difficulty leading in that position (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Koenig et al., 2011; Zheng, Kark, & Meister, 2018). Indeed, men receive a double advantage when being recruited to leadership positions through and because of cultural stereotypes: he is male and perceived as such (Hamilton, 2014; Paris, Howell, Dorfman, & Hanges, 2009). Therefore, he is associated with masculine concepts and stereotypes which, in turn, associate him with the perceived qualities necessary for good leadership, increasing his likelihood of garnering a leadership position (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Elprana et al., 2015; García-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Koenig et al., 2011). Women do not receive such a double advantage, even when they act agentically (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Koenig & Eagly, 2014; Rincón, González, & Barrero, 2017).
Despite Federal legislative and regulatory attempts to address the inequities, there remains a significant gender gap in leadership positions, particularly in male-dominated industries (Esser, Kahrens, Mouzughii, & Eomois, 2018; Hernández Bark et al., 2016; Huszczo & Endres, 2017; Wang et al., 2013). Organizational culture and stereotypical mindsets make it difficult for women to overcome barriers to advancement.

**Relevant Models, Theories, and Frameworks**

**Theoretical Framework(s)**

**Gender Roles**

Within the framework of gender and leadership, research for the distinction and differentiation of leadership between masculine and feminine is considerable yet mixed (Esser et al., 2018). Much research supports the focus on the differences surrounding gender roles as the most salient factor in gender-related issues in leadership behavior (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Esser et al., 2018; van Gils, van Quaquebeke, Borkowski, & van Knippenberg, 2018; van Vianen & Fischer, 2002). How an individual behaves, thinks, and processes his/her environment may be a result of daily socialization whereby s/he learns what is proper and appropriate/inappropriate for both genders (Koenig et al., 2011; Vinkenburg et al., 2011; Zheng et al., 2018). Gender roles are “beliefs…expectations…in that they are normative and…describe qualities or behavioral tendencies believed desirable for each sex,” and there is a perception inferred between the role and the people who are engaged in that role as
possessing traits or characteristics needed for that specific role (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574).

Ridgeway (2011) found that the primary means used by people to understand and engage in social behavior is gender. During initial meetings, people tend to categorize a person based on gender first because the process of categorizing by gender is habitual, automatic, and cognitive (Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Offermann, 1986; Sweida & Reichard, 2013). Therefore, stereotypical behavior is part of the socialization process that may affect one’s daily behavior (Botes, 2014; Denissen, 2010). Further, Botes (2010) argued that the way a person behaves influences the behavior and actions of those who are observing.

Gender role stereotypes contain both descriptive and prescriptive norms for gendered behavior, describing the expectations about who men and women are as well as who they should be (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ferguson, 2018; Ridgeway, 2001). "Descriptive norms are the shared beliefs about what men and women actually do, whereas prescriptive norms are the shared understandings of what men and women ought to do" (Ferguson, 2018, p. 410). Consequently, the agentic gender role describes and prescribes that men should be assertive, independent, and self-confident. The communal gender role describes and prescribes that women should be expressive, helpful, and nurturing.

Role incongruity occurs when a woman or man performs social roles that do not align with the descriptive and prescriptive norms for their gender. In contrast, role congruity occurs when the two social roles align. For example, if a woman is
performing a role that is nurturing, such as a caregiver, and fits the stereotyped behavior and expectations, she will experience role congruity. However, if a man were to perform that same role, he would suffer role incongruity because the social expectation is incompatible with the stereotypical gender role expectations for men.

Research on social role theory (Eagly, 1987) found that men from a young age are socialized to be more task-oriented, adventurous, assertive, outgoing, and achievement-oriented. Women are taught to be more communal, nurturing, emotional, to respect male power and authority, and to restrain themselves from aggression and assertiveness (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Neubert & Taggar, 2004; Wood & Eagly, 2015). Yang & Aldrich (2014) found that ascribed attributes, despite growing egalitarian value systems, remain a fundamental basis for assigning rewards and distributing leadership. Yang and Aldrich (2014) pointed to research that showed gender roles modify merit effects on teams:

1. Social beliefs about gender contain certain hegemonic assumptions that lead individuals to discriminate, knowingly or not, against female competency (Correll, Benard, & Parik, 2007; Ridgeway, Johnson, & Diekema, 1994);

2. Gendered family and marriage roles imprint social practices that alter implied instrumental rules in business groups (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003; Budig, 2004, 2006; Budig & Hodges, 2010); and
3. Compelled gender-compatible behaviors are the result of stereotypical gender expectations operating as self-fulfilling means (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Empirical findings from Yang and Aldrich’s (2014) research of entrepreneurial teams and start-ups suggested that women would generally face fewer disadvantages in business leadership, except for male/female perceived spousal characteristics (male is the breadwinner, the female is homemaker) and related accountability. Further findings indicated that gender acts as an underlying and often unacknowledged “cultural and cognitive principle lurking beneath the surface of all social interactions” (Yang & Aldrich, 2014, p. 322).

Eagly (1987) suggested that men, because of societal expectations, are anticipated to have more agentic qualities (assertiveness, aggression, confidence, independence) than women and to engage in behaviors that are more congruent with leadership. Conversely, women are expected to engage in more communal behaviors (nurturing, helpful, kind, gentle), and those behaviors are more incongruent with leadership roles (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Lanaj & Hollenbeck, 2015; Lemoine, Aggarwal, & Steed, 2016; Mendez & Busenbark, 2015). A meta-analysis by Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt (2002) revealed that, as highly extraverted individuals emerge as leaders, the likelihood is greater that that leader will be successful in that leadership role. That suggests a substantial bias against women and the over-emergence of male leaders (Lanaj & Hollenbeck, 2015) where leadership
emergence is the extent to which group members regard an individual as being “leaderlike” (Lemoine et al., 2016, p. 471).

The effect of gender roles influences organizational behavior in the way people react to leaders in terms of gender expectancies (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000; Eagly et al., 2003) and the extent to which people internalize their gender role (Eagly et al., 2003; Gabriel & Gardner, 2004; Wood, Christensen, Hebl, & Rothgerber, 1997). Consequently, men and women differ in their expectations of behavior in organizational settings (Ely, 1995). Gender roles are “beliefs…expectations…in that they are normative and…describe qualities or behavioral tendencies believed desirable for each sex,” and there is an inferred perception of the role, and people who are engaged in that role possess traits and characteristics needed for that position (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574).

Research shows that women leaders are disliked more than men who occupy similar positions and roles (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Parks-Stamm, Heilman, & Hearns, 2007) and face social and economic penalties (Rudman, 1998) when they enact or direct authority (Brescoll, 2011; Sinclair & Kunda, 1999). Rosser (2003) hypothesized that perceptions are rooted in an individual’s experiences with a leader’s behavior, directly or indirectly, and are based on what a leader says and does. The contextual and cognitive factors influencing gender perception include: (1) the beliefs, expectations, and motivator between the leader and the perceiver; (2) whether or not the gender schema are informed by elements among which are the nature of the task, the characteristics/traits of the leader, and the organizational context; (3) whether or
not differential expectations are conveyed to women and men; and (4) whether these result in adaptation of the leader’s self-protection (Becker, Ayman, & Korabik, 2002; Deaux & Major, 1987). Research has long held that social perceivers hold stereotypic beliefs about groups (Katz & Braly, 1933) and their leadership. Thus, individuals determine whether they believe the leader(s) is(are) effective. Moreover, Heilman (1983, 2001) asserted that women who aspire to leadership positions face a perceived lack of fit.

Person-organization (P-O) fit is a predictable, measurable synergistic fit between possible employees and the organization (Knerly, 2018). P-O fit considers such factors as the environment in which the work takes place, including the organization’s climate, culture, values, and norms, as well as employee attributes, traits, and characteristics (Heilman, 1983; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Knerly, 2018; Lyness & Heilman, 2006). P-O fit considerations include contextual elements that may require an employee “to modify the demands of the position to account for responses to as-yet undefined tasks and responsibilities” (Knerly, 2018, p 22).

Empirical results from a quantitative study by Lyness & Heilman (2006) of archival organizational data of performance evaluations of 448 upper-level managers suggested that gender bias can “detrimentally affect the performance evaluations and promotional opportunities of upper-level women managers” (p. 782). Their findings appeared to support their hypotheses that women of all managerial levels suffer from poorer evaluations and fewer promotions because of the gendered view that managerial roles are primarily agentic (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). Managers who
“fit” the perceived masculine gender stereotype received higher performance evaluations (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). Additionally, they acquired more opportunities for promotion than those who were perceived as not fitting the supposed expectations (Lyness & Heilman, 2006; Lyness & Thompson, 2000). Further findings indicated that those who did not meet the perceived role requirements were subjected to more stringent evaluations, with women receiving more negative evaluative comments than their male counterparts (Lyness & Heilman, 2006).

Both the lack of fit (Heilman, 1983, 2001; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Lyness & Heilman, 2006; Parks-Stamm et al., 2007) and the think-manager-think-male paradigm (Schein, 1973) empirically describe the barriers women may face in achieving leadership positions. Women are not believed to have the same abilities, traits, and talents as males, all perceived requisites to assuming a leadership position (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011; Klatt, Eimler, & Krämer, 2016; Koenig et al., 2011; Rosette & Tost, 2010). Role congruity theory has shown that perceptions of role incompatibility have profound adverse effects on a woman's leadership effectiveness (Eagly et al., 1995; Rosette & Tost, 2010), leader emergence (Antonakis & House, 2014; Karau & Eagly, 1999; Lemoine et al., 2016; Mendez & Busenbark, 2015; Ragins, 1988; Van Vugt & Spisak, 2008), and perceptions of leadership style and ability (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly et al., 1995; Eagly et al., 2003).

Individuals/subordinates have expectations not only for how women and men should behave in general but also for how male and female leaders should behave. Lord and Maher (1993) held that, as a leader behaves with a subordinate’s
expectations consistently, subordinates rate the leader as effective. Indeed, Lord and Maher’s (1993) leadership categorization theory posited that individuals hold mental representations (prototypes) by which leaders should behave. A person’s prototype affects many aspects: his/her attention, encoding, and schema information (Phillips & Lord, 1982). Physical features associated with sex, ethnicity, and race may activate prototypes, which may affect the perceiver’s expectations for male or female leaders (Lord & Emrich, 2001). Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonksy (1992) found that male leaders were evaluated slightly more favorable than female leaders, primarily when leaders were described using a masculine leadership style. Dominant women who use more assertive speech are less influential to men than women who are less dominant or assertive (Carli, 1990; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). Women who express anger tend to be evaluated less favorably than men (Glomb & Hulin, 1997; Lewis, 2000).

Building on Heilman’s (1983, 2001) assertion that women who aspire to leadership positions face a perceived lack of fit, Statham (1987) suggested that sex-differentiated management may exist. In her study, she found that female leaders were perceived as more task-oriented and focused on their followers (1987). Women leaders interacted more with subordinates, and followers felt that the female leaders paid close attention to everything happening within their purview. On the other hand, men, she found, were perceived to be more self-focused, more distant from their followers, and emphasized individual leader power over people and situations. Followers felt that the male leader led from a distant, “stay out of it” manner (Statham, 1987).
Paustian-Underdahl et al. (2014), in a meta-analytic study of forty-nine years of research of contextual moderators of perceptions of leadership effectiveness, presented several notable findings. First, they found the moderating effect of the relationship between a leader’s role and the perception of that leader’s effectiveness, observing that different results occur depending on whether self- or other ratings serve as the measure of the leader’s effectiveness. Second, consistent with role congruity theory, gender differences were moderated by the extent to which the examined firm was male- or female-dominated. The follower’s perception tended to support the view that the view the male leader was more effective if the organization was male dominant. Paustian-Underdahl et al. (2014) found the results were consistent with Eagly et al.’s (1995) results, although the effects seem to have waned over time (suggesting time may have a moderating effect). Paustian-Underdahl et al.’s quantitative findings showed $d = .12, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.09, .32]$, while Eagly et al.’s (1995) results were for $d = .42, 95\% \text{ CI} [.32, .52]$.

Third, they found that certain leadership roles (in business, education, for example) may be incongruent with the male gender role, thereby negatively affecting the perceived success of the male leader. Fourth, women are seen to be more effective than men in middle management and senior leadership positions. Through the lens of Foschi's (2000) double standards of leadership model whereby women are perceived to be seen as more effective than men in top leadership positions because of the perceptions of the extra competence of the female leader, Paustian-Underdahl et al., (2014) contended that role congruity theory may be supplemented to explicate that the
perceptions of extra competence may override perceptions of women’s incongruity. Fifth, gender-related stereotypes regarding perceptions of female leadership effectiveness appear to have slightly shifted from Eagly et al. (1995) in that women leaders are being viewed more effectively by both men and women as the number of women has increased in the workplace, further suggesting the potential moderating effect of time. However, any potential moderating effect of time is beyond the scope of this study.

Stereotype activation theory (2001) postulates that if a stereotype becomes cognitively accessible in certain situations, it will affect and influence behaviors and attitudes (Marx, Brown, & Steele, 1999; Wheeler & Petty, 2001a; Wheeler, Jarvis, & Petty, 2001). As the stereotype is triggered, so is the cognitive accessibility of traits and characteristics ascribed to the stereotyped group members (Wheeler & Petty, 2001). For example, society has embedded the belief that entrepreneurship is associated with a masculine stereotype. Female entrepreneurs, either explicitly or implicitly, are made aware of the masculine stereotype and may be negatively influenced by how they think and act on task-specific entrepreneurship behaviors (Sweida & Reichard, 2013).

These deeply held societal views skew expectations of female leaders, thereby reinforcing stereotypes and biases regarding female leadership effectiveness (McGoGan, Cooper, Durkin, & O’Kane, 2015). These persistent beliefs significantly restrict women’s leadership effectiveness by compromising their leadership authority, forcing them to overcome significant resistance to their leadership when compared to
men (Davis, Babakus, English, & Pett, 2010; Eagley, 2007; Eagly, 2005). Research (Fine, 2010; Gorman & Kmec, 2007; Hersch, 2006; Marlow & McAdam, 2013) has demonstrated that

Occupational segregation arises from associations between essential gender-based attributes so jobs requiring forms of caring (a stereotypical feminine attribute), or with feminized domestic associations such as cleaning are seen as natural extensions of womanhood, and so, do not involve learned skills or competencies (Marlow & McAdam, 2012, p. 117).

Such stereotypes perpetuate gender differences and segregation in business. Outside the garment trades, for instance, where women are perceived to have the requisite skills, women are still vastly outnumbered by men in industrial occupations, where the perceived skills needed to be successful are predominantly masculine (Caraway, 2006; Foner, 1987; Prieto-Carrón, 2008).

Social Role Theory

Social role theory, a foundational predecessor of role congruity theory, may explain gender-role stereotyping. According to social role theory, perceivers infer that a correspondence exists between a person's actions and that person's inner dispositions; therefore, the descriptive nature of gender roles originates in the beliefs of others rather than in the person demonstrating the behavior (Cenkci & Ozcelik, 2015; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Heilman et al., 2004). Eagly and Steffen (1984) argued that gender stereotypes are learned and promulgated by individual observation of the unequal distribution of men and women in various social roles (Dasgupta & Asgari,
The supposition here is that there are traits and behavioral tendencies perceived to be desirable for each gender in addition to the social expectations of the roles that men and women should occupy (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Peachey & Burton, 2011). Men are expected to display more agentic qualities such as aggressiveness, competitiveness, dominance, self-confidence, and self-sufficiency (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000; Eagly, 1987; Moran, 1992). Conversely, the expectation for women is that they will be more communal, having traits such as affectionate, gentle, helpful, kind, sensitive, and sympathetic (Eagly et al., 2000; Eagly, 1987; Schein, 1973).

Arguing that the assignment of gender responsibilities is based on assumptions, social role theory concentrates on the historical separation of work and duties between males and females (Bongiorno, Bain, & David, 2014; Botes, 2014; Collins, Burrus, & Meyer, 2014; Johnson & Eagly, 1990; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly et al., 1995; Elprana et al., 2015). By focusing on the culturally developed norms roles, one may better understand stereotypical behaviors exhibited by men and women (Cameron & Nadler, 2013; Willemsen, 2002).

Social role theory addresses and attempts to explain the interactions between men and women within groups and societies, as well as economic systems, as these interactions have been developed and evolved by social networks (Botes, 2014; Carli, 1999). Historically, men and women may have been assigned tasks consistent with their physical strength, attributes, or abilities (Porter, 2009). Even as technology, economics, and social systems evolved, these stereotypical assigned roles remained (Cameron & Nadler, 2013; Porter, 2009). Porter (2009) argued that some perceived
gender role positionings (masculine or feminine) have become associated with the occupied social roles rather than to their sex (male or female).

Social role theory, unlike role congruity theory, addresses the workplace gender roles rather than the prejudice women face in the workplace (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Koenig et al., 2011; Porter, 2009).

According to Eagly and Karau (2002), social role theory suggests that people should behave in a manner that is consistent with their societal gender roles. It is based on the idea that a role defines how an individual is expected to act, how the individual should occupy the role, how the individual should perceive that role, and how the person ultimately behaves (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly et al., 1995; Karau & Eagly, 1999; Porter, 2009).

**Glass Cliff Phenomenon**

While research has recently begun to show more positive reactions to women’s leadership and their effectiveness (Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014), women are still less likely than men to hold positions of authority, receive or have the opportunity for promotion, be part of support systems, or garner rewards in their leadership roles (Bruckmüller, Ryan, Rink, & Haslam, 2014; Haslam & Ryan, 2007; Hoobler, Lemmon, & Wayne, 2014; Lemoine et al., 2016; Ryan et al., 2016; Surawicz, 2016).

The glass cliff phenomenon was first presented through archival research conducted and published by Ryan and Haslam (2005). Data collected from their study of 100 FTSE companies listed on the London Stock exchange suggested that women may have a leadership advantage for companies during downturns or those facing
financial or other significant crises (Ryan & Haslam, 2005), perhaps partially explaining the increase in women’s presence in top leadership during the global financial crisis post-2007 (Bruckmüller et al., 2014; Ellemers, Rink, Derks, & Ryan, 2012; Ryan et al., 2016). Ryan and Haslam (2005) posited that, because of the inherent uncertainty involved, crises facilitate risk-taking behaviors to foster novel, innovative, and creative ideas (Boin & Hart, 2003; Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). Further, Ryan and Haslam (2005) contend that women are afforded previously unavailable opportunities for leadership positions because women “are seen to have particular skills and traits that make them particularly suited to dealing with these [crisis] situations” (p. 449).

During times of organizational crisis, research (Dohrn, Lopez, & Reinhardt, 2015; Meindl, 1995; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985; Ryan et al., 2016) suggested that leaders are subjected to much more intensive scrutiny by followers. Followers are more likely to blame those leaders for poor organizational performance rather than other situational factors (Ryan et al., 2016). Further, leaders experience greater scrutiny and pressure from stakeholders (Ryan et al., 2016). Pearson and Clair (1998) found that during times of crisis, organizations experience higher rates of leadership turnover, potentially resulting in damaging future career prospects. Ryan et al. (2016) theorized women in these glass cliff positions undergo more harsh scrutiny and criticism because of three reasons: times of crisis, the appointment of a female leader, and role incongruity (Brescoll et al., 2013; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014). Because of the focus on situations of crisis and the
mixed research into it, the glass cliff phenomenon will not be utilized for this study beyond a review of relevant literature.

**Role Congruity Theory**

As postulated by Eagly and Karau (2002), role congruity theory examines the association between gender roles and the other social roles enacted by individuals (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ferguson, 2018). It predicts that women encounter more difficulties ascending to leadership roles because of a common prejudice that women possess fewer leadership traits than men (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000). Ridgeway (2001) argued that the primary means used by people to understand and engage in social behavior is gender. Women in leadership roles continue to be stereotypically judged based on female, communal attributes such as nurturing and mothering (Peachey & Burton, 2011; Porter, 2009; Ye, Wang, Wendt, Wu, & Euwema, 2016).

Eagly and Carli (2007) maintained that people tend to associate male and female leaders according to how they associate their feelings about men and women in general. Once they have categorized a person as a leader, they frame that person into their expectations based on those associations (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Therefore, women may suffer hindrances in leadership, thereby promotion, because of prejudice against them from opposition when women occupy leader roles (Eagly, 2007; Peachey & Burton, 2011).

Eagly and Karau (2002) advocated that agentic characteristics are distinctly male traits in leadership roles and are incompatible with communal qualities that tend to be associated with women. They described agentic traits as those more strongly
associated with men, such as assertive, controlling, confident, aggressive, ambitious, dominant, independent, self-confident, and self-sufficient. For women, Eagly and Karau (2002) noted that communal qualities that are more associated with women are generally concerned for the welfare of others with traits of affection, kindness, sympathy, sensitivity, gentleness, and compassion.

Role congruity theory is an evolutionary step from social role theory. It advanced the notion that women leaders face potential prejudice since leadership ability is generally ascribed to men who display agentic qualities rather than women who exhibit communal (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Peachey & Burton, 2011). Role congruity theory is similar to social role theory in that both seek to explain the concepts of gender roles and leader behavior and how the two interact (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eddleston & Powell, 2008; Lemoine et al., 2016; Porter, 2009; Ye et al., 2016). Further, role congruity theory contends that women (1) may be disadvantaged in securing leadership positions because they are not perceived as qualified because they lack the necessary leadership skills, and (2), even if a woman occupies a leadership position, she may be unfavorably evaluated because she “may be perceived as violating the gender norm ascribed to women” (Peachey & Burton, 2011, p. 418).

Empirical research has shown that the masculinity of leader role expectations are, in fact, very robust and have been found across nationalities (Cenkci, Ozcelik, 2015; Schein, 2001), in a variety of industries/services (Brenner et al., 1989), and by a variety of methods (Rosette & Tost, 2010; Willemsen, 2002).
In her research, Brescoll (2016) found that women are perceived as being warmer, kind, nurturing (communal) but possessing less agentic (aggressive, dominant, ambitious, independent) than men. As followers (both male and female) typically desire leaders whose style is more agentic, there tends to be a perceived lack of inherent and necessary characteristics within female leaders in potential success (Brescoll, 2016). In male-dominated work, women may also face prejudice in securing leadership positions and might encounter issues maintaining those positions once they receive them because they do not possess the desired agentic characteristics based on subordinates’ expectations (Peachey & Burton, 2011).

Gender role incongruity, as defined by Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra (2006), is “the congruity between gender and other roles, including leadership style” (p. 51). Deeply rooted in social role theory, role incongruity holds that in leadership, for example, certain traits are both expected and, to some extent, required for specific role success as perceived by others, in this case, followers (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Hirschfeld, Jordan, Feild, Giles, & Armenakis, 2005; Hirschfeld & Thomas, 2011). Meta-analytic research by Eagly and Karau (2002) showed that the approval of the communal qualities of women versus the agentic characteristics of men is demonstrated by the beliefs held regarding gender ideals, the beliefs that males and females hold of their most ideal self, and attitudes and responses of others regarding both the prescriptive and perceived roles and responsibilities of men and women.
Role incongruence envisions the type of person evaluators believe may be optimal for a given role and the degree to which the person may or may not differ from the ideal characteristics necessary for that role (Hirschfeld & Thomas, 2011). That dyadic situation may provide a means for bias, mainly if the evaluator differs significantly from the person s/he is scrutinizing. Hirschfeld and Thomas (2011) created and tested a model that examined the perception of a leader with several variables: gender, age, and knowledge mastery. Their findings presented a potential correlation between the perception of leadership success as dependent upon the age and gender of the leader and the leader’s knowledge of the tasks associated with his/her leadership role. They found that males tended to more negatively evaluate women, especially as both they and the female leader's age, than analogous males (Hirschfeld & Thomas, 2011). Additionally, they observed that women with higher degrees of self-efficacy with higher aspirations for career advancement differed greatly than male counterparts with similar traits (Hirschfeld & Thomas, 2011). Though their findings support a slight degree of age bias, the results of their study using their model indicated the existence of significant degrees of gender preferences in both career decision, knowledge mastery, and follower gender preference (Hirschfeld & Thomas, 2011).

Role incongruity has profound effects on discrimination and prejudice in that leaders are perceived as legitimate if that role aligns with social expectations (Ferguson, 2018). Eagly and Karau (2002) theorized that role incongruity leads to two forms of discrimination and prejudice toward female leaders. First, because of
descriptive gender norms, people have *a priori* beliefs about males and females based on stereotyped gender roles. Because agentic qualities ascribed to men closely resemble those attributed to leadership more so than do the communal attributes ascribed to women (Hoobler et al., 2014; Lemoine et al., 2016), women are more likely to experience obstacles to access these roles if they engage in behavior incongruous with perceived expectations. Second, when men and women who already perform or engage in social roles that deviate from expected gender roles, they will experience prejudice and discrimination. Communal performance by men or agentic actions by women is evaluated less favorably and seen as less legitimate because of a violation of prescriptive gender norms about what men and women ought to do (Eagly, 2018; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Koenig et al., 2011; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014).

Eagly and Karau (2002) identified two types of prejudice that women face: descriptive and injunctive. Descriptive is an indication of gender stereotype leading people to believe women are less qualified than men for leadership (Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Wang et al., 2013). Injunctive is a notice of stereotype that suggests that, as women display desirable leadership characteristics (agentic), they are perceived less favorably because their behavior is not consistent with female behavior expectations (Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Wang et al., 2013).
Conceptually, role congruity theory describes the prejudice that women leaders face in many circumstances because of the perceived incongruity between the female gender role and the leadership role (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Porter, 2009; Wang et al., 2013). This theory is useful in this present study to possibly explain the perception of female leaders on whether they are competent, qualified, or capable of being promoted to more senior levels of leadership roles based on their behavior and gender stereotypes.

**Power**

The etymology of the word power, like the construct of power, is complex. Its root is in the French word, *pouvoir*, meaning power. *Pouvoir* is derived from the Latin *protestas* or *potential*, which means *ability*. The word *ability* is derived from the Latin *potere*, meaning to be able to. In French, the noun *pouvoir* implies power, and the verb *pouvoir*, like with Latin, means having the ability to. However, no English verb form exists, thereby complicating the attainment of a scholarly approved application and conceptualization of the word, power (De-Moll, 2010; Wrong, 1995).

The basic tenants of power and influence theories argue “the power possessed by a leader is important not only for influencing subordinates, but also for influencing peers, superiors, and people outside the organization” (Yukl & van Fleet, 1992, p. 160). Power is a complex phenomenon, and, following Katz (1998), it is necessary to distinguish power from authority and influence, as they “conflate terms that can lead to confusion” (p. 421). For her, power includes the ability to influence and impact the roles and tasks of others; therefore, authority and influence are integral aspects of
power usage (Katz, 1998). Liu, Liu, and Wu (2010) define power “as the degree of discretion that individuals possess in deciding the allocation and usage of personal or organizational resources in their work” (p 1438).

Those individuals who have or develop prominent levels of political skill are more likely to gather power through influence. Upward mobility and success are related more to political skill and networking than to above-average performance records (Liu et al., 2010). Although the possession of resources does not necessarily or automatically confer power, leaders with political shrewdness understand how to seek and manage power effectively and skillfully. Indeed, as Wilensky (1967) observes, one’s ability to influence others is inextricably linked to social power. Effective leadership requires the successful use of power and influence tactics (Byrd, 2008); however, the exercise of power may be positive or negative (Botes, 2014).

Noted social psychologists Tedeschi and Bonoma distinguished power from influence, force, and authority, but acknowledged that power, as a descriptive and explanatory construct, is used by social scientists because of its “generic, intuitive appeal” (Tedeschi & Bonoma, 1972). Modern definitions of power do not necessarily distinguish power from influence but, instead, show a potential link between the two. For example, Fiske (2010) said that “power is the ability to exert influence” or “the amount of force one person can induce on another” (p. 546). Eden (2001) observed a link between control and power and influence, a view supported by Fiske (2010) in what Fiske called power as control. When one has power, one can control or influence the behavior of others (Eden, 2001).
Podsakoff & Schriesheim (1985) conducted an extensive review of power and argued the most prevalent (at the time) power construct classification was French and Raven’s power bases (French & Raven, 1959; Keshet et al., 2006). French and Raven (1959) identified five basic categories of power:

1. Coercion—the threat of punishment
2. Reward—the promise of monetary and/or nonmonetary compensation
3. Legitimacy—drawing on one’s right to influence
4. Expertise—relying on one’s superior knowledge
5. Reference—enhancing the target’s identification with an influence agent

[Information power—the presentation of convincing and logical material possessed by a person—was added in 1965 by Raven; however, information power is considered part of or an extension of expert power (Botes, 2014). As such, most psychological measures derived from French and Raven’s bases of social power do not include information power as a sixth base (Botes, 2014)]. See Figure 1 for an illustration of French and Raven’s (1959) model.

In 1965 and 1993, Raven broadened the original taxonomy to include fourteen current bases of power and a detailed power interaction model. A comprehensive review of relevant literature conducted by Elias (2008) noted that Raven’s expansion has gone relatively unnoticed. Even though other research may have identified additional sources of power (Morgan, 1986, for example), French and Raven’s typology has proven to be small to be efficient and measurable, large to be sufficient for identification and classification of power, durable to stand the test of time, and
useful for explaining how it is used in relationships (Botes, 2014). For those reasons, all other theoretical frameworks and constructs were not considered. Additionally, political power is not considered for this study since political power is not a distinct facet of French and Raven’s (1959) model, nor is it present in subsequent models.

Figure 1. French and Raven (1959) Social Power Bases.

**Power Dynamics of a Relationship**

Social exchange and social influence theories tend to explicate relationships as a means of cost/benefit (Botes, 2014). Two individuals who are involved in a mutual relationship develop an arrangement of outcomes for both individuals, whereby the benefits outweigh the costs (Botes, 2014; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Each individual in that dyadic relationship measures potential outcomes against his or her internal standard of needs and desires, comparing the relationship against competing alternatives (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Internal standards order the attractiveness of the relationship, and alternatives to that relationship determine the survivability of it (Botes, 2014).
When a particular relationship garners more benefits than other options, individuals within the dyad are more dependent on the relationship (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). The greater the dependency on the relationship, the less power the individual holds (Beckman & Phillips, 1999; Botes, 2014). With regular benefits arising from the relationship, the more the member/recipient depends upon the other relationship member who provides the benefit(s) (Blau, 1964). The recipient is, therefore, subject to the power of the other member’s power (Blau, 1964), and the suspension of the benefits from the source member is considered punitive (Blau, 1964).

Astley and Sachdeva (1995) argued that power is present within organizational configurations and may exist between individuals or individual and group. They identified three sources of power within the organization: hierarchical authority, resource control, and network centrality (Astley & Sachdeva, 1995). Hierarchical authority focuses on the power that comes from formal decrees arising from official positions within a leadership hierarchy (Anderson & Brion, 2014; Astley & Sachdeva, 1995). Power resulting from the ability to control resources and supply them to others is resource control (Astley & Sachdeva, 1995; Tregaskis, 2003; Zigarmi, Roberts, & Randolph, 2015). Network centrality encompasses an individual’s location in an advantageous position within the hierarchy, and the better one’s position, the more resources and information are available (Astley & Sachdeva, 1995; Mendez & Busenbark, 2015; Neubert & Taggar, 2004).
**Legitimate Power**

Legitimate power, also known as positional power, occurs when one has the ability to influence another person’s behavior because of the position the person occupies within the firm or organization (Atwater & Yammarino, 1996; Blois & Hopkinson, 2013; Botes, 2014; Drea, Bruner, & Hensel, 1993; French & Raven, 1959). Consequently, legitimate power may be viewed as authority originating within the organization and flowing outward through a command structure (Botes, 2014; Lunenburg, 2012). Socialization processes, as well as cultural norms, may legitimize power, further exacerbating gender stereotypes (Botes, 2014). Haralambos and Holborn (2008) argued that, according to Judith Butler’s theory of performativity (1990), power differences between men and women are a natural phenomenon that has been naturalized by society. Women are viewed, therefore, both socially and culturally, subordinate to men because of stereotypical views of the masculinization of authority and superiority (Botes, 2014; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Haralambos & Holborn, 2008).

**Reward Power**

Reward power is dependent upon a leader’s ability to “administer positive, and remove or decrease negative outcomes to the follower” (Atwater & Yammarino, 1996, p. 5). A leader may affect the behaviors of followers by providing the followers with things they wish to receive (promotion or bonus) or removing obstacles (longer hours, relaxation of dress code rules) (Botes, 2014; Dang & Vo, 2014; Drea et al., 1993; Elias, 2008; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998; Raven, 2008).
One who exercises reward power has the potential to exert control or may influence another’s behavior that may lead to increased efficiency or enhanced performance (Botes, 2014). Lunenburg (2012) contended that the relationship between the power holder and target might be either positive or negative, and power relations between the power holder and the target may range from a “strongly positive association between the two variables to weakly positive and no relationship between the two” (p. 3).

**Coercive Power**

One may affect the behavior of another using coercive power, most often observed through perceived threats or punishments to an employee through reprimands, poor work tasks, critical suppression information, suspension, demotion, or termination (Botes, 2014; Lunenburg, 2012; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, & Ochana-Levin, 2004). Botes (2014) argued a close link exists between misuse of coercive power and negative social behaviors such as bullying and workplace violence, including sexual harassment or assault. Botes (2014) further stated that one might engage coercive power through “threat, confrontation, and punitive behavior” (p. 18), which may influence not only the relationship between the power holder and the target but also may affect a group through the promotion of the power holder’s social agenda in the form of group oppression or suppression (racism, sexism).

**Expert Power**

Expert power is the capacity to sway others using advice, knowledge, and/or information afforded to a person that is directly related to the extent followers attribute
knowledge and expertise to the power holder (Lunenburg, 2012). Even within the lowest ranks of a hierarchical structure, one may hold expert power based solely upon the specific knowledge s/he holds within a certain field or in a particular environment (Botes, 2014; Carli, 1999; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1990). Expert power may be evident within a social hierarchy through the implicit or explicit rank order of individuals within a valued social dimension (Botes, 2014) and may be divided into a formal and informal hierarchy. Botes (2014) said a formal hierarchy is the differentiated role structure, and power is accorded to individuals based on the hierarchy level s/he currently possesses relative to his/her expertise. Informal hierarchies occur in groups where one may form inferences or make judgments of another’s competence and power based on quick and limited observations rooted in one’s stereotyped centered expectations (Botes, 2014; Carli, 1999; French & Raven, 1959; Gary Yukl & Falbe, 1991).

Social hierarchy creates social order and indicates a ranking order connecting hierarchical relations with disparate specialized labor roles (Anderson & Brion, 2014; Botes, 2014; Wilson, 1997). Those connections have a motivational function both for the power holder and the target, providing incentives for both to ascend to higher positions of authority and power (Magee & Langner, 2008). The desire to gain more power may instigate a desire to gain more skills/knowledge to achieve higher rank levels, thus incentivizing individuals to work harder to achieve firm goals (Abendroth, Melzer, Kalev, & Tomaskovic-Devey, 2017; Botes, 2014). Therefore, power and status may be seen as the basis of social hierarchy with individuals ranked by the
amount of resources they possess or to which they have access (Magee & Langner, 2008). Magee and Galinsky (2008) purported that an individual or group is respected where power is a social relation and resources are valued through means of asymmetry because “power can lead to status, and status can lead to power” (p. 20).

**Referent Power**

Referent power “develops out of the admiration of another and a desire to be like that person” (Lunenburg, 2012, p. 4). Power holders receive referent power from others and may evoke positive feelings such as worth, approval, personal acceptance from followers (Botes, 2014; French & Raven, 1959). High-powered individuals’ behaviors are influential such that one with less power may adopt similar behaviors as the high-powered individual to be similar to the high-powered person (Botes, 2014). Social learning theory (Bandura, 1971) argues that most behaviors displayed by people are learned through the influence of example, either deliberately or otherwise. Leaders, particularly those using a(n) authentic, participative, or inclusive leadership style, who have a positive effect on their subordinates, increase the influence of referent power (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Botes, 2014).

A power holder’s capability to influence a target is the maximum possible influence the power holder may exercise (French & Raven, 1959), even though s/he may not exert all of that power in any given particular situation (Elias, 2008). For example, even though a manager may possess the power to terminate employment or grant a monetary reward, s/he may not resort to those measures to make use of his/her power. Additionally, power and influence do not always occur when the power holder
possesses a higher status or rank than a target (Blickle, Schütte, & Wihler, 2018; Elias, 2008). Much research conducted by Yukl and colleagues (Yukl & van Fleet, 1992; Yukl, Falbe, & Cecilia, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1991; Yukl, Seifert, & Chavez, 2008) differentiates power usage between upward (supervisor being influenced by a subordinated) downward (supervisor influencing a subordinate), and lateral (peers influencing each other).

**Social Power**

One’s ability as an agent to facilitate change in attitude(s), behavior(s), or belief(s) by using available resources to the agent is social power (Elias, 2008; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, 2008). Dependent upon from which of the six bases of power (coercive, reward, legitimate, expert, referent, informational) identified by French and Raven (1959) the power holder chooses, the target may resist or comply. Social influence occurs when one utilizes one’s words or actions to influence or change another person (French & Raven, 1959; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, 1993, 2008; Spino, Dinnebeil, & McInerney, 2013). The ability one has to facilitate that change is social power (Spino et al., 2013), and the resources one utilizes to engage the change are power strategies (Elias, 2008; French & Raven, 1959; Spino et al., 2013). The distinction between social power and social influence is that social power involves social influence while social influence pertains to the actual influences or the enactment of influences tactics to achieve compliance (De-Moll, 2010; Raven, 1965). Again, the behavior of a high-powered individual may be very influential, and the
social interaction is a means whereby individuals obtain power to fulfill their needs and gain an advantage.

**Theory of Tokenism**

Kanter’s seminal work *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977, 1993, Kindle Ereader) defined power as “the ability to get things done, to mobilize resources, to get and use whatever a person needs for the goals he or she is attempting to complete” (Chapter 7, Power, para 2). For Kanter, while she draws focus on the gender of the organization's member’s, she does not view differences in gendered mode of behavior but rather as differences in power, and power is a fixed amount that circulates through the organization (Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lewis & Simpson, 2012). She purported the theory of tokenism, whereby numerical group composition could influence organizational processes (Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013). Group proportions are linked to social interactions and experiences, and, as these proportions fluctuate, so do the work connections of the group members (Gustafson, 2008; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013).

Kanter analyzed how interactions within the group/organization are influenced by different numbers of people from separate social types within the groups (Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013). In particular, she concentrated on groups with skewed gender ratios—those with a high proportion of men and a small number of women, which she labels “tokens” (Kanter, 1977, 1993). She argued that the groups with majority male members (dominants) control and determine the group and its subsequent culture (Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013).
As dominants develop more awareness and sensitivity to the minority members (tokens) of the group, three things happen. First, a heightened awareness of the tokens creates performance pressure for the token (Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013). Second, the token becomes isolated as the dominants emphasize their sense of commonality (Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013). Third, role entrapment occurs where the distortion of the social characteristics of the tokens becomes engendered by the dominant’s stereotypical beliefs (Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013).

From a feminist perspective, how one overcomes these stereotypes is to increase the number of women within organizations to create more gender-balanced groups (Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013). As groups have smaller amounts of tokens, Kanter (1977) argued that a shift in the group’s dynamics occurs leading to a reduction in the visibility of the minority, thus creating psychological discomfort because of a less accepting culture (Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lewis & Simpson, 2012; Poutanen & Kovalainen, 2013). Women’s token status impacts their ability to secure power or secure access to power, yet men possess the majority of power, generally, within organizations (Lewis & Simpson, 2012).

Taken all together, the theory of tokenism provides support for affirmative action because of the stereotypical belief systems of the dominants becoming embedded in the structure of the organization but does so because of power dynamics.
rather than gender isolation(ing) behaviors (Lewis & Simpson, 2012). For that reason, Kanter’s theory of tokenism was not considered.

**Gender and Power**

Gender plays a significant role in power—how it is perceived, distributed, reinforced, or usurped—and research shows that women face inequalities related to power (Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2016a). Gender is distinct from the term “sex” in that sex is used to denote whether a person is male or female; however, gender indicates the masculinity or femininity of a person (Botes, 2014; Haralambos & Holborn, 2008). Kendall (2010) agreed that gender has masculine and feminine connotations but argued that gender is also related to masculine and feminine cultural qualities. Gender and sex are not necessarily separate from each other: to be a male does not automatically confer masculinity (Botes, 2014). Indeed, gender is a societal construction, molded by society’s diverse perceptions, views, and beliefs (Botes, 2014; Kendall, 2010). From an early age, men and women are reared from birth to occupy feminine or masculine role expectations, and those expectations entail different approaches to power (Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2016b, 2016a; Wood & Eagly, 2015). Thus, unequal power distribution is significantly entangled with gender (Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2016a).

Similar to trait theory, power motivation, that is “an interpersonal difference in the desire to influence others” (Schuh et al., 2014), tends to follow the gender traits of communal and agentic because most in leadership positions are male. Therefore, power is distributed, and people are motivated more from agentic than communal
characteristics (Liu et al., 2010; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2013). Power motivation, though malleable, tends to favor agentic traits rather than communal, leading to greater degrees of role incongruity (Eagly et al., 1995; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Schuh et al., 2014). In 1998, Brunner and Schumaker found that women inclined to create power for themselves through empowering others and facilitated change via communal roles (nurturing, caring) while men used power to achieve their personal view of the group’s common good rather than pursue the collective’s view of the common good. Isaac, Behar-Horenstein, and Koro-Ljungberg (2009) called the women’s perspective “power with” and the men “power over” (p. 143).

In general, men tend to be more assertive, and women envision themselves as the objects of assertive or aggressive behavior; therefore, women find power from internal resources while men find power and strength from external action (van Wagner & Swanson, 1979). Research suggests that traditional socialization for women has led them to be less aggressive, less independent, more concerned about likeability, and less able to problem solve in certain situations (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Hernandez Bark et al., 2016; Koenig et al., 2011; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; van Wagner & Swanson, 1979; Wang et al., 2013). Women who assume leadership or supervisory positions may face significant problems arising from disparate socialization patterns concerning power (Golgeci, Murphy, & Johnston, 2017; Keshet et al., 2006; McLaughlin, Uggen, & Blackstone, 2012; Oreglia & Srinivasan, 2017; van Wagner & Swanson, 1979).
Early research by Johnson (1976), who conducted two empirical studies using French and Raven’s five power bases into the study of women and power, found that sex-role stereotypes affected the use of power. Her research found that men and women were expected to use power styles differently, and there are negative consequences, particularly for women, in that differential use (Johnson, 1976, p. 100). According to results from her study, people strongly expected men to use expert, legitimate, information, direct reward, and coercion as sources of power (Johnson, 1976). Personal rewards, coercive power, referent power, helplessness, and indirect power forms were viewed as appropriate for women, leading Johnson (1976) to argue that “Females…are limited in our society’s expectations to the less powerful cases” (p. 108).

Organizational and inequality researchers contend that differences in group power are among the fundamental issues contributing to organizational inequalities (Abendroth et al., 2017; Baron & Bielby, 2006; Kanter, 1977, 1993; Tilly, 1998). Research into gender power relations and theories involving it suggest that those in power positions tend to promote personal and group agendas, suggesting that male managers who exclude women from promotion or other equal opportunities are critical key contributors to gender inequities in the workplace (Abendroth et al., 2017; DiTomaso, Post, & Parks-Yancy, 2007; Stainback, Tomaskovic-Devey, & Skaggs, 2010). To combat inequalities, research indicates that as more women enter management positions or election to corporate boards the entrance of women into other leadership jobs improves (Cohen, Broschak, & Haveman, 1998; Kurtulus &
Findings from a study of ninety-four large German firms with 5,022 workers conducted by Abendroth et al. (2017) found that women managers are rare; their presence is generally in lower-managerial positions; they earn less than their male counterparts; and they have less access to organizational power. Abendroth et al.’s (2017) findings conveyed that women supervisors have less power than men highlighting that:

1. Women who had female supervisors made less earnings than men with male supervisors;
2. High-skilled men with a female supervisor made less than a high skilled male with a male supervisor;
3. Female supervisors were more likely to promote men rather than women because of a lack of access to organizational power; and
4. Formal human resources (HR) practices vastly influence the promotion of women into senior positions as long as the HR practices are transparent.

In a comprehensive meta-analysis of research on men, women, and power, Carli (1999), citing numerous studies to support this position, said “men generally possess higher levels of expert and legitimate power than women do and that women possess higher levels of referent power than men do” (p. 81). It follows that, since expert power is based on perceived rather than actual competence and people tend to
view women as less competent than men, women have less access to expert power (Carli, 1999; Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003). Carli (1999) continued by contending that legitimate power is less available to women since women tend not to demand or command respect and authority that men do and, consequently, do not earn the “right” to exercise influence over others (p. 85).

Empirical research of undergraduate students found that people responded better to self-promoting men than modest men, but modest women were more favorable than self-promoting women (Giacalone & Riordan, 1990; Wosinska, Dabul, Whetstone-Dion, & Cialdini, 1996). Conspicuous displays by women of competence and confidence were found to result in rejection, especially by men, whose legitimate power was perceived to be threatened by women who displayed those behaviors (Carli, 1999). Specifically, undergraduate men found that competent women and women who were self-promoting were unappealing (Rudman, 1998). Indeed, men reported that they favored women who appeared tentative rather than assertive and confident (Carli, 1990). Men felt threatened by task-oriented women who were articulate and confident (Carli, 1999).

Research does show that women have access to referent power since referent power is relationship-based and, therefore, does not conflict with perceptions of role congruity (Shapiro, Ingols, & Blake-beard, 2011). Groshev (2011) concluded that the various definitions of power are masculinized, so the language surrounding power terms are more relevant to men, including men’s wealth, influence, control, verbal authority, leadership, and strategies. The language of power maintains the status quo,
keeping those in power in power, and marginalizing, excluding, or silencing others
(Bruckmüller, Hegarty, & Abele, 2012; Fletcher, Bailyn, & Blake-Beard, 2009).

Women face a double-bind when they engage in behaviors that conflict with
stereotypical gender roles, which are then used to evaluate them and traditional
feminine negatively (Shapiro, Ingols, & Blake-Beard, 2011). Communal behavior,
nor masculine, agentic behaviors will be rewarded and are both often penalized
(Shapiro et al., 2011). A study by Denissen (2010) in a male-dominated building trade
showed that women were inhibited by gender dualities in language use. Women were
negatively evaluated for swearing as it violated the ideal of expected female behavior;
however, women were assessed negatively for not swearing because they were
perceived as not willing to engage in appropriate organizational norms (Denissen,
2010). Shapiro et al. (2011) said the double bind is difficult for women with power
usage when they “use power like a woman and [they are] seen as manipulative and
weak, or use power like a man and be seen as overly aggressive” (p. 720).

Differences within communication styles may contribute to the choice of
power base or power tactic. During social interactions, women tend to exhibit a more
social-emotional or relational orientation, whereas men are more likely to demonstrate
an unemotional, independent disposition (Eagly, 1987). Research indicates that
gender-related differences in communication during social interactions result from
gender role socialization (Davey, 2008; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985).

Getty (2006) suggested that verbal communication occurring among men and
women is entirely dissimilar, due, in part, she argued, to the differences in
communication purposes. Women, for example, tend to use verbal communication as a means of including others and establishing and maintaining relationships (Payne et al., 2001). Women also use language as a status equalizer to support each other and to match experiences (Getty, 2006). On the other hand, men tend to use spoken language as a way to establish and maintain individual status (Baldoni, 2004; Baxter, 2015; Eagly & Wood, 1999). Getty (2006) contended that men use language as a means to the end and for problem-solving instead of for listening and matching experiences with others. Verbal communication styles for women may be categorized as relational and supportive while men’s verbal communication is assertive and straightforward (Getty, 2006)

Communication differences between men and women may contribute to perceptions of power utilization (Getty, 2006). Possibly evolving from the ways by which girls were socialized (taught to be passive, not aggressive), many women have negative and/or uncomfortable feelings about power either when they use it or think about it (Payne, Fuqua, & Cangemi, 2001). Men, however, tend to be more comfortable with power, as men assume, according to research by Payne et al. (2001), that they are expected to wield authority. As with women, male perceptions of power possibly evolved from socialized behavior.

**Interpersonal Power Interaction Model**

A person’s culture, organization, and his/her individuality aid in the selection of an appropriate power strategy (Shapiro, Ingols, & Blake-Beard, 2011). An organization’s structure, norms, culture, as well as its external environment, affect
power strategy choice (Valley & Long-Lingo, 2001). Raven (1992) analyzed the tactics and actual usage of power, describing influence as an application of power. Shapiro et al. (2011) and (Hannagan, 2008) argued that an individual directs his/her power usage through genetics, hormones, and other mental and physiological means. Research undertaken by De-Moll (2010) found that much research, even in social science and psychology, tended to focus on an individual level and how that individual tries to (1) empower another, (2) get a desired object or outcome, or (3) fulfill his/her potential. Again, Fiske (2010) argued that a principal motive in power is control, and the control aspect of power allows the individual to feel successful in his/her environment.

According to Raven (1992, 2008), several reasons why a leader may utilize a power strategy exist. First, a leader wants to use the most effective strategy. Second, based on McClelland (1975), McClelland & Teague (1975), and Winter (1973), a leader with a need for power will utilize impersonal coercive power and legitimate position power (Elias, 2008; French & Raven, 1959; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, 2008). A leader with a strong need for affiliation and concern that they will be liked by their subordinate will more likely use referent power and reward power, making use most especially of personal reward power (Elias, 2008; French & Raven, 1959; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, 2008). Those with a need for achievement might make use of informational and expert power (Elias, 2008; French & Raven, 1959; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, 2008).
Raven (1992, 2008) described the process through which the power holder (or influencing agent as he called it) selects, implements, and evaluates the most appropriate use of a particular social base (Getty, 2006). The model consists of six main stages and may be viewed from either the power holder or the target of influence (target) (Raven, 1992). Those six stages are as follows (Getty, 2006; Raven, 1992):

1. Motivation to Influence
2. Assessment of Available Power Bases
3. Assessment of the Costs of Differing Influence Strategies
4. Preparing for the Influence Attempt
5. Choice of Mode of Influence
6. Assessing the Effects of Influence

Figure 2 provides an overview of Raven’s power/interaction model of interpersonal influence.

Figure 2. Raven’s (1992, 2008) Interpersonal Power Interaction Model
In 2008, Raven further modified his six bases of power into eleven disparate power bases and expanded his Interaction Model into the Interpersonal Power (IPIM). Table 1 lists those power bases, defines them, and provides an example of each. Negative referent, negative expert, and indirect informational were not originally part of the hierarchy; however, more current research indicates that the three are considered peripheral routes of persuasion and influence and, therefore, are included (Bélanger, Pierro, & Kruglanski, 2015; Pierro et al., 2013; Wilson, Erchul, & Raven, 2008).

Table 1. Definitions of Raven’s (1992, 2008) Social Power Bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Power Base</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive expert(^b)</td>
<td>Target complies because the agent is an expert in the field.</td>
<td>“My supervisor probably knew the best way to do the job.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative expert(^a)</td>
<td>Target does not comply because he/she assumes that the agent is using expertise in his/her own best interests.</td>
<td>“My supervisor is using his/her position for personal gain.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive referent(^b)</td>
<td>Target complies because he/she wants to be associated with or be viewed as similar to the agent.</td>
<td>“I saw my supervisor as someone I could identify with.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative referent(^a)</td>
<td>Target does not comply because he/she does not want to be associated with or be similar to the agent.</td>
<td>“My supervisor got his/her position because of being friends with the boss.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal reward(^c)</td>
<td>Target complies because he/she perceives that the agent can provide a tangible reward.</td>
<td>“My supervisor's actions could help me get a promotion.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenon</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reward</td>
<td>Target complies because he/she believes the agent will approve of or like him/her.</td>
<td>“I liked my supervisor, and his/her approval was important to me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal coercion</td>
<td>Target complies because he/she perceives that the agent has the power to punish him/her.</td>
<td>“My supervisor could make it more difficult for me to get a promotion.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal coercion</td>
<td>Target complies because he/she believes that the agent will disapprove of or dislike him/her.</td>
<td>“Just knowing that I was on the bad side of the supervisor would have upset me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct informational</td>
<td>Target complies because the information provided by the agent makes logical sense.</td>
<td>“Once it was pointed out, I could see why the change was necessary.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect informational</td>
<td>The target complies because he/she hears from another source how well a particular course of action worked in a similar situation.</td>
<td>“My coworker found a better way to run the machine.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate position</td>
<td>Target complies because the agent holds a position of authority.</td>
<td>“As a subordinate, I had an obligation to do as my supervisor said.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of reciprocity</td>
<td>The target complies after the agent has done something positive for the target. The target feels a need to reciprocate for this prior good deed.</td>
<td>“For past considerations, I had received, I felt obliged to comply.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of equity</td>
<td>The target complies as a way to compensate for previous hard work or suffering on the part of the agent</td>
<td>“I had made some mistakes and therefore felt that I owed this to him/her.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of dependence</td>
<td>Target complies because the agent is unable to do it himself/herself.</td>
<td>“I realized that a supervisor needs assistance and cooperation from those working with him/her.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65
Research has shown that these power tactics may be clustered into harsh or soft power tactics (Knippenberg, Knippenberg, Blaauw, & Vermunt, 1999; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998), depending upon the level of freedom of choice, the power holder allows the target when choosing whether or not s/he complies (Bélanger et al., 2015). Because they are not associated with enforceable rules which dictate and dispense either rewards or punishment, soft power tactics provide the broader range of choice (Bélanger et al., 2015; Pierro et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2008). Soft power tactics include expert, referent, personal reward, informational power, and legitimacy of dependence (Bélanger et al., 2015; Raven et al., 1998; Raven, 2008; Wilson et al., 2008).

In contrast, harsh power tactics pressure the target to comply with enforceable rules or norms which are supported by threats/promises of appropriate (negative or positive) consequences, thereby limiting the freedom to comply (Bélanger et al., 2015; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, 2008; Wilson et al., 2008). Harsh power tactics include personal and impersonal coercion, impersonal reward, legitimacy of position, equity, and reciprocity (Bélanger et al., 2015; Pierro et al., 2013; Raven, 2008; Wilson et al., 2008).
Several factors influence one’s choice of power tactics by power holders to elicit compliance from targets within the IPIM (Figure 2). Situational factors such as social norms, work setting, organizational culture, and corporate position along with personality factors such as self-esteem, need for power, desire for control, and self-preservation influence power tactic choice (Bélanger et al., 2015; Spino et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2008).

Figure 3. Process of Power Base Choice Based on Raven (1992, 2008)

According to Lines (2007), research lines are varied between power constructs and influence tactics, with some research contending that the two are inseparable and others recognizing two distinct phenomena, though intertwined to varying degrees. Those who argue that power and influence tactics are inseparable hold that the concept of power is not viable without some behavioral enactment (Lines, 2007). Raven takes this approach. The choice of power base depends upon the desired goal (Figure 3). In Raven’s (1992, 1998, 2008) approach and model, the influence tactic and power base are congruent. Indeed, they are the same.

In a quantitative study of 173 undergraduate students (78 male, 95 female), Offermann and Schrier (1985) found the following:
1. Women reported a higher likelihood of using Personal/ Dependent (tell him or her you really need support) and negotiation strategy (compromise)

2. Women reported more negative attitudes toward power than men

3. Men reported more negative attitudes of others’ power than women did (men felt threatened if others held power and they did not)

Taking the results of Offermann and Schrier (1985) and applying Raven (1992, 2008), women are more likely than men to use soft power bases, particularly legitimate power of dependence. Men are more likely to use indirect (try to manipulate another) and reward/coercion (offering a reward for cooperation) (Getty, 2006; Offermann & Schrier, 1985; Raven, 1992; Raven, 2008). Women appear to use more power and influence bases consistent with communal characteristics, while men appear to use more agentic.

Promotion

Gender/sex discrimination, including other forms of discriminatory actions within the employment areas of hiring, promotion, and wages, are illegal within Federal law under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as well as the Equal Pay Act of 1963 (Bognanno, 1987). Bognanno (1987) argued that sex discrimination at any level is complex, multifaceted, and difficult to quantify; however, empirical literature within her study found that sex discrimination has played a statistically significant role in pay and promotion decisions regarding women.
Comparable to men, women possess less managerial positions (Dencker, 2008). Some research suggests that lack of women in senior management may be the result of sex differences in hiring (Castilla, 2005; Dohrn et al., 2015; Fernandez, Castilla, & Moore, 2000; Gorman & Kmec, 2007). The most opportune time for a firm to discriminate based on a person’s sex is at the initial hiring point since those who are not selected have little information whether or not they were treated equitably (Levine, 2009; Petersen & Saporta, 2004). Dencker (2008) posited that barriers to women’s advancement and upward mobility eased in the 1970s and early 1980s when women were promoted at a higher rate (percentage) than men in upper levels (Petersen & Saporta, 2004; Rosenbaum, 1985). However, in the late 1980s to the early part of the 2000s, the net promotion of women slowed considerably (Dencker, 2008).

Promotions provide a direct measure of authority within the workplace, and most employees enter the firm at lower levels (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Of those entering the workforce at lower firm levels, some will rise to medium and senior levels of leadership within the same organization while others may move to different firms to garner higher positions, assuming that the employee wishes to advance (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003). Eagly and Carli (2007, 2003, 2016) found that women who hold positions of authority are less likely to have higher degrees of decision-making power regarding employees’ wages and promotions than comparable men, even if she holds the same job title as a man. Studies (Adshade & Keay, 2010; Trond, Petersen & Saporta, 2004; Prieto-Carrón, 2008; Seguino, 2000; Strom, 2006; Szymanska et al., 2018) using similar statistical means for examination of
discriminatory promotion processes as these studies analyzed wage gaps, controlling for human capital variables (skills, education, tenure, and experience). Eagly and Carli (2007) found that promotions occurred for women less than for men, women wait longer for promotions to supervisory roles, and women have a longer tenure between promotions (Beeson et al., 2012; Deschacht, De Pauw, & Baert, 2017; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Lawrence et al., 2018).

Proponents of the glass ceiling effect (Auster & Prasad, 2016; Baker & Cangemi, 2016; Ellemers et al., 2012; Furst & Reeves, 2008; Glass & Cook, 2016; Lyness & Heilman, 2006; Novo-Corti, Calvo, & Varela-Candamio, 2018; Powell, 1999; Surawicz, 2016) contend that as women are promoted they face increasing amounts of discrimination, becoming less likely than similar men to be promoted; however, large-scale U.S. data surveys have not generally shown such patterns (Baxter & Wright, 2000). Indeed, a large meta-analysis undertaken by Baxter and Wright (2000) of work data from the United States, Sweden, and Australia found that women face an almost equal bias at all levels when other variables (age, experience, tenure, education) are controlled (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Research conducted by Eagly and Carli (2007) found that, even in a female-dominated industry such as education and nursing, men are promoted faster than women, a condition coined by Sociologist Christine Williams as the glass escalator. However, a study of the glass escalator is beyond the scope of this study.
Instead of career changes, organizational promotions are the most common type of upward mobility for many workers (Harlan, 1989). Merton argued in his theory of adaptive behavior that a person’s expectations and ambitions for culturally valued goals are psychological revisions to socially organized opportunities (1968). He maintained that, in the U.S. labor market and American society in general, an incongruity exists between culturally prescribed ambitions that define success as an authentic objective for everyone and the socially organized paths for the achievement of that success (Harlan, 1989; Merton, 1968), and those opportunities generated from those paths are limited (Harlan, 1989). Therefore, those with limited opportunities seemed to be pessimistic about their desirability for attainment success because of the tension between their goals and the means of goal achievement (Merton, 1968).

Applying Merton’s theory to promotions, Kanter (1977, 1993) hypothesized a person’s attitudes regarding job advancement are psychological adaptations to the conflicts between the company’s culture of mobility and the restricted prospects for promotion. That clash creates a paradox whereby the firm pressures workers to value promotions as the most effective means of self-worth and ability identification, yet the company establishes a shortage of pathways for higher-level promotions due to the company’s hierarchical and pyramidal job structure (Harlan, 1989; Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lewis & Simpson, 2012). Lower-level workers withdrew from the organization’s cultural reference frame by lowering their level of promotion expectations because of the paradox, while those with higher opportunity jobs
internalize their success attitudes and express those beliefs with high expectations and ambitions for promotion (Kanter, 1977, 1993).

Another vein of research from the 1970s and 1980s (Gruenberg, 1980; Gurin, 1977; Kalleberg, 1977; Kalleberg & Losocco, 1983; Locke, 1976; Miller, 1980; Mortimer, 1979) revealed that attitudes toward promotion are attributable primarily to the individual's psychological needs, societal and organizational socialization, competing role demands, and worker bias(es) (Harlan, 1989). Through this lens, workers’ personal characteristics (age, gender, education) have a vital impact on how the workers find value, meaning, and satisfaction in their current job, and how they feel about promotion (Gruenberg, 1980; Gurin, 1977; Kalleberg, 1977; Kalleberg & Losocco, 1983; Locke, 1976; Miller, 1980; Mortimer, 1979).

Because of socialization experiences and stereotypical biases, gender differences in promotion attitudes are believed to originate outside of the workplace (Beeson et al., 2012; Cameron & Nadler, 2013; Clow & Ricciardelli, 2011; Harlan, 1989; Haslam & Renneboog, 2011; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Kalysh, Kulik, & Perera, 2016; Kulik & Olekalns, 2012). Harlan (1989) postulated that women who express perceived low ambition might have been reacting to limited job promotion opportunities. Women are more likely to occupy low promotion rate jobs, and managerial prejudice against promoting women and perceived promotion systems discrimination may cause women in the same field as men to be more skeptical as to whether they will be judged equitably by the same performance standards as men.
(Beeson et al., 2012; Diekman et al., 2002; Eagly et al., 1992; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Elprana et al., 2015; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafría, 2006; Harlan, 1989; Karau & Eagly, 1999; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Paustian-Underdahl, King, Rogelberg, Kulich, & Gentry, 2017; Wang et al., 2013).

Studies have shown that women face issues with advancement beyond middle management (Schnarr, 2012), and evidence suggests that male executives may have little concern to promote women to managerial roles, thereby perpetuating a climate of gender polarization (The Conference Board of Canada, 2013). As Kiser (2015) stated, "if men control promotion and advancement to upper-level positions, and an organization does not promote a culture of gender diversity, women are left behind and do not have the same opportunities as men for promotion" (p. 599).

A manager’s career success may be dependent upon the degree to which job assignments and promotions are challenging and conducive to the development of managerial skills (Dipboye, 1987). Fernandez (1981) found that thirty-four percent of the managers he surveyed felt that most female managers are placed in dead-end jobs. He did not compare women to men in his survey, leaving the possibility that men may suffer a similar effect (Dipboye, 1987; Fernandez, 1981). In a survey of 117 male and 117 female managers five years after receiving an MBA, Rosen, Templeton, and Kichline (1981) found that women were more likely to report that their given job assignments prevented them from developing social networks, and female managers
complained that they were stuck in menial, clerical tasks while their male counterparts were developing networks, making contacts, and being visible.

In a review of the literature surrounding female and male segregation within manufacturing, Levine (2009) found two areas missing from research: (1) a more apparent distinction between barriers limiting women from entering traditional male jobs along with identification of barriers limiting women from adequately performing in those jobs, and (2) formal institutions create unnatural divisions between the formal institution and informational interactions. Formal institutional structures include job application and promotion processes (for example, posting job openings in a predominantly male department within the department itself, thereby limiting female access) (Levine, 2009; Roos & Reskin, 1984). Manufacturing sex-specific segregation policies such as weight lifting requirements that limit a woman’s ability to occupy specific roles were commonplace before Title VII and are no longer mostly legal, yet the established stereotypical precedent often remains (Levine, 2009; MacLean, 2006).

Informal interactional factors include stereotypical gender roles and, even, harassment of female employees (Levine, 2009; McLaughlin et al., 2012). O’Farrell & Harlan (1984) argued that male coworkers might limit a woman’s advancement by withholding or refusing to assist in the training of women in new jobs. Supervisors may contend that the presence of women in male-dominated areas could lead to inappropriate sexual advances or liaisons, which could affect productivity (Milkman, 1982). Supervisors may limit or exclude women from promotions because of the
assertion of gender-based stereotypes such as women are not physically strong enough for specific manufacturing jobs (Levine, 2009; Milkman, 1982; O’Farrell & Harlan, 1984; Reskin & Padavic, 1988; Roos & Reskin, 1984).

Top leadership positions are those of authority (Bowles, 2012; Martell, Emrich, & Robison-Cox, 2012), and the use of that authority is to exercise legitimate power (Bélanger et al., 2015). Social structures legitimize the distribution of power throughout the organization, and the socialization processes of espoused values and social norms reinforce the social, power structure (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1993). Within the social structure are those whom French and Raven (1959) call “legitimizing agents,” and they occupy privileged places within the social structure and have the power to confer authority to others (Bowles, 2012). These social structures create stereotypical female-dominant career paths which relegate women to lower levels of leadership and bypass women for promotion beyond the lower to mid-levels of management (Bowles, 2012). Therefore, women, more so than men, require networking and legitimizing agents to gain access to promotions.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Overview

The study was a phenomenological qualitative study. Whereas quantitative studies focus on the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, qualitative approaches emphasize the processes and meanings of the lived experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Qualitative research encompasses a variety of methodologies, each with its own research paradigm, history, traditions, and method(s) of inquiry (De-Moll, 2010). Creswell & Poth (2017) identified five broad qualitative research traditions used today: case study, ethnography, grounded theory, narrative, and phenomenology. The qualitative method utilized for the study emerges from phenomenology—existential hermeneutic phenomenology.

Organization of the Remainder of the Chapter

The chapter’s first section includes detailed descriptions of ethical considerations, research questions and research design, research approach, and the quality management model used within this study. The second section of the chapter contains information covering the population of participants, demographics of participants, and instrumentation and procedures. The third section of the chapter includes the process of data collection, data analysis, and researcher positionality regarding the study. Validity of the study concludes this chapter.
Ethical Considerations

Researchers must take steps and precautions to protect both the integrity of the study and the safety and well-being of the participants (Creswell & Poth, 2017). To that end, the study instituted and followed procedures that involved voluntary informed consent that avoided deceitful acts, and each participant was provided an informed consent form before the interview, which was signed by the participant (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Grant, 2017). All necessary precautions to maintain the strictest levels of confidentiality were taken to ensure the highest quality of data was collected, and the protection of those providing was safeguarded (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Paley & Lilford, 2011).

Philosophical Worldview

Creswell and Poth (2017) contend that the philosophical worldview establishes the point of view from which the research is conducted. This study’s research purpose was to explore the lived experiences of women in manufacturing, to uncover and better understand the meaning, and facilitate construction of potential explanations for work environment situations (Grant, 2017). The intention of the research was not to discover an absolute truth nor change or explain the situation. Instead, the purpose was to investigate the lived experience of women and how women may have overcome potential obstacles in their promotability in the primarily male-dominated manufacturing industry.

Qualitative research is concerned with both the exploration and comprehension of the essence of the phenomenon and the specific meaning ascribed to it by
individuals (Creswell & Poth, 2017). The chosen research design allowed me to explore, describe, and explain how women were affected not only by the promotion process but also how they responded to their experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2017).

**Research Questions**

To reiterate, the research questions utilized for this study were

RQ1. What are the experiences of women leaders in their promotability in manufacturing?

RQ2. Do women encounter similar or disparate challenges in job promotion as their male counterparts?

RQ3. What are the success factors contributing to the process of promotion for women in the manufacturing industry? Are such factors connected to constructs of power?

**Research Design**

The most appropriate research methodology depends upon the purposeful identification of the research questions as correlated with the study’s intent (Creswell & Poth, 2017). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) asserted that qualitative research is a multi-method that encompasses a critical, naturalistic study of things that endeavors to make sense of phenomena in terms of the connotation people convey to the phenomena (Byrd, 2008). For this research study, a phenomenological approach was used to explore the lived experiences of the women who may have experienced hurdles in their job promotions (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Englander, 2016; Paley & Lilford, 2011; Råheim et al., 2016). According to Merriam (2009), researchers who
undertake qualitative studies “are interested in how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, [and] what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (p. 14)

Phenomenology is the study of the lived experience, focusing on a person’s, or people’s, beliefs of the world (Langdridge, 2007). It is the study of “essences and possible human experiences and is based on the belief that the human world can be understood only through the experiences of those who live in it” (Tunheim & McClean, 2008, p. 37). Von Eckartsberg (1998) maintained that phenomenology is the study of the phenomena as people confront them—how they encounter that particular human experience in their lives.

For the phenomenologist researcher, knowledge and understanding are embedded in the everyday world, and truth and understanding of life can emerge from one’s lived experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Langdridge, 2007; von Eckartsberg, 1998). Therefore, phenomenology helps to discover the meaning of life experiences. Merriam (2009) stated, “From the philosophy of phenomenology comes a focus on the experience itself and how experiencing something is transformed into consciousness” (p. 24). It is through the exploration of the lived experience where one may begin to understand the complexities of phenomena at the core level.

Four characteristics span the different phenomenological approaches to inquiry:

1. It is rigorously descriptive;
2. It uses the phenomenological reductions;
3. It reconnoiters the intentional association between people and situations; and

Van Manen (1990) contended that phenomenological human science research is about exploring the lived experience of daily life, and the “lifeworlds” of those being studied are complex and numerous with people concurrently inhabiting different lifeworlds. Phenomenological research seeks to gain a deeper understanding of experiences that are often taken for granted and regarded as trivial. It involves studying how people interpret their lives and how they take meaning from what they underwent (Cohen, Kahn, & Steeves, 2000).

The nature of my study lent itself to hermeneutic phenomenology. The exploration of the human experiences of both men and women in manufacturing described the daily lives of those who were interviewed. The research approach captured their perspectives and gained a clearer understanding of their experience as related to the focus of my study. These living individuals may have been facing promotions or may have had positive or negative experiences relating to promotion. Seasoned veterans had a plethora of insights and saw the evolution of women’s experiences in their workplace(s).

Newcomers to management provided unique observations into novel leadership positions. Regardless, the complexities of these experiences offered opportunities that pure quantitative data cannot provide: each person’s unique stories...
and experiences. Finding meaning and common themes from these different individuals, both male and female, who were at differing points within their careers and had a wide range of job experiences and insight, were critical to my study. Therefore, hermeneutic phenomenology provided the best means for me to explore the research questions.

Research Approach

Although there are several types of phenomenology, there are two main approaches to it: descriptive and interpretive (Sloan & Bowe, 2014). Descriptive phenomenology was developed by Edmund Husserl and interpretive by Martin Heidegger (Connelly, 2010; Sloan & Bowe, 2014). Sometimes referred to as transcendental phenomenology, Husserl’s descriptive phenomenology preceded Heidegger’s interpretive (Sloan & Bowe, 2014). Interpretive phenomenology is also known as hermeneutic phenomenology and as existential phenomenology (Langdriddle, 2007; Sloan & Bowe, 2014). The purpose of descriptive phenomenology is to describe a phenomenon as a distinct entity separate from the setting in which it occurs (Bynum & Varpio, 2018). In contrast, hermeneutic phenomenology describes the connotation of the phenomenon to comprehend the contextual forces shaping it (Bynum & Varpio, 2018). That distinction allows researchers to understand complex, environmentally influenced phenomena more fully.

Having its etymological roots based in the same lexical origins as the Greek messenger of the gods, Hermes, hermeneutics goes beyond explicating or describing a
phenomenon but instead strives to convey the meaning within the context of everyday
life (Bynum & Varpio, 2018). Both hermeneutic phenomenology and van Manen’s
methodology have their origins in the writings of Heidegger (Findlay, 2012).
Heidegger used the term *Dasein*, or “being in the world,” to define and describe the
manner in which human relationships are open to and inseparable from what is
occurring around them because of the human capacity to comprehend one’s own,
personal existence and reality (Cohen, Kahn, & Steeves, 2000; Maggs-Rapport, 2001).

According to Bynum and Varpio (2018), hermeneutic phenomenology differs
from other qualitative methods because of its interpretive character and emphasis on
the lived experience, the inclusion of researcher’s experiences in the methods of data
collection and analysis, and the active, thoughtful process of reflecting and writing
guiding data analysis (Creswell & Poth, 2017). For Bynum and Varpio (2018),
hermeneutics require that the researcher acknowledge that his/her own past
experiences and knowledge are vital and embedded in the interpretive process.
Researchers openly reflect on and share their subjectivity while at the same time
“adhering to the hermeneutic tradition and achieving reflexivity” (Bynum & Varpio,
2018, p. 253), instead of sequestering or suppressing their own biases, expertise, or
experiences. The resulting analysis is a rich and robust description of the particular
phenomenon that will have a more salient connection and illuminate elements
connecting the lives of the participant to the life of the reader (Bynum & Varpio,
2018).
Existential phenomenologists hold the view that philosophy should not be undertaken from a detached, disinterested, objective, or disengaged standpoint as some phenomena only appear to the researcher who is engaged in the right kind of way (Kafle, 2011; Warthall, 2006). Kafle (2006) said, “existential phenomenologists have included descriptions of the meaning of being (Heidegger), [and] the role of the lived-body in perception (Merleau-Ponty)” (p. 188). Table 2 highlights the relevant research paradigms.

Table 2. Relevant Research Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivist</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Realism</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Theory</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Dialogic Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretivist</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Constructed Reality</td>
<td>Hermeneutic Phenomenology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sample

Purposeful sampling is extensively selected in qualitative research for the identification and collection of information-rich cases related to the phenomenon of study (Palinkas et al., 2015). Critical is the identification and selection of those individuals that may be especially knowledgeable of the phenomenon, notably, if the individual experienced it (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Palinkas et al., 2015). In addition to
knowledge and experience, Bernard (2002) stated that the participants’ willingness and availability to participate in the study is vital. Participants should feel a sense of peace and safety to articulate and express their thoughts, opinions, and experiences openly and reflectively.

For the hermeneutic phenomenological study, participants were both female and male. The female participants had dissimilar levels of experiences from those newly entering the workforce to seasoned veterans. They also had varying levels of experience with promotions, thereby supplying an opportunity to explore expectations versus experience. Some of the women were power holders. The men in this study were the power holders, those who oversaw or in some way, participated in the promotion of women. From their vantage, exploration of their experiences in promotion yielded data regarding the perception of the power tactics women may have used, and whether that power use may have impacted the female leader’s promotion.

Selection of Participants

Participants were selected from the manufacturing industry. Firstly, I selected several with whom I have worked previously and had achieved some level of middle-to upper-level management experience with some degree of involvement in employee promotion. I have several female leaders within my network with whom I have some degree of rapport, and these women hold disparate levels of experience and supervisory roles within their respective companies. Beyond those, I sought suggestions from those female leaders for other possible candidates. All the men who participated in the study were part of my network.
Female Participation

As the focus of this study was female promotion in manufacturing, securing female participants was crucial. Fifteen women were sought for participation, with five each from the three levels of experience. Ultimately, fourteen women were interviewed for the study; however, two asked not to participate in the final data collection after their interviews had been conducted, transcribed, and analyzed. They reasoned that, upon personal reflection, they did not feel comfortable sharing their experiences. Accordingly, their data was removed from the study and did not appear in the findings.

The women in this study were very willing to participate. Each made herself available for the interview, and all were quite open in the sharing of their experiences. Every female participant expressed appreciation for the research as well as the opportunity to participate. One participant, Mary, encouraged other women to contact me to join the study. She urged three other women who contributed to the research.

Male Participation

To establish a baseline and assess whether men and women had similar or disparate experiences in manufacturing, I sought to interview an equal amount of men as women. As there are markedly more men in manufacturing than women, I expected to obtain interviews with fifteen men easily and quickly. However, securing those interviews, rather, finding men willing to be interviewed on record, proved to be
difficult. Of the thirty inquiries I made, only three agreed to be interviewed and fully participate in the study.

Of the twenty-seven left, twelve never responded to email inquiries. One veteran middle manager said that he did not feel qualified to participate in the study and recommended three other men. Of the three he recommended, none replied. One CFO responded with his interest to be interviewed; however, his schedule prevented the possibility of completing the interview because his company was involved in a major acquisition. Two CEOs refused because of schedule timing. However, in a personal conversation, one other provided a side response as follows:

In the wake of the #MeToo movement, I do not feel comfortable being interviewed or my responses being recorded. I don’t want any of my past actions to in any way be misconstrued as harassment or misogynistic. I understand these are confidential, but I can’t take a chance. My company and family depend on me.

The remaining men cited scheduling conflicts as an explanation for non-participation in the study. Although one cannot determine with absolute certainty the veracity of the reasons of the men who declined, one may suppose that other men may have had similar feelings but did not vocalize them. It is interesting that so few men were willing to participate, given the sheer number of men in the manufacturing sector.

Consistent with research (Butera, 2006; Robinson & Godbey, 1997; Schor, 1991), the most common reason given by men who declined to participate was a lack
of time. However, research conducted by Butera (2006) found that women have similar time constraints as men, yet women participate more frequently in qualitative research than men. Butera (2006) argued that male reticence to participate in qualitative research might be due, in part, to social role expectancy and role congruity. Men are expected to be in control, dominant, courageous, and rational—all agentic characteristics previously described in this study. In her research on friendship, Butera (2006) found that men would not participate if the study appeared to violate masculine social norms, or if it challenged the masculine need for privacy and role compartmentalization.

Additionally, Renzetti and Lee (1993) stated that there are four ways that one may feel threatened to participate in research:

1. Where research intrudes into the private sphere or delves into some personal experience,
2. Where the study is concerned with deviance and social control,
3. Where it impinges on the vested interests of powerful persons or the exercise of coercion or domination, and
4. Where it deals with things sacred to those being studied that they do not wish profaned (p. 5).

Research into issues regarding female promotion in male-dominated industry may probably have made male participants uncomfortable to the point of unwillingness to participate. It is also possible that the men may have refused to join
because of the fear of sharing sensitive information about personal experiences that may place the participant in a perceived poor appraisal with a male interviewer (Lefkowich, 2019; Renzetti & Lee, 1993). The mere supposition that one may be regarded as misogynistic, or worse, may have been enough to dissuade men from participation, even with the explicit knowledge of the study’s complete anonymity.

While there may be some amount of authenticity that many of these men had scheduling conflicts, the fact remains that the women in the study, whose schedules were equally busy, readily participated, adjusting their schedules to accommodate the interview. However, the men who did participate in the study were open, and they contributed valuable data to this research in a comparable fashion as the female participants.

**Power Holders**

During the pilot study, I realized that some of the participants could be both a power holder and a non-power holder (refer to the validity section for further details). At some point in the careers of veteran employees, they were not in a position of authority where they would have the power to promote. Indeed, they would have been those seeking a promotion. As a result, when I interviewed those with the most experience and who indicated on the demographic information they had the authority to promote, I asked the questions from the power holder script that pertained to promotion as part of the promotee interview (refer to the validity section for further details).
Data Collection

As the researcher, I am the primary instrument of data collection. “The human instrument builds upon his or her tacit knowledge and uses methods that are appropriate to humanly implemented inquiry: interviews, observations, document analysis, unobtrusive clues, and the like” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 187). The researcher, as the instrument of data collection, realizes that gathering the data in an interactive process (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993).

To address the research questions, I interviewed women and men at three distinct levels within the manufacturing industry. For the women, I interviewed those who were in their early career (year one to year five), mid-career level (year six through year fifteen), and executive-level (year sixteen and above). Men (and some women) who were interviewed were those who were power holders, those who currently, or have in the past, conducted promotions. It was essential to speak with individuals at different levels within organizations and various points within their career to ascertain whether challenges faced differed (or not) at various levels of the organization (Hubbard, 2018). Research conducted by Glass and Cook (2016) showed that, as they are promoted, women should experience an increase in awareness of gender-specific obstacles, particularly in the most senior positions within the organization. To accomplish this and following research by Hubbard (2018), I accessed my network within the manufacturing industry built over the last eight years.

Interviews were conducted in person, by telephone, and through a virtual video platform (Skype) so that participants were able to share their experiences. I heard
their journey in their voice as they recalled their experiences filtered through their beliefs and interpretation (Madsen, 2008). I wanted the women leaders to share their feelings, thoughts, reflections, and stories. I sought to hear the men who held power to give voice to their journey, as well. According to Schein (2004), stories have the potential to assist in offering an understanding of culture, and culture can help in understanding leadership. By understanding the expectations associated with leadership, one may begin to understand how and why women are promoted (Farré, 2013; Lawrence et al., 2018).

Each of the participants was given the choice of creating a pseudonym or allowing me to create one for them. The first interview I conducted was a Hispanic lady. When I asked her if she wanted to create a pseudonym, she asked for help creating one because she wanted a non-Hispanic name. Puzzled, I asked why she did not want a Hispanic sounding name. She said that she did not want people to know she was Hispanic because she thought it might sway what people think when reviewing the data. Three people chose their pseudonyms, and I created the remainder. I chose generic names, many from my favorite television shows or movies (Rose, Dorothy, Sophia, Sheldon, Marsha, Tracy, Sally). Additionally, I sought to select names that would not disclose race, ethnicity, or national origin.

Interview Process

Following a loose framework built around the individual’s career experiences and perceptions, the interview protocol focused on the challenges that women may have experienced in the promotion process, identified potential hurdles (perceived or
otherwise), and defined power and influence tactics (Appendices D and E). In the case of the promotee, the interviews concentrated on their perceptions and experiences within the promotion process. Power holders, likewise, defined power and influence (Appendix F). After the example of Hubbard (2018), the interview questions were broad and open-ended, and they did not specifically focus on gender, thereby seeking to minimize the potential of bias or forced answers. The interview protocol also ensured that anything shared would not be derived from preconceived ideas or assumptions the researcher may have thought might have taken place (Myers, 2013). Any themes and information garnered during the interviews organically evolved. Interview questions are included in Appendices D, E, and F.

Once more, when I interviewed those with the most experience and indicated on the demographic information, they had the authority to promote, I asked the questions from the power holder script that pertained to promotion (Appendix F). Rather than interview the power holders twice with analogous items except for those explicitly addressing power holder promotion experiences, I combined the appropriate questions into one interview. Given the nature of work demands on the time of these senior leaders, I felt it prudent to combine the questions, especially when I considered the number of male participants.

Once the interviews were transcribed, participants received a copy of the transcription via email. All, save one, had the opportunity to review, edit, take away, or add to the transcription. Four responded with corrections, and no one added or
deleted any part of the interview transcripts. Follow-up with Marsha, however, was not possible. Shortly after the interview, Marsha suffered a massive heart attack that significantly affected her lifestyle. I asked her husband if he thought she would like me to remove her data, but he said she was excited to have participated and to keep it as part of the study.

Data Analysis

Regardless of the chosen research paradigm, data analysis makes meaning of the collected data (Simon, 2011). Qualitative data analysis requires that one work with the data through appropriate organization, elucidate the data, synthesize it, and look for patterns (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Through that process, themes emerged, and the researcher decided what was salient, what was to be learned, and what was to be shared with others (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

Having its roots in psychological sciences, the heuristic inquiry “is a process that begins with a question or problem which the researcher seeks to illuminate or answer… The heuristic process is autobiographic, yet, with virtually every question that matters personally, there is a social—and perhaps universal—significance” (Moustakas, 1990, p. 15). Moustakas (1990) identified several key concepts within heuristic inquiry:

1. Identifying with the focus of inquiry;
2. Engaging in the process of self-dialogue;
3. Acknowledging the importance of tacit knowledge;
(4) Honoring individual intuition;

(5) Engaging in the process of indwelling involving the search for deeper meaning in the answers;

(6) Creating conditions that allow the focusing on inward and outward data to clarify and answer questions; and

(7) Acknowledging the importance of the internal frame of reference of the individual who seeks the answer (Haertl, 2014).

Heuristic inquiry begins with the researcher’s perspective, but the inquiry process expands to questions that are often universally significant (Haertl, 2014; Moustakas, 1990). The value of the heuristic model is that, like hermeneutics, it begins with the experiences of the researcher or practitioner, and it involves a deep understanding and personal involvement with the research question(s) (Kenny, 2012). As with the hermeneutic approach, it is a valuable tool in the exploration and study of the lived human experience (Kenny, 2012; Moustakas, 1990, 1994).

For data analysis of my hermeneutic phenomenological study, I followed the six phases of heuristic research. Phase one, initial engagement, began with the development of a research question (Haertl, 2014). Phase two, immersion, involved the researcher immersing him/herself in all the data and exploring internal knowledge. Phase three, incubation, followed and had the researcher taking a break from the question’s focus so that when s/he revisited the question, s/he gained new insight (Kenny, 2012). Phase four is illumination, the process by which the researcher
allowed tacit knowledge, intuition, and the data to unfold and aid in the understanding of the answers to the questions (Haertl, 2014). Phase five, *explication*, enabled full and thorough examination of themes that emerged, and the researcher turned inward to “draw from them every possible nuance, texture, fact, and meaning” (Moustakas, 1990, p. 24), to clarify meaning and build a more complete picture of the phenomenon through the uniqueness of the researcher and the experiences of the participants (Norton, 2017). The final phase, *synthesis*, encapsulated the answers and reported them in some form, written in the case of my study. Hiles (2001) asserted that a seventh stage, *validation*, existed in that *creative synthesis* within Moustakas six phases promoted internal validation, and the dissemination of the data led to external validation.

As discussed previously, data was collected through interviews and supplemented with field notes, reflections, and memos. The sources of information were then synthesized for form depictions of each participant and summarized the essence of their experiences. According to Moustakas (1990), contact with each participant creates a depiction and identifies a process through which the depictions can move in the data’s synthesis (Kenny, 2012). The first stage is the creation of the individual representation (Moustakas, 1990). Then, the researcher looks for themes, identify patterns, or detects places of resonance so the researcher may compile a “first-person narrative” that brings together the main themes into a central place (Kenny, 2012, p. 9). The final phase is the full integration of the researcher’s intuitive and
personal knowledge along with the experiences of the emerged themes through the process of working with the depictions (Kenny, 2012; Moustakas, 1990).

Following the research of Ho, Chiang, and Leung (2017) and Kenny (2012), heurism shares some tenants with those of other qualitative approaches, particularly hermeneutic. Like hermeneutic, heurism engages with a phenomenon as it is, with those who have experienced it, and goes beyond mere conceptualization (Kenny, 2012). Both hermeneutic and heuristic research connects the experiences of the participant with those of the researcher and gives voice to these experiences. Both approaches require dwelling in the language of the participants for thematic analysis. The identification, selection, and reporting of themes are not about the viewing of the data as objects. Instead, it is the reporting of the nature of being (Kenny, 2012).

Themes reside inside the thoughts of the research, and the researcher seeks to link the thoughts to the data and manifest the researcher's interpretations of these emerging themes (Ho et al., 2017). For both hermeneutic and heuristic methods, it is the thematic analysis that helps researchers to reflect on the ordinary, everyday understandings and disentangle these realities to explain the phenomenon from multiple elucidations to a single thread of understanding (Haertl, 2014; Ho et al., 2017; Kenny, 2012). It is for these reasons that I followed Ho et al.’s (2017) and Moustakas’ (1990) approaches to data analysis for my study.

The data analysis followed the interviews and their transcription. The recorded interviews were transcribed by www.weloty.com. To check for accuracy of the
verbatim transcriptions, each transcription was verified against its recording for thirty seconds at each of the following intervals in minutes and seconds: 11:11, 22:22, 33:33. The accuracy of the transcription to recording was approximately ninety percent. One transcription, however, was poorly transcribed, and Weloty was asked to redo the transcription. The subsequent work was significantly improved. Errors in transcription were corrected prior to coding and data analysis.

*Nvivo 12* was the software program chosen to aid in the coding of the data. Every interview’s transcript was uploaded to the program. Every interview was initially autocoded so that I could see the number of words that were repeated (Figure 4). For example, Sheldon’s interview used the words “operators” and “engineer” eight times each. This process continued for each of the individual transcripts. The goal was to aid me in defining codes of which I may not have otherwise thought. However, many of the recurring words were not relevant suggestions for the study, such as “thing” or “class.”
After auto-coding, I reread each interview’s transcripts and began the coding process. Themes began to emerge as each interview was repeatedly read and, upon reflection, overall themes synthesized. These overall themes were gender, job culture, power, promotion, traits, work-life balance, and work process (Figure 5).

Figure 4. Autocode Example
Figure 5. Master Codes

Some of those themes were broken down into sub-themes (Figure 6 and Figure 7). For example, power was drilled down to power definition, status definition, become expert, and seniority. Then, each interview was analyzed and dissected. The apposite passage from the interview was copied and pasted into the appropriate code, with some being copied into several codes.

Figure 6. Coding Themes and Sub-Themes 1
Once all interviews were coded, I took a break from the dissertation for a couple of weeks, as Moustakas suggested. That time away allowed me to clear and focus my thoughts and approach the data with a fresher perspective. I reread and recoded each interview, making minor changes. For example, I felt that influence appeared to be a subtheme of power rather than a separate overarching theme. Once the codes were in place with the subthemes, I, again, analyzed and dissected each interview. Some passages remained where they were initially, while others were transferred. Once all coding was completed, the data started to be synthesized for reporting. Chapter Four describes the results of the analysis and synthesis.
Researcher Positionality

“A researcher's background and position will affect what they choose to investigate, the angle of investigation, the methods judged most adequate for this purpose, the findings considered most appropriate, and the framing and communication of conclusions” (Malterud, 2001, pp. 483–484). Before my current position in my firm, I was a teacher. My wife is a teacher as well, a middle school band director. While much of primary and secondary education are considered female-dominated (Choi, 2013; Fuller, Cliffe, & Moorosi, 2015), band directing and coaching are significantly male-dominated (Fischer-Croneis, 2016; Peachey & Burton, 2011). I taught high school for fifteen years and received numerous awards, including Teacher of the Year, District Top Five Finalist, and Disney Teacher of the Year. My wife, who is equally trained and teaches far more students than I, has received more Superior ratings (the highest ratings at Florida Bandmasters Associations State Evaluations) than I and continues a streak unsurpassed in the local eight-county district of twelve consecutive years. Additionally, she is a Grammy-nominated music educator.

However, she has received considerably fewer accolades from the local male directors and is referred to by other male band directors with expletives. She has been nominated for state-level awards on three occasions, met and exceeded all the requirements, and lost to men. When no one thought I was listening, I heard directors call her expletives because she is confident and successful. I have witnessed her pain, struggle, and tears as she works diligently to help her students succeed, and, despite
the difficulties she faces, she perseveres. She has served as my inspiration to explore the experiences women face in male-dominated industry and what they must do to gain promotion despite the obstacles they face.

**Validity**

A pilot study helped guide the development of the research plan and aided in the determination of the feasibility, practicality, and workability of the methods in the larger study (Yeong, Ismail, Ismail, & Hamzah, 2018). The pilot study was a smaller version of the more extensive study. It was salient in testing the effectiveness of the interview protocol before any field testing (Yeong et al., 2018). I contacted three colleagues with whom I conducted the interview questions. Two were asked the interview questions for those who were promotees, and the other was interviewed with the power holder questions. By conducting these pilot studies, I gained valuable insight into time management, experienced the flow of the interview protocol, and received valuable feedback regarding the structure and content of the questions (Sumner, 2018).

Some changes were made to the Interview Protocol for both Power Holders and Promotees. Appendices D-F exhibit the Interview Protocol used for this study. Questions that appeared to be leading during the pilot study were eliminated. For example, in the promotee protocol for both men and women, the following question was eliminated: *Are the opportunities for women (1) equal, (2) less than or (3) more than others in your position or higher?* A few of the questions needed to be clarified with simpler and more straightforward verbiage. The following question *What factors
do you control, and what factors are systematic or systemic? was re-written to What factors do you control, and what factors are part of the job culture. Each of the pilot study’s participants asked for the definition of systemic. The question was modified to more basic vocabulary while maintaining the integrity of the question.
Chapter 4

Findings

Overview

The findings from this research contribute to a better understanding of women’s experiences in manufacturing, in addition to how women achieve promotion. Following Moustakas' six phases, the qualitative research methodology of hermeneutic phenomenology was used to examine transcripts of fifteen interviews. The qualitative software tool, NVivo 12, was utilized to access, organize and store the data while documenting the data collection process. This chapter presents a discussion of the results and other research findings pertinent to the research questions. Several themes emerged in the process of analyzing the data. These themes are discussed with the aim of providing answers to the research questions.

To reiterate, the research questions addressed in this study were

RQ1. What are the experiences of women leaders in their promotability in the manufacturing industry?

RQ2. Do women encounter similar or disparate challenges in job promotion as their male counterparts?

RQ3. What are the success factors contributing to the process of promotion for women in the manufacturing industry? Are such factors connected to constructs of power?
The purpose of this chapter is to discuss these findings and explore the shared findings in greater detail. Findings indicated that women's experiences in manufacturing are markedly disparate from those of their male counterparts. Because of work and job culture expectations, women were relegated to more clerical type roles and achieved opportunities for advancement differently and more slowly than men. Further findings in the study indicated that women utilized power tactics to gain promotion, and those tactics varied if the power holder were male or female.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Chapter**

The rest of the chapter is laid out in the following manner. The profiles of each of the participants begin the findings, followed by the demographics of the companies. The findings are then presented, followed by a synthesis and summary of the data. Other findings and the contribution of these findings to applied practice are discussed.

**Research Findings**

**Participant Profiles**

**Beth 3-3-A**

Beth is an industry crossover. When she retired as a full professor from a prestigious university, she began working as an educational consultant with a worldwide musical instrument manufacturer. With more than fifty years of experience in both sectors, she has pioneered women’s presence in both academia and consulting.
She is considered by many as a pioneer for women in both fields as she began working in a time when few women were employed outside of clerical roles. In her career, she has forged networks for mentorship and women well outside her current company. One of her core tenants is that women should not seek to separate themselves from men but rather should “beat them at their own game.” When faced with the “good old boy” club, she pushed even harder for the inclusion of women. Beth is not a power holder.

**Dorothy 5-1-A**

Dorothy is an inventory clerk in her firm, a position she has held for slightly longer than four months. She was promoted to this position from the warehouse floor. A younger member of the workforce, her tenure at the company has been for almost two years.

Her interview was conducted over the phone, yet she seemed incredibly nervous. Dorothy’s personality is quiet with a meekness other women participants did not seem to possess. Like others in the study, however, Dorothy’s experiences are marked by perceptions of ineptitude because of her gender and promotion hurdles other male colleagues did not have. What was striking is that she second-guessed her strengths and decisions. I was curious if this were her true personality or a conditioned response from her work experiences. It is not entirely clear from the interview. Dorothy is not a power holder.
Jennifer 3-1-A

Jennifer is a female chemical engineer in her late twenties with a Bachelor’s degree in Chemical Engineering working for a company that supplies products for the government. She provided evidence of time she was overlooked for a promotion because she is female. She spoke of the need that women must provide more information to prove themselves, unlike men. She, along with the other women in the firm, was required to take a training course that would “help them get along better with the men, and not piss the men off.” To advance, she would need another degree. Nevertheless, she does not want to advance and be promoted because she felt it would take away her from her extended family or prevent her from marrying if she chose. She would also have to move (as would anyone who received a promotion to that level).

She had to take a phone call from someone at her work who called her on a Saturday when she was off. Because we were in the middle of the interview, the recording was stopped; however, I overheard the conversation. This male coworker (not her boss/supervisor) questioned her repeatedly regarding how she set-up for a test the next day. He questioned her methods, even after she adequately answered the question. Given my role as an executive vice president in a plastic injection molding company, I have some understanding of the chemical process they were discussing. Her answers were reliable, but the explanations were unnecessary, especially given the near interrogation she received. Jennifer is not a power holder.
Jill 4-1-A

Jill is a sales engineer for a major manufacturing company in the Midwestern United States. She has a Bachelor’s degree in Engineering, and she has been with the company for less than two years. Part of her degree work allowed her to be a member of an elite leadership group. As such, she was guaranteed an interview with the company as long as she completed specific benchmarks set for her. After graduation, she was interviewed and passed over ten times, losing to others in the cohort whose GPA was demonstrably lower than hers.

Her experiences are slightly different from the other women in the study because many of her issues stemmed from customers. Her company sells manufacturing products (large machinery, for example) to smaller manufacturing companies. Because she is female, many of her male customers subject her to more rigorous standards than other male salespeople in her company. Since her sales figures are partly tied to her promotability, she feels that she is overlooked because of negative interaction with these male clients. Jill is not a power holder.

Marsha 2-1-A

Marsha is retired as a middle manager in the male-dominated field of law enforcement and now works as a manager in a security firm. Although not from a traditional manufacturing role, she has provided security services for a manufacturing plant, and her experiences are not unlike those of other women in this study. Marsha is a quiet and reserved person, but she was ready to express her story. To a
considerable extent, she has become jaded to the process of promotion as she felt that she had been overlooked several times for advancement. She attributed those promotion passovers to her weight, lack of good looks, or the “good ole boy” system. She witnessed female manipulation for job promotions along with men who were oblivious to the influence tactics women used on them. Marsha is not a power holder.

Follow up with this respondent is not possible. She suffered a massive heart attack and has been severely impacted by that health episode.

Martha 1-2-A

Martha has been with her company for more than thirty years. A naturalized citizen from Mexico, she grew up on a farm in the remote mountains of Western Mexico. With no degree, Martha has only two years of formal education. Martha began in the warehouse, where she worked on the line assembling flush valves for toilets. Her company is among the oldest plumbing manufacturers in the U.S., beginning the manufacturing of toilet parts in 1946. The company began in California, grew to an employee base of more than 250, went through bankruptcy in the mid-2000s, and was purchased and moved to Florida. Since 2011, the company has undergone a significant transition. The workforce is more than 300 and is privately owned.

Over five years after beginning work, she was promoted to shift lead, then, to flush valve supervisor. This has been her only job. She is soft-spoken, bilingual, yet carries a sense of quiet authority and confidence. She described many instances of
gender issues, primarily female to female discrimination, as well as how women use their sex as a means of promotion. Martha holds a power holder position but does not enjoy the responsibility that includes the ability to hire and fire. She refuses to participate in the promotion process.

**Mary 2-2-A**

Mary is currently an IT middle manager in an IT manufacturing firm but began her career right out of college in an air conditioner manufacturing company. Her experiences in both locations, though similar, are different in the level of subtlety in her current role from a male colleague and a male mentor. She has a good definition of the good ole boy network. She had to gain a master’s degree to feel like she was more likely to be considered for promotion.

Her career began on the floor of an air conditioning manufacturer in Northwest Florida. She worked there for several years until she became pregnant. She has a wealth of experiences in the promotion process, but her experiences are markedly different from men, even men without similar experiences or pedigree. She and her family now live in Northern Alabama, yet she encounters similar, if not more prominent, effects of promotion as in her previous location. Mary is not a power holder.

**Rose 5-2-A**

Rose is a retired employee of a machine manufacturer in a rural setting. Her company was unique both to this study and in manufacturing. The company’s
workforce was predominantly female. Consequently, her experiences are dissimilar in many ways from other women in the study. However, she details that some women, when they achieve promotion over other women and supervise mostly women, become more agentic and aggressive toward other women.

Rose’s interview was interesting because it allowed me the opportunity to explore women supervising women immediately after receiving a promotion. That exploration is beyond the scope of this study except to the degree that women may hamper the promotion of other women. Rose was not a power holder.

**Sally 1-3-A**

With more than thirty years, Sally is an industry veteran and leader of HR with her current company. She has an MBA but began work with a non-profit before moving into manufacturing ten years ago. In her current position in her company, Sally has not witnessed much in the way of female discrimination due in large part to her senior position. An influential female mentor may have moderated her road she had early in her career. She admitted that the mentor opened avenues to her that more than likely would not have existed had she not had her mentorship. Sally is a power holder and has had the authority to promote, hire, and fire for much of her career. She is the sole female power holder in this study.

**Sophia 6-2-A**

Sophia is a mechanical engineer and holds a Bachelor’s degree in Engineering. Having been with her company for a little more than five years, Sophia’s particular
workgroup is contracted with one of the nation’s largest pulpwood and paper manufacturers. Even though Sophia holds a degree in mechanical engineering, she cannot call herself an engineer because she lacks the requisite certifications.

Her experiences have been mostly rewarding and without significant incident. Sophia’s career path includes limited opportunities for promotion; however, she must undertake further training and education. Unlike other women in the study, she has not faced negative situations in promotion because of her gender. In fact, she posited that the lack of women in leadership roles is probably due to the lack of women in manufacturing. Sophia is not a power holder.

**Tonya 3-2-A**

Tonya is a former member of the military and now works as a production planner in a tire manufacturing firm. She has a bachelor’s degree and is working on completing a Master’s in Organizational Management while working full time. She has been in her current role for two and a half years, along with six in the military.

Her story is not unique in several ways. Tonya was openly candid about her use of sex as a manipulative tool for promotion. Further, she vividly recounts situations that she encountered as a woman that she felt would not have occurred if she were male. Outside of the military, Tonya feels that she must work harder and prove that she is more knowledgeable so that she is respected by men and not overlooked from promotion of any kind. She readily admits that her current job has jaded her mindset tremendously. Tonya is not a power holder.
Tracy 4-2-A

Tracy is a mid-level manager in a chemical manufacturing factory. She has been with the company for more than five years, with four of those years in her current role. Tracy holds an Associate’s degree and is taking classes to boost her chances of promotion. These classes include a voice/communications course in conjunction with one that is designed to help increase self-confidence and self-promotion. Her experiences have been troubling and include sexual harassment from a former supervisor, along with other discriminatory actions by males in her firm. The authenticity of her stories shows that women in her firm are not as likely as men to be promoted. Further, women have a markedly different experience than men.

Acknowledging that her path to promotion is challenging, Tracy is enrolling in college to complete a bachelor’s degree because she feels she cannot be promoted unless she has more education than her male colleagues. Even though she is a middle manager with a proven record at work, Tracy is not a power holder.

Adam 4-3-B

Adam is a former member of the military and holds a Ph.D. in Organizational Management. He began a consulting company, but, through a community need, expanded his company into a plastics manufacturing business. His company has less than twenty employees; however, he predicts future growth with anticipated government contracts.
Adam is well-educated and highly intelligent. He was frank and relaxed throughout the interview. Several times, Adam mentioned his perspective as a member of a minority. Therefore, his view is interesting because, as a population class that may have received discrimination, he can identify it more easily than those who may have never experienced racism. Adam is a power holder, but he delegates or shares that authority with others in his firm. He is the final decision-maker, however.

**Mark 2-3-B**

Mark is a manufacturing private business owner. He believes women are as likely to gain promotion as men within the confines of the physical demands of the job role. Mark feels that the job culture is molded from the company’s espoused values, mission statement, and vision statement. The women he employs are mostly clerical; however, that is the choice of the women. This company is relatively young (less than eight years). He is a dynamic, collegial, and engaging person, and the company’s organizational structure and growth reflect that. He does believe that there are some roles that only men can do (based on the physical requirements of the job and primarily in the warehouse), and some that only women can. For his company, a group of three typically promote as a means of rewarding those whom they feel deserve recognition for high-quality work, attitude, and ethic. Mark is a power holder, a role he tends to share with his business partner along with his spouse.
Sheldon 1-1-B

Sheldon is a younger male having graduated a few years prior from a major university. He is a chemical engineer with a Bachelor’s degree in Engineering. He has worked for two companies but now works with an international paint manufacturer. The previous job was in a similar capacity as the current one. That one was also an international manufacturing company based in Norway.

He described issues he witnessed of male good ole boy discrimination of women. In the first company, he told of the inherent organizational culture that did not promote women and unconsciously denigrated women. His perspective on the struggles of women that he witnessed is critical to understanding power dynamics. He spoke of how women had to go the extra mile with more knowledge than men to be considered for a promotion. Sheldon is the least experienced (regarding the duration of the time employed) person interviewed. However, he has been promoted to a position with authority to hire and fire and is a power holder.

Demographics of Organizations

Firm size varied across the participants (Figure 8). Mark and Adam both owned smaller firms that employed under fifteen people. Martha’s and Marsha’s company employed approximately 350 employees across the United States, while Tracy, Tonya, and Jared worked for multinational enterprises (MNEs) that employed tens of thousands globally. The largest firm represented was Jill’s company with an
international workforce of more than 69,000 employees. 20,545 was the average firm size for this study.

Firm size was not a direct question during the interviews. However, most of the participants mentioned their firm’s size. When they mentioned the size, I would ask if the firm were privately or publicly owned and whether it was a government contractor. The purpose of those questions was to explore if the company were required to follow affirmative action hiring procedures. Jennifer’s company was the sole company that supplied the Federal government; however, she did not know what percentage of the business was related to government contracts. Therefore, she did not know if the company had to follow Federal government regulations regarding affirmative action hiring.

All the companies represented except for one were primarily male-dominated. Rose’s company was female-dominated. The community in which the company is based is a rural area with the majority of its citizens working at the large Army base nearby. It may be that the preponderance of the women in the plant may be attributable to the Army base’s workforce needs. That supposition is purely speculative and is not data-supported.
Figure 8. Firm Size

Experience varied across the participants as well (Figure 9). Beth had more experience than any participant with fifty-five years. Adam and Mark both owned their own companies but have done so for under ten years. All the participants had no less than two years of experience. The average level of experience for this study was fourteen years.
Figure 9. Participant's Level of Experience

Promotion

Spilemer and Lunde (1991) define power as the “change of rank within an organization. Rank, or grade level, differentiates among workers with respect to status, power, and salary” (p. 69). Typically, a job promotion would include a pay increase or bonus of some kind, alongside an escalation in authority or responsibility. Employees tend to desire a promotion for monetary or remuneration of some form (Kosteas, 2011).

Manufacturing companies, as is true in many industries, tend to promote from within before hiring from outside the firm (Albrecht & Goldman, 1985; Caraway, 2006). As firms vary in size, so, too, do the processes and procedures for promotion. Firms in this study varied in size from fifteen employees in small business operations to large MNEs with more than 60,000 employees. Each company had its unique
policies and procedures for promotion, with the larger firms tending to have a more organized, systematic, and standardized process.

Sheldon’s current company has a formal process by which those in consideration are interviewed, and their work history/performance is scrutinized. Anyone interested in promotion is encouraged to move forward in the process. However, the first consideration is for those within the company before the company interviews from outside. That process was fairly consistent across most of the participants’ firms.

Mark’s company does not have a strict process. Instead, “We come together as a group of managers: myself, my business partner, my wife who also helps me run the administrative side of the business or my brother who helps me run the other shop.” For his company, the group promotes based on the individual’s performance and regard the promotion as a reward for exceptional work and loyalty. As such, no formal interview occurs, and none of the employees know when a promotion is forthcoming. Instead, the group decides and presents the promotion with the pay increase to the individual they decide deserves it. This process is atypical in the study.

For most, the process included a recommendation or evaluation from the supervisor. In many cases, an interview or formal evaluation of some fashion was necessary. Often, several people were considered for a position, similar, in fact, to an initial interview/application procedure. Many of the respondents revealed that promotions were considered on an “as needed” basis. For those firms represented by
these participants, all the companies except for one followed that general principle—

promote as necessary. The only exception was Jennifer’s company.

My company does promotions only once a year, which is kind of why you get
locked in too. If you’re not quite ready for it in March, […], you have to wait
an entire year even if that would be the next April [if] you were all of a sudden
ready.

It is important to note that Jennifer’s company does supply material and products to
the United States government. As such, her company should follow the hiring and
promotion policy guidelines of the Federal government (DiPrete & Soule, 2006).

For most of the women in the study, a promotion was more challenging than
for their male colleagues. Opportunities for promotion appeared to be relegated to
clerical or administrative roles, while very few women were promoted to or worked on
the warehouse floor, lines, or maintenance. Many of the women in the study felt that
they were consigned to roles that men did not want. Dorothy said, “There are certain
areas that I’ll never get to like maintenance. There’s never been a female maintenance
employee ever.”

Mary had similar observations as Dorothy.

I do know that, like when it came to rigging and racking in the factory, for
example, there were no women on any of those teams. So, like the physical
design, the physical layout of all of our materials in the plant were solely
designed, put together, rearranged, kept up, maintained by [a] team of only men. Like women, just even weren’t considered for that team.

Many manufacturing workplaces have had jobs that were physically demanding or taxing, and men have undertaken those roles (Porter, 2009). Old mindsets persist in modern manufacturing despite the level of technological advance with autonomous and robotic manufacturing lines (Cameron & Nadler, 2013; Porter, 2009). Granted, the expense of technological upgrades may be cost-prohibitive for smaller firms. Nonetheless, the use of robotics has lessened the degree of physical job demands; however, the stereotype still exists in both men and women (Porter, 2009).

Mark felt that some positions might necessitate male employees because of the physical demands required.

I don’t think that I have any roles here that are so physical strength dependent where a man could do a better job. I do believe men have this bone density that are stronger naturally, so if you are dealing with a role where someone relies on physical strength, that might be an advantage if you’ve got physical abilities that the other person might not have.

Dorothy had similar feelings as Mark.

Scientifically, we are a little weaker. So, I think if you are in a position where there is a lot of heavy lifting or a lot of strength involved, you can build the strength, but it will take a little more time.
The continued persistence of the stereotypical views of role congruity does exist in both men and women (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Novo-CortiCalv et al., 2018). From the example above, findings from this study indicated that women hold stereotypical views of themselves in the same way that men do for women.

One salient data element from the study is that a lack of women in senior management may be resulting from a lack of women in the industry. Promotions tend to occur first from those within the organization (Kosteas, 2011). Because of the fewer numbers of women in the workforce, it is logical to argue that women would have fewer opportunities for promotion. Additionally, since the roles women mostly occupy are clerical, women may be promoted in areas where there are fewer men (Litzky & Greenhaus, 2007; Strom, 2006).

Like most, Sophia’s company was primarily male; however, she was the sole participant to recognize the lack of female leaders may be linked to the lack of women in general. When she was in undergraduate school, those students in the engineering program at her school were vastly male. At her current job, she is one of less than ten women in her area among hundreds. She readily acknowledged that the first obstacle women face might be the lack of qualified women.

It really just has to do, I think there’s just not enough women there that if there’s promotions everywhere, there probably is going to be a majority or are going to be all men just applying for them versus like three or four or even ten women in them.
Organizational/Job Culture

As the diversity within an organization evolves, companies need to be able to address gender diversity. Perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of both genders may affect organizational culture. Men and women have different life experiences, distinct gender socialization, and gender norms, and these disparities should be considered in leadership development or promotion (Budworth & Mann, 2010; Kiser, 2015).

Much research and many frameworks have been developed to understand and explain the differences between the status of men and women in organizations. (Refer to Chapter Two for further information.) Cultural theories and role theories may be used to understand those differences better. In particular, cultural theories describe the collectively shared patterns of assumptions, values, and expectations that guide the cognitions, emotions, and perceptions of the firm (Rosser, 2003). Consequently, the culture includes the “collective, subjective logic that forms the unspoken, often unconscious subtext of social life” (Rosser, 2003, p. 74). Like cultural theories, role theories focus attention on expectations and norms (Billing & Alvesson, 1994) and are concerned with gender differences expressed through disparate expectations and behaviors (Billing & Alvesson, 1994; Rosser, 2003). Ayman (1993) contended that roles are normative and are the primary means by which social judgments are used to identify the “ideal” behavioral patterns.

Again, Eagly and Carli (2007) maintained that people tend to classify male and female leaders according to how they associate their feelings about men and women in
general. Once they have categorized a person as a leader, they frame that person into their expectations based on those associations (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Role congruity theory argues that women suffer hindrances from promotion because they are evaluated as less effective for performing leadership roles because they lack the necessary prerequisite skills to lead effectively (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Koenig et al., 2011; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014). Hence, women may not be promoted as readily as men because of the perceived lack of requisite leadership qualities.

Many of the women in this study felt that the culture of their organization made them feel less valued, and their opinions were not as important as their male colleagues. Mary complained that “the importance of my opinions are not valued. It’s just like he [a lower-ranking male employee in her department] goes first. He gets to voice his opinion right when it strikes him as opposed to I might need to wait a minute until he’s done.”

“The work culture at my organization it’s a good ole boys club, and they don’t bring in people from the outside to fix that. A lot of the leaders are moved around because of their bad behavior,” said Tonya. Tonya felt that the job culture at her plant was particularly toxic to women and promotion, although it was different at other campuses. “They [corporate office] need to basically come in and cut the head off the snake because, in all the other plants, women are promoted freely.” At the home plant in Germany, “When I was at the German plant, it was like female to male. It was
almost 50/50. It was the weirdest thing and, people don’t leave. They don’t have turnover. It’s just a different mentality.”

Tracy had similar thoughts about opinions. “We're just very underrepresented when it comes to our opinions for the company. I also believe that the company is not as accommodating when it comes to allowing us to do jobs out in the plant.” When asked why the female opinion is not taken seriously, Tracy said, “I think a lot of it is the job culture […] It wasn't always this way, but it seems to be a fear-based culture, too.”

Marsha went further than job culture. For her, the issue is more significant. “I think it's just a society thing regardless of whether it's in the workplace or not.” When prompted for why she thinks it is a societal issue, Marsha plainly said, “because of their [women’s] gender and women appear to need protecting and not be the protector.”

Men noticed the disparity of women in management. Each of the companies represented had workforces that were markedly more male than female except for Rose’s firm. Consequently, the work culture was more agentic than communal. Sheldon said that he did not see very many female leaders in his first job. “The four companies I’ve worked for, the only company that I saw that would have made it hard for a woman to move up, would have been that Norwegian Company that I worked for.” The Norwegian company was a global manufacturing MNE, and his campus was U.S.-based. Each campus was independently managed, reporting to headquarters in
Norway. According to Sheldon, headquarters had a more *laissez-faire* approach to managerial oversight, relegating much of the HR decision-making to the individual campuses. At his plant, he felt the managerial leadership created a toxic culture, particularly for women.

I kind of became friends with the vice president. He had an office inside the plant, but he was always traveling. There was multiple different divisions, so he was the vice president of the entire manufacturing division.

He had a lot of oversight in other places, and after talking to him he never said it directly, but he always hinted that he knew that it was problems with just our plant and saying he was working on them, which is why it is believed that the trip in December for the board of directors is to get rid of the management staff and change the company culture in that plant.

When asked about how women are promoted there, Sheldon said, “The only experience that a female was given a true promotion, pay raise, different job description […] she had to leave the plant and work for the global division. She […] had to leave our management to get a promotion.”

As the owner of a small, private manufacturing company, Mark based his company’s organizational culture around his faith. “Core values for me personally they go back to my faith, my beliefs. […] Upfront, I let people know this is what we expect of our employees.” According to Mark, he wants the workforce to experience what the customers will and has designed the work culture accordingly. “Everything
that I do is rooted in how I can help somebody else experience better whatever it is they are experiencing. In the space that we operate in, it all goes back to our core values.” His strategy for promotion is performance-based. “I won’t promote someone because they have been here a long time. […] If you do that you will have a whole string of B team players, and you don’t go win the Super Bowl with B team players.”

**Gender**

Questions one and two of the research questions guiding this study asked if the paths through promotion differed between men and women. Data collected from the interviews showed that women appeared to experience more challenges in promotion. Tracy’s experiences in her company illustrate the point.

They [upper management] look at their [men’s] degree, and they [men] get promoted. They don't have to prove that they’re necessarily adding X amount of value to the company. Not to say they don't add value. I just don't think they're having to prove their worth in the same way. The women are doing the same thing, but they're also having to constantly put data in front of supervisors and managers.

Many of the women in the study expressed similar situations and feelings. To varying degrees, participants described how men took advantage of networks or were promoted more quickly. However, women had to prove their merit more frequently, or the process was modified. Jill’s most recent experience with attempting promotion provided the example.
Well, previously, it was 3 to 5 years’ experience to move to the next level. When I was given this new sheet, it was added to stay 5 to 7 years of experience. So, pretty much they outed me from even being qualified for a promotion.

When asked how she felt after she received the new promotion guideline, Jill said,

Oh, I was pissed. I was really upset. I considered looking for other roles. You know, I mean the Chicago market and I know I can get paid a lot more if I went to another company. And, I got really upset that, you know, [I] have been working for this company for almost five years and felt like they weren’t investing in me, when I had invested so much time and energy into them. So, I was really, really hurt, really upset you know after I sacrificed a lot of my time for this company that they couldn’t give me an extra couple or $1,000.

Once more, Tracy contended that a man’s path is easier.

It seems that the same amount of work is not completed in order to get a promotion for a male as a woman. Not to say that we don’t get those promotions, but that we may have to take a lot more home and work from home and put in more hours to get afforded the same opportunities as a male would. They're missing opportunities really because there's a lot of women here that have had thirty years of tenure here and have never been moved any farther than one or two ranks up.
Women in the study seemed to agree that they felt the lack of respect they receive from men negatively impacts their promotability. Jennifer cited an example where she felt bullied in a meeting, and her suggestion was squashed because of her gender.

Then another meeting I was suggesting that we implement a new technique on a couple of coding series that we have. There’s just like a couple of products that we make, and it was dismissed. Then, a male came into the meeting late and said we should add these products to the list and when I suggested it before everybody was like, “No, we are not going to do that,” and then as soon as he says it, everyone is like, “Okay, yeah. Great.”

Like Jennifer, Sophia had experiences of men ignoring her opinions.

When you stand up to speak and give a presentation, you can tell they are not looking at you and they just completely don’t listen to anything you say, and they don’t look at you when they talk, and you know they are talking about your presentation but are talking to someone else as if someone else gave the presentation. We have had to sit down with his higher up, because my boss is a woman, and she perhaps had some choice words with him one day. He did not last very long.

Tracy argued that she needed to be more agentic to gain respect. She saw of women that “We tend to have to be more assertive and drop the niceties in order to gain respect from the men.” She continued,
I think a lot of times the women sort of have to almost spar with the men and kind of outwit and negotiate with them to the point that they, that tends to be how their respect is earned in the company.

From the male perspective, Sheldon described his advantage as a male in manufacturing.

I feel like indirectly in my experience it has benefited me maybe not directly though, but like management directly favoring me, because I'm a guy, but indirectly in the sense that operators have welcomed me into their circles which management notices.

He talked about his sister’s experience as a chemical engineer in a manufacturing company.

My sister kind of had to fight her way into getting the operators to respect her because she is a girl. But, whereas I'm a guy, I go in the operator’s circle. I’m kind of already included in that sense, which management does end up noticing.

Marsha experienced a lack of respect in her career by her male colleagues and superiors. “It's not necessarily struggles as far as the job itself [...] It's just how you feel you are treated [...] I feel that it was a ‘Yeah, you don’t know what you are talking about type of thing.’” She felt that, as a result of the treatment, her promotability was negatively impacted. “It's very much a stereotype. I do think women are looked at as weaker so, I think they are not valued as much as a male.”
Even when they receive the promotion, women faced a backlash from those under their supervision, marring potential future promotions. Martha was promoted within the warehouse in her company to a position she did not want. Martha was comfortable in her role and did not want the stress of becoming a supervisor.

To tell you the truth, I don’t want to be a supervisor. I don’t want that because some people get jealous and, if you have friends, people are very jealous about you. They don’t like me anymore. I didn’t want to go in that position, but they didn’t ask me. They put me right there and told me, ‘you have to go and work.’ When they put me in that position, one person there who was a male went and said, ‘I don’t want to go here anymore because I can’t work with a woman supervisor.’ He asked him to move him to another department. The other department has a male supervisor, not female.

Martha’s leadership experience was tainted by the unwillingness of the male to follow her leadership. He transferred, but Martha never forgot. She never sought another promotion and has remained in middle management in the same role for more than twenty-five years.

The experiences of men and women, by these examples, suggest that the paths for men and women are, indeed, different. To the extent that stereotypical behaviors create impediments to promotion and how promotees use power tactics to circumvent those, an in-depth exploration of the potential reasons for these differences is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
Work-Life Balance

Women in this study seemed to encounter concerns with a work-life balance that their male colleagues did not. The desire to maintain a careful balance of family and career impacted some of the women’s desire for promotion. Jennifer, especially, felt that she did not want to become a senior leader. In fact, she did not want to progress far above her current role as a chemical engineer.

I could progress further if I wanted to, but some of that comes along with lots of trouble and just like more demanding hours. I don’t know that I necessarily want that though I guess what I'm saying is I’m may be more content to stay in my department in my area. I can’t see myself staying with this company but more for like the convenience of it being close to home.

Jennifer readily admits she is close to her family, who live under two hours from her job. She does not want to sacrifice seeing her extended family because of the job demands a promotion would bring.

Looking elsewhere is a big deal, I guess, because it probably means moving further away than I want to be. But, if I stayed here, I know that I will probably will just continue progressing or being promoted within my department and then maybe one day running my department once my boss retires.

Mary was up for a promotion at her job when she found out she was pregnant. Once she announced she was pregnant, she was passed over for a promotion that was
given to a man. She cannot say with certainty why she did not receive the promotion; however, she felt very strongly her pregnancy had much to do with it, mainly as she worked on the floor of the warehouse.

I was going to have maternity leave that I was going to have time off and I was like, ‘I really don’t think I was up for consideration. I wouldn’t have gotten any kind of promotion. It was very impersonal. I just mentioned it [pregnancy], and it just became a bigger deal than it was and how to deal with it. So, yeah, it was all disappointing. That’s something men will never really have to worry about. Because even if their wife is pregnant, and they’re having a child themselves, they physically don’t have anything holding them back from coming to work the next day.

Mary felt that men are not impeded as much by family as women are. In her job of ten years, she did not receive a promotion while men who began after she were promoted quickly.

Even though she has a bachelor’s degree, Jill was passed over nine times. Jill recounted her experience in an interview for the role she currently has.

I did an interview at one time, and it was, it's actually for the position I have currently, and I was, honestly, for the interview, I was shocked that I was given this position. I interviewed with a gentleman, and one of the questions that he asked me was, ‘why do you want this job?’ I explained to him why I want the job, and he knew that I had just recently got married and he was like, ‘Well,
you know this job is going to be really difficult.’ I was like that’s fine. He was like, ‘Yeah, it's going to be tough like don’t you want to have a family? Like why are you going to take a difficult job?’ And, you know, in my opinion, you would never ask a man that question. You know, why? Why can’t I have a difficult challenging job and you know, potentially have a family later or also experience personal, or is that something you need to know in an interview. So, I obviously address the question, but I do feel like that question would have never, ever, ever been asked to a male candidate for the role.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion sex, or national origin. Further, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 (PDA) bars employers from any sex discrimination based on pregnancy.

(k) The terms 'because of sex' or 'on the basis of sex' include, but are not limited to, because of or on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions; and women affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions shall be treated the same for all employment-related purposes, including receipt of benefits under fringe benefit programs, as other persons not so affected but similar in their ability or inability to work, and nothing in section 703(h) of this title shall be interpreted to permit otherwise. (“The Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978,” 1978).
During a job interview or a promotion interview, PDA prohibits employers from asking questions that could lead to discrimination based on sex, pregnancy, or future plans to become pregnant (www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/publications/fs-preg.cfm, 2020). “The PDA also forbids discrimination based on pregnancy when it comes to any other aspect of employment, including pay, job assignments, promotions, layoffs, training, fringe benefits, firing, and any other term or condition of employment” (www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/publications/fs-preg.cfm, 2020). Both Mary and Jill were exposed to situations that under the PDA were violations of Federal statute. Being pregnant or having plans to become pregnant do not preclude a woman from just consideration for a job or promotion.

**Influence**

Most of the participants, both male and female, saw a distinction between power and influence. Overall, influence seemed to be relationship-based and was a more positive experience, whereas power was more authoritarian and was more negatively perceived. Sally felt the difference between power and influence is relational. “You can influence somebody without having power over that individual. It’s based on the relationship that you have with people.”

All the participants expressed influence as a leadership trait, even if one is not in a leadership position. “I think that influence doesn’t have that domineering flavor to it. I think influence is like leading by example, whereas power is dictating how you want things to be,” said Jennifer. She went on to say that there is a distinction
between men and women within power and influence. “I think women would use it
[influence] more.” She described an instance where a production engineer, who is not
in a position of authority, had to correct a fellow employee. “She can tell something
to somebody that they’re completely wrong without making them feel completely
wrong.”

Tonya concurred with Jennifer. “Well, influence can be anything and any
level. That’s a lot about charisma. We have just employees on the floor who
influence people to do a better job just because of their enthusiasm.” Tonya described
influence as a trait. “Most of the time I think it’s intrinsic because there’s a lot of
people who are leaders, who are not necessarily, can influence people.”

Marsha felt that influence is knowledge-based. For her, knowledge is more
salient because it shapes the choices to network, how to network, and when to
manipulate.

You can influence somebody just by knowledge. You don’t have to be in a
position of power or in a position of authority to influence somebody. In some
sort of circumstances, you can use influence and manipulation kind of hand in
hand so, it's all about knowledge.

Consistent with the research of Raven (1992, 1998, 2008) previously
discussed, for most, influence and power are not synonymous. However, Mary felt
that power and influence are two aspects of the same concept. For Mary, she
described influence as “similar to power. I think that influence almost feels like a
softer, softer way of describing that [power].” She continued linking influence and power as analogous concepts. “I think that, for example, someone who leads via influence rather than leads via power is more likely to be liked.” Later, she said, “people that are leading by power or intentionally using their power are more likely to be not always abusing it.” The important aspect of her description of influence is

> Good influencers aren't necessarily trying to be. I think that they're leading by example. But it's not that they're trying to lead. They're just doing what they're supposed to do in the best way that they know how and, thereby, influencing.

Earlier, Mary described power as “having sway over people is always going to be power […]. Power can relate to, you know, your official title.” In the quotation above, influence is described as the ability outside of a formal position to motivate others. Her definition of power and description of influence are relational and include having some form of influence over others.

Mark had similar thoughts. “I guess influence is another way of saying power.” He described the ability to motivate customers to buy product in the marketplace, and he equated having the positional power to get into that marketplace to influence customers. In the workplace, he said power is, again, positional, and he can influence his employees to perform to his expectations. “Influence to me would be the influence to come in that front door for someone [an employee] to say, ‘I trust that today is going to go well because he [Mark] is here.’”
Network

O’Neil, Hopkins, & Sullivan (2011) contended that networks help employees navigate the social, political, and cultural qualities of the organization; are a source of power and social capital; and affect career success (promotion, salary, and career satisfaction.” As with previous research (Brass, 1985; Davies-Netzley, 1998; Greguletz, Diehl, & Kreutzer, 2019; Hurst, Leberman, & Edwards, 2018; O’Neil, 2004; Ratcliffe, 2002; Roebuck & Smith, 2011) men appeared to benefit from networks and social structures related to the job and work cultures.

Recent research by de Klerk and Verreyn (2017) empirically found that women use networking ineffectively. Women tend to form smaller networks with stronger tie strength (contacts with a stronger relationship to the individual) and a similar degree of relationship among the members (ILO, 2017; O’Neil, Brooks, & Hopkins, 2018; O’Neil et al., 2011). Their networks have a propensity to have less influence, are less developed, and are associated with fewer opportunities within the firm (de Klerk & Verreyn, 2017; O’Neil et al., 2011; O’Neil, 2004). Women see the necessity and importance of networking to foster stronger relationships; however, these activities do not appear to benefit women in career advancement (de Klerk & Verreyn, 2017). Men, on the other hand, have networks with weak ties with a network that is broader and more diverse, tending to promote upward mobility (O’Neil et al., 2011). Sophia provided an example of networking in the process of promotion.
I work in a very small town, but if these males were to go down, I don’t think the city would survive that type of thing. So, if you’ve grown up there, and everyone kind of just knows everyone because I don’t live there, I think that plays into a huge factor. So, it’s like, ‘Oh, this is, Jane Doe, who is the daughter of so and so.’ If they kind of know you or your family, you are more than likely to get promoted a lot easier versus, ‘Hey, here is someone brand new. We don’t know, or we don’t know where she came from.’

**Political Power**

It is important to note that this study did not explore political power for several reasons. Firstly, political power is not included in French and Raven’s (1959) original model. Secondly, networking is a facet of the overall concept of political power and is not of itself considered to be the sole indication of the presence or absence of political power (Anderson & Brion, 2014; Blickle et al., 2018; Cavanagh, Moberg, & Velasquez, 1981; Ocasio, 2006). Thirdly, for the purpose of this study, networking most resembles the use or taking advantage of relationships through referent power (Bélanger et al., 2015; Raven, 1965; Raven et al., 1998; Wilson et al., 2008).

**Good Old Boy System**

From the perspective of the female respondents, men took advantage of what many of the respondents termed the “good ole boy” system. “I do think that a lot of the male-dominated fields are by nature very, just for lack of a better term like good old boy,” said Mary. Beth identified the good old boy network early on in her career.
“There are […] colleagues that didn’t know me very well. They just outright did not include me with the good old boys club. But that’s always been okay with me.”

When asked to define the good old boy network, Beth said it is “a group of insecure males who are not comfortable with strong females and don’t wish to include them.” Tonya goes further:

It is men who are part of themselves because they’re masters of the universe. They’re going to promote their friends that have their back because, in a big manufacturing company, there are always people looking to sabotage to get ahead.

They conceal things to be provided to corporate to make themselves look better because they have to get their bonuses. They click altogether. Their kids are themselves all together. Their wives have known each other for years.

Yeah, I don’t know the whole thing because until I moved to this area, I never had an experience like this bad.

When asked whether she or other women would be part of the good old boys club, Tonya said, “Like those guys that were to treat people horribly and they continue to be promoted or demonstrate bad behavior, running around yelling, and they get promoted. If I did that […], everyone would think very poorly of me.”

Tonya’s response follows closely with research. O’Neil et al. (2011) found that women do not benefit from using networking strategies similar to men. Additionally, O’Neil et al. (2011) found that a woman’s position within the company
hampers her networking abilities because she is not able to fully demonstrate her abilities and achievements to more senior leaders, particularly to those who have the power to promote.

Mary was very strident in her description of the good old boy network. When asked to define the term, Mary said, “I think everyone kind of understood what you mean, even if you don't necessarily have a good way to define it.” She felt that it was more than just networking at the company—it was the accepted lifestyle in the community. Men were expected to be social and help other men. Mary said,

You don't deviate from the norms too much. I'd even go so far as to say you've probably gone fishing or hunting in the last year or two. I mean, it just seems to be a very tight cast kind of thing […]. I think it's just someone who’s used to [a] way of doing things, and they haven't deviated from that.

Dorothy affirmed Mary’s assessment. “Men in the company kind of have stuff handed to them here and there, most of them. Some of them don’t, but most of them make friends. Their friends give them preference.”

Women are not alone in noticing the good old boy system. Sheldon described situations at his first job where supervisors promoted men they/he knew and with whom they/he were congenial.

I have noticed, if someone up top like a plant director or a regional director likes someone, they have the power to put that person in the position regardless if that person is per se qualified. I did experience it at [redacted] one time.
There was an engineer who was very difficult to work with. He was a very smart individual, but he was by no means a team player. He was given a role because the plant director liked him.

Sheldon identified that the man was promoted because he was liked by those with the power to promote rather than meeting all the qualifications. Again, his observation is supported by the research of O’Neil et al. (2008). Men tend to communicate with each other more easily, generally occurring in environments where there are no women—informal structures such as hunting clubs, locker rooms, church men’s meetings, and civic organizations (O’Neil et al., 2011; O’Neill & Blake-Beard, 2002).

Adam contended that essential job skills were not necessary for the presence of a good old boy network.

The guys are hooking up the other guys; it’s the males hooking up the other males. You're not given the position based off of, you know, quality of work or status of work or the current qualifications […]. So, they’re given the position based off who they know. How if they’re given the position, how they can influence something else. So, it's not necessarily based off the qualification of the individual, or how qualified they are, or how well they may suit that job. It is really based off who they know and how they can make things more easier or perfected by promotion.
In Adam’s experience, however, he saw what he called “the good old girl” network as well. Within the participants of this study, Adam was the sole member to elucidate a female version of the good old boy network. He said,

I think it would be the same thing as a good old boy network, just the female side. I don't see it so much heavily in the high-rank level, but I see it more in the factory level where they'll start to say, ‘hire this person versus this person.’ And, they'll recommend the same gender-based off of, ‘hey they know the work,’ or they take care of each other in that essence.

Anecdotally through observation, I have witnessed such behavior from women in my workplace. Conversely, I witnessed men take advantage of network connections more easily and readily than women.

Mentor

On the other hand, women were not as likely to take advantage of networks, especially considering the few women in many of the work environments. Because men typically hold senior levels of leadership, women are not afforded opportunities to network above their current positions in ways similar to men (Eagly & Carli, 2007; O’Neil et al., 2011; Roebuck & Smith, 2011). However, women who had strong and influential mentors, regardless of the gender of the mentor, responded that they benefitted from the mentorship.

Mentors do provide benefits to those seeking promotion, and strong mentor-protégé relations may enhance the protégé’s career success, job satisfaction, and
psychological well-being (O’Neil & Blake-Beard, 2002). The protégé may experience heightened senses of confidence, esteem, protection, and competence (O’Neil & Blake-Beard, 2002). Women do appear to suffer from a lack of mentorship in male-dominated industries (Ragins, 1993; Cook & Glass, 2014; O’Neil & Blake-Beard, 2002).

Those with female mentors responded that they felt more comfortable navigating the system and felt better prepared for the promotion process. Sally said,

I think that I've been very fortunate because I've had some really good mentors. The first one was actually a woman executive. She kind of took me under her wing and showed me a lot of the world’s cultures of the other people on a proactive, positive basis.

Sally’s first job was for a non-profit before she moved into manufacturing. In that non-profit, her mentor was the head of Human Resources, a veteran in the firm and a minority. Sally contended that she felt that because her mentor was a female of color, she was able to learn from the journey of her mentor. In her view, her mentor overcame all the obstacles and made Sally’s journey simpler to navigate. Additionally, Sally had a male mentor in the non-profit after her female mentor retired. “[He] made sure that I was taken seriously. He guided me on a lot of the decisions that I needed to make and promoted me within that organization.”

Mary felt that she had an unofficial mentor, someone who guided her. “I was getting some good trust and some good guidance and direction from my colleague
coworker.” That coworker aided her in decisions that advanced her career. This coworker was male, which did not seem unusual to Mary because there were no females in her area.

Not all who had mentors had good experiences. Tonya had a male supervisor mentor who wanted her to become a supervisor. Tonya’s career goal was not supervisory in this particular department; however, she felt bullied by her mentor. “You don’t have to be a supervisor. I’m not a person who was going to go up to somebody, especially someone with 20 years’ experience, and try to correct them. […] I’m not effective in that way.” The conflict between her mentor and Tonya resulted in a toxic environment for Tonya. She has low job satisfaction and did not want to seek any promotion. Eventually, she and the mentor agreed to part ways.

Self-Promotion

Because men are socialized to be more outspoken and speak well of themselves to garner resources and prestige, men are more likely to use self-promotion tactics as it is more inherently perceived as masculine (Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Women tend to not self-promote because of the incongruous, agentic nature of self-promotion (Karazi-Presler, Sasson-Levy, & Lomsky-Feder, 2018; Rudman, 1998). Rudman (1998) argued, “women may be reluctant to self-promote for fear of being judged unfeminine, pushy, and domineering, which in turn limits their perceived suitability for many occupations” (p. 630).
Female study participants attested to the veracity of previous research and the importance of self-promotion in the workforce. Mary said, “I mean […] if there is an advantage to talk about, maybe it's that […] if you make a positive name for yourself, you probably stand out more.” For Mary, self-promotion was critical for the promotion process, but, unlike other women in the study, she did not receive any backlash from her self-promotion. She felt that self-promotion “just depends on a person's ability to use their power or their influence” to drive decision-making or garner the required results.

Research by Rudman (1998) contended that women do not self-promote because of the reticence of being perceived as pushy, dominant, or non-feminine. In other words, women do not want to be perceived as more agentic than communal. Jennifer felt that “men are better about talking themselves up” than women. She felt that women are “more likely to be […] humble,” whereas men “would own it and not be afraid to say, ‘I did this,’ while I’m always like, ‘We did this.’” For her, it is more important to include than it is to take credit. Women tend to be inclusive whereas men are not (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014). In the promotion process, Jennifer said the following of herself:

I think that would aid in the promotion process if a man was like, ‘Well, I did this, and I’m able to do this if I got this position,’ whereas I would not be able to be as aggressive or assertive in that kind of situation.
Tracy expressed similar experiences. In her firm, male self-promotion was the norm. “Men don't tend to have as much of a struggle with bragging on what they're good at. It's just kind of part of their personality, and that's not so much a problem in the workforce.” She equated self-promotion with bragging, and men, she said, were better than women with pushing their strengths and accomplishments forward. She understood the power of the “bragging,” but she did not think she was capable of self-promotion. “I think a lot of times, I sold myself short, and people tend to overlook you because they're like, well, she doesn't think that she can do that job, so we'll find someone else.”

**Power**

Power is “the degree of discretion that individuals possess in deciding the allocation and usage of personal or organizational resources in their work” (Liu et al., 2010, p. 1438), and it includes the ability to influence and impact the roles and tasks of others (Katz, 1998). Further, Eden (2001) and Fiske (2010) argued that power and influence work together, and, when one has power, one may influence others.

For this study, French and Raven’s social power bases (1959) and Raven’s interpersonal power interaction model (2008) were utilized to examine the relationship between a person who was being considered for a promotion and the power holder with authority to grant a promotion. Power is a dyadic relationship between a person and another or a person and a group, but the traditional power models, including the various iterations of French and Raven’s power models, already discussed, look
primarily, if not only, at the relationship from top-down rather than bottom-up. The power holder exercises some form of power tactic over the target. In this study, it was argued that power might occur in reverse, and those promotees use power and influence tactics to impact the promotion decision. This research analyzed from the bottom up to better understand how women navigate promotion.

Each of the participants in this study was asked to define power. Overall, participants' views of power varied considerably. Mary considered power as a continuum.

Power? I think it's almost you can call it a spectrum […] having sway over people is always going to be power […]. Power can relate to, you know, your official title. It can relate to, I mean, people hold power in negotiations, and it doesn't even necessarily have to be anything tangible. They just may have an upper hand or an advantage, or they may have information that the other person doesn't know.

Looking through the lens of French and Raven’s (1959) model, Mary related power to legitimate (“power can relate to, you know, your official title”); coercive (“having sway over people”); expert (“people hold power in negotiations” and “they may have information that the other person doesn’t know”).

For Marsha, power is a product of individual traits in conjunction with institutional promotion. For her, “each individual has their own power, strengths, and capabilities.” Regarding promotion, she equated power with authority (legitimate) in
that “as you [are] promote[d] you are given more authority; therefore, you have more
decision-making. I think as you promote, you become more powerful that your
opinion would hold more weight.”

Similar to Marsha, industry veteran Sally felt that power is two-fold: formal
and informal. Formal power depends upon “what your position and title is within an
organization, but it gets you to pretty far” (legitimate power). Further, she felt
informal power was individual and influential. “There is power that comes just from
the individual, and the connections that you have with others within your organization
and your ability to influence others at this stage regardless of what level you are within
that organization” (referent).

Tonya saw power as traits or characteristics that are inherent to individuals.
For her, “someone who has true power is charismatic, understanding, humble. That’s
true power to me. They realize themselves they don’t know everything, but yet they
have a background. They can be taken seriously, but they’re still stretching to learn.”
Power for Tonya, because it is based on character traits, is referent as people should
“learn from the people they work with.”

Tracy connected power with decision-making. “I see power as having the
authority to make decisions without necessarily getting permission.” As an inventory
manager, Tracy felt that male managers in lower positional power were usurping her
authority given by positional (legitimate) power. However, “predominantly the sales
and branch managers are male, and we have been asked to get approval to place orders
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that we're bringing in the inventory. [Inventory] Managers have to get approvals from branch managers.” Tracy felt that others were controlling the power she should have held since she lacked the necessary decision-making authority to complete her legitimately held role effectively.

**Legitimate**

Legitimate power, also known as positional power, occurs when one has the ability to influence another person’s behavior because of the position the person occupies (Atwater & Yammarino, 1996; Blois & Hopkinson, 2013; Botes, 2014; Drea, Bruner, & Hensel, 1993; French & Raven, 1959). As research (Botes, 2014; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Haralambos & Holborn, 2008) showed, women in this study felt that they lacked legitimate power. Even when they possessed organizational authority, they had to justify or prove themselves more than male counterparts. For example, as a leader, Jennifer believed that “I constantly feel like I’m having to prove myself, and then if I do get upset that I'm not being listened to, then I’m labeled as confrontational.”

Tonya had similar sentiments but felt it was because of a top-down hierarchy. “I think that the opinions of men are sought and encouraged. A lot of that has to do with the fact that our entire executive staff is male, and a lot of the higher-ranking positions are.” Because the senior-most levels of leadership are male, promotions and power distribution tend to be male-to-male (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002).
“Titles were a big thing [in the company] because that meant something to people, and it kind of established their hierarchy within the organization,” Sally stated. Those with legitimate power hold a position of authority within the company, and that authority is often represented with a title. Because Sally had a position with authority to promote, she held legitimate power. “Titles were very important, and whenever a position became available, there was always a number of individuals who were vying for that position, so we interviewed for the position.”

When women do have legitimate power, they sometimes have difficulty handling their authority. Jill observed that

Women who have, feel like they're in a position of power, some of them not all of them, you know. There are a couple of them I feel like they almost feel like they have to overcompensate by being very intense, and by being in your face. I think that they do that so people respect that and it ends up almost backfiring.

Rose had an experience where a woman was promoted above her, and the woman began to act more agentically than she had previously.

What they did the same to, like disconnect from me and not want to associate with you. Or they would either if they were in the same department, then they would criticize you more and be more likely to find errors that you had made.

Not all women given power had concerns. Jill did have an experience with a lady in senior leadership that seemed to motivate Jill. “We have a woman who just left our company. She was very, very high up, a very high-ranking executive. She
had a lot of influence and power. She was able to do whatever she wanted. It was
crazy.” Jill would not elaborate on this leader beyond that point, even with continued
prompting. She did not know the lady’s career path, how she arrived in her position,
or how long was her tenure. However, Jill felt empowered by this lady’s position, but
she was aware of her own status in the company. “Unfortunately, I don't have any
influence, power, or status.”

Tonya contended that a woman must do more to achieve a legitimate position
of authority.

I think that women need to be doing everything a man is and then some to get a
promotion. I think you need to be a beast in order to even be considered for
something that a man who is qualified for would be considered for.

Outside of her experience in the military where there are generally more explicit paths
for promotion, Tonya was overlooked for several promotions in her current civilian
role until her last promotion. When she got the promotion, and her training was
complete, the company usurped her authority and power from the position.

So, I applied and gone all with the supervisor training program. Well, that
kind of just shocked me, because I had not supervised anyone that wasn’t in a
professional way. These were hourly employees, and I just was in shock. I
said, ‘No, put me back in production planning some sort.’ I knew someone
who we’d had a discussion when I first started because he was prior
locomotive manufacturing and he knew my extensive background with ERP
systems, SAP, and MMS. So, they talked me, that’s how I say, they talked me into taking this job because they were going to be implementing this. I was going to be instrumental. They sent me to Germany for training and had these training classes here. Then, they went to implement it, and it just fell. It got hard. So, the leadership didn’t want to continue with it. Then they started implementing a few more other like to do in the plant control.

They gave that job to a man who was an hourly employee on the floor who did not have a degree and had less experience than me. I told them, ‘I’m going to HR over this.’ So, what would they do? Instead of giving him the actual position of the person that left, they made him equal to me, but he works Monday through Friday as I call it, a super planner, because he just does the computer work, which is what they hired me to do.

**Reward**

One with reward power may affect the behaviors of others by providing the followers with things they wish to receive or removing obstacles. In this study, reward power was observed, much like it was described in Chapter Two. The outcome of a promotion was the reward being sought. “I think as far as a woman in general that their promotions are [the] reward,” said Marsha. In this study, findings suggested the reward power and coercive power occurred contiguously. For example, when a woman uses coercive behaviors, the promotee holds a reward for the power
holder granting promotion: If I sleep with you, will you give me a promotion or better working conditions?

Tonya described a situation where she slept with her supervisor to receive a promotion.

Last year, the old department head had recently become single, and I shouldn’t have done this. I started seeing him, which was totally inappropriate on his part for the most, but mine as well. He took me to a position, and I went to work a straight Monday through Friday.

Well, he got sacked, and that did tarnish my reputation. He didn’t get sacked, sacked; he just got moved to another department. He used his status to move me into a better position.

When asked what advice she would give to those starting out, Tonya said, “Don’t sleep with your boss.” In this real-life illustration, Tonya used her sex as a tool. For the power holder, the reward was the sexual encounter. For Tonya, the coercive power tactic was the exchange of sexual relations with the promise of a better working condition.

Coercive

Coercive power refers to the ability one may have to affect the behavior of another (Botes, 2014; Lunenburg, 2012; Schwarzwal, Koslowsky, & Ochana-Levin, 2004). Many of the participants equated influence as coercion or manipulation. Sheldon stated, “Someone who influences someone can either do it in a positive or
negative version. If you are a positive influencer to me, you have a different set of personality traits than somebody who would negatively influence someone.” For him, the negative aspect of influencing was manipulation. “For me personally, manipulation would be I manipulate the system to get what I want.”

Granted, the promotion and interview process itself may facilitate coercive behavior. As a seasoned company veteran who has conducted many interviews and promotions, Sally agreed.

Recruiting can be very manipulative in itself because folks who come for those interviews. They know what the questions are that you are going to ask them. They have already prepared most of their answers ahead of time. That’s what their job is, not manipulate but to persuade you that they are the best person.

This study, however, looks beyond simple influence and coercive behavior described above by Sally. Indeed, Sally recounts an instance where a female tried to manipulate.

I have seen a female trying to influence the decision based on her gender. It didn’t really stick well with me because I feel like an individual regardless of your gender, you need to take the position based on your experiences, and based on what you are able to bring to the position. You’re going to be able to take the position and help others within the organization to grow in their role.

None of the power holders interviewed admitted s/he had been the target of manipulation. All, except Mark, said they had seen it occur in others and described the situations. This is not surprising because people tend not to want to present
themselves in a negative light or show an instance where they may be perceived as weak or incompetent (Butera, 2006; Fine, 2013; Lefkowich, 2019; Pini, 2005).

As a part of a promotion interview committee, Adam witnessed a female using coercive techniques on another male member of the committee.

The way they dress and the way they appeared was very, very big influence on them trying to get that position. They were more open. They were exposed more. The dress again, more, not conservative. And their mannerism changed with that individual during the interview process. They're more open. Their gesture was more open. Their body type was more open to the individual. And they only spoke to the decision-making individual in the room. It was a group. It was a group interview. And, the individual knew that this one person had decision authority. So, she brought all her attention and her mannerisms and the essence of open body time. Really leaning towards the individual, making sure that they felt that they were the only attention given in the room where I felt like I was a bystander in the room. I was a fly on the wall.

Marsha saw both facets of the promotion process as an outside observer. She witnessed women try to dress and act as a means of coercive behavior while men would promote women who looked a “certain way.” “The supervisor of communications would only hire younger women, well-endowed women, skinnier, prettier, the ones that didn’t wear tasteful clothing, that will come into work wearing short shorts or stuff like that,” Marsha explained. She continued, “The women who
were again skinnier, prettier, younger, dressed a little bit more inappropriately got more attention.” She recounted the last time she observed women who were looking for promotion. “I have seen other females trying to promote. They get flirty, real friendly as a way of kind of why they are on the job on top of doing their job.” When asked whether a man would have to use coercive tactics, Marsha said,

I don’t think a male would have had to look a specific way in order to do the job. I think the interview process would have consisted of, ‘Can he be capable to do the job?’ Whereas not only with the women that was kind of part of it. A lot of it was the appearance. […] I think women are more looked at as sexual objects as opposed to men so, I think for men, they are not asked to do extra and go outside of work [sexual relations] to promote.

Marsha’s beliefs regarding women and promotion were vividly clear.

I think most women are willing whether it will be to work hard, to dress a certain way, to look a certain way or to treat somebody a specific way, I think most women will kind of do whatever they have to do to get there whether it will be professional or not.

Martha witnessed fellow female workers use their physical attributes coercively, as well.

I see one person there getting friendly with the male supervisor and flirting with him. Taking food to him all the time and I know a lot of people who are like that. They get involved. After that, he put her like a lead person helping
him. I don’t like to say that, but it's true. A lot of women do that because of the same reason. They [power holders] don’t believe in women. A lot of women that want to be at the time in the same position want to be promoted. They are only going to use that. Thank God I don’t have to do that because I don’t want to be them. I'm not lying. I’m telling you the truth.

**Expert**

Expert power is the capacity to sway others using advice, knowledge, and/or information afforded to a person that is directly related to the extent followers attribute knowledge and expertise to the power holder (Lunenburg, 2012). In my experience as an Executive Vice President in a manufacturing company, the specific area of manufacturing (the type of manufacturing, what is being manufactured), may require requisite knowledge. In other words, plastics manufacturing will entail both similar and dissimilar skill sets than pottery manufacturing. Further, skill sets will vary within the firm from inventory control clerks to plant engineers. Some jobs require minimal amounts of training, while others necessitate advanced degrees with specific certifications.

Ideally, there would be no gender differences related to the possession of skill sets, information, or knowledge. As Sally said in her firm,

I don’t think it matters what the gender is. For us, it would require a bachelor’s degree. I guess you could say or equivalent, but now they really
require the bachelor’s degree, and I would say probably at least eight to ten years of experience because we are a very diversified group.

Sophia’s company is like Sally’s regarding the engineering division. Now, Sophia admittedly did not know how the process would have occurred had she had no college degree, but a promotion for her requires more training, additional certifications, and mandated testing. However, any person wanting to advance must undergo comparable training.

[…] Mine is a little bit more black and white. In ten years, I’m hoping to have my professional engineering license, and, if that means I need to stay at the plant I’m at now or move, that it’s not a huge deal, but I do like where I work. I would like to stay there even just moving up in the ranks I’ve worked with professionals because part of the qualifications for it is you have to work underneath a licensed engineer for about four years, and then you have to take kind of like your engineering intern exam. So, then once those two tests have been passed, and they are hours long tests, then you get to call yourself a professional engineer.

To advance, most women in this study felt that they had to advance their education or undertake training(s). Mary contended that higher education was necessary. “Higher degrees are more likely to help, especially women. I think, in my experiences anyway, [I] have definitely seen more men without a degree become
successful in this industry than women.” Mary holds a bachelor’s degree and is contemplating a higher degree for advancement or attend more training events.

Jill’s experience corroborated Mary’s. Jill holds a bachelor’s degree, but she feels that holding the degree is not enough.

You have to be really, really, really knowledgeable. And I feel like women have to prove themselves, like ten times, when men only have to prove themselves once. Especially in a technical industry, people automatically assume I don't know what I'm talking about.

To advance, Jill said she would need an MBA if she wanted to leave her sales position. “If I wanted to go into marketing or something like that, they want you to have an MBA.”

Tonya’s desire is to be promoted to more than shift-lead. During the interview, Tonya said that she needs to become an engineer so that she can make the money she felt she deserved for the work she had been doing.

Become an engineer. At the end of the day, that’s what I’ll have to do. So, they will take me seriously. To be taken seriously, I have to prove that I know what I’m talking about, and the only way to do that is to have a technical degree. I’m getting my ducks in a row and getting my degree and then going back to engineering school because, for this area, I don’t make that money. I will for the promotion, and if I don’t get it, I will leave—period.
Tonya’s career plan does not include a position with supervisory responsibility. For her, engineering offers the challenge and monetary rewards that she desires. “In my field, it is so highly male-dominated that, if one is a female, one is perceived to be very incompetent and unable to cope with.”

Tracy’s current boss and a female mentor told her that she needed more education to be considered for a promotion.

The biggest thing for me has been that males, they’ve gotten their foot in the door without a degree or with minimal degrees because they've got training. So, they are afforded a lot of opportunities to cross-train, and then that has allowed them to get promotions without having an actual like bachelor’s degree, I would say.

I had an associate's when I came into the job, and I actually met with some people multiple times for promotions, and I was told very starkly that if I don't have a bachelor’s degree, they cannot put me in those roles even though I'm qualified in every other way.

Tracy’s career goals include moving into the senior levels of leadership in her company. In her current role in procurement, she has taken training and course work to aid her in advancement.

Men don't tend to respond as well to even a female voice. So, some things that I learned I actually took a communication class specific for women […] just to kind of learn that men don't like a lot of emotional conversation, like to fix
things and I do think that something that's helped me over the years because I think that was part of the communication breakdown and body language.

Much like Margaret Thatcher took classes to deepen her voice to be more effective as a political leader, Tracy felt that she had to learn how to communicate with men more effectively to facilitate promotion better. She had to not only change her communication styles but also obtain an advanced degree beyond her Associate’s.

Jennifer described a training all the women in her division were required to take.

All of the women in my division were called to a conference room. We were given a training, and there were no men in the training. The training consisted of tools and strategies for getting along better with men. Can you believe it? I had to take a class on how not to piss off the men in my company. I asked if the men had to take a course in how to get along with women. The response was, ‘why should they have to?’ It was unbelievable.

Dorothy felt as though the men in the company treated her as if she were not as intelligent as other men in her department. “I got told a lot more that I couldn’t do it, that I was too dumb to do it, that I wasn’t qualified to do it--a lot of discouragement.” Additionally, “In our plant, they like for you to have a bachelor’s degree for everything for some reason.” To advance to the next level, Dorothy must expand her training or receive a college degree, attend more training, or develop additional skill sets.
I’ll have to develop more excel skills and mainly just refine the computer skills because she [the current role occupier] does a lot of excel work. A lot of work that I don’t know how to do just yet, and my communication skills need to be worked on with anybody.

As the owner of a manufacturing company, Adam described what education and experience he values.

I’d say, some level of business or management degree/leadership degree. The industry is important to understand, and I think that's what you look at the culture factor, but you can do that and focus your advanced degree in that industry. But I would say either the MBA, an MSA [...] supply chain management, management leadership to understand people, to understand how to work with people, and push things forward.

However, he acknowledges how difficult it is for women in the industry.

I think it's a huge factor right now, especially since it's a male-driven industry. I think it’s going to be very difficult for females so to coming in and jump into this industry, as it's not atypical what they might want to consider a typical female industry. So, based on the matter of right or wrong, good or bad, society views are views. Women seem to have to be more educated than men, unfortunately.
Referent

High-powered individuals’ behaviors are influential such that one with less power may adopt similar behaviors as the high-powered individual to be similar to the high-powered person (Botes, 2014). Essentially, in the power dyad from promotee to power holder, the critical component is respect and a willingness to “want to be like” the other (Bipp, 2010; Meister, Sinclair, & Jehn, 2017). Even though this study examined the power dyad oppositely from conventional thought, respect is a vital aspect of promotion (Ng & Sears, 2017).

As a core principle for his company, Mark espoused respect for his employees and customers. By promoting respect, he fostered an environment that increased productivity and job satisfaction.

That’s most important, which is a Biblical principle by the way, ‘Do unto others as you would want them to do unto you.’ If I can blow your socks off and make you feel like you are special, you might come back for me again, and it happens as well.

Many times, the women in the study remarked that they had received no or very little respect from their male colleagues and male supervisors. Frequently, Jennifer is faced with a lack of respect.

There are men that I work with who I feel like I don’t get a lot of respect from. Very frequently, in meetings, I will be trying to say something, and it will be dismissed. Then, a man will say the same thing, and it's the greatest idea ever.
Jennifer felt that the lack of respect and the way she is treated in the example negatively affects her promotability. “I feel like my gender has been a negative in that way, and I don’t get the same respect as all other men around the plant.”

Jill described the importance of respect in the workplace. “If you are a person of influence and power, people respect your opinion. And, by having someone of that in your corner, they can sway decisions.” Jill has been carefully cultivating relationships but admits the garnering of respect from the men in her chain of command is difficult. “Most of my team is male, and it's been kind of difficult to get my footing on this team. As I grow, my connections will be senior level and even potentially executive level and things like that.”

To gain the respect of men, Tracy stated that women have to be adversarial to a degree to gain respect.

I think a lot of times the women sort of have to almost spar with the men and kind of outwit and negotiate with them to the point that they, that tends to be how their respect is earned in the company.

However, Jennifer explained that women must be more careful to not become belligerent. “I’ve had an old boss call me into his office a week after he got promoted and sits me down and tells me that some of the people around the plant think I’m confrontational.”

Women face the double bind of not appearing too communal while fighting against perceptions of being too agentic. Gaining the respect of males, particularly
those in leadership with promotion authority, may be especially difficult for women. The tenants of role incongruity theory identify the complexity that women face from the need to gain respect for promotion balanced against the view that they do not possess the requisite agentic skills to be promoted (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Lucas & Baxter, 2012).

**Synthesis and Summary of Data**

**Power and Promotion**

Findings from the study indicate several factors. The experiences of men and women in promotion within manufacturing are markedly different based on the data collected from the interviews. While women seemed to benefit from mentors, men took advantage of networks to garner promotion. As predicted from role congruency/incongruity theory, women appeared to suffer from negative perceptions of the capabilities and requisite skills of effective leadership, thus marring potential promotions. With so few women in senior levels, women lacked role models or potential leadership paths established by senior-level women.

Women were also hampered by male beliefs that women would undergo work-family/work-life conflicts because they thought women would want to have families, despite potential legal ramifications from the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978. Further, women felt that they would have to prove themselves more worthy of promotion while men would not be held to more rigorous standards.
Using the model of social power bases of French and Raven (1959) together with the interpersonal power interaction model (Raven, 2008), findings indicate that women and men both use power to garner promotion. However, women utilize power differently than collegial men. Chapter Five will examine how women use power. A model is presented to explicate power usage.

Other Findings

This study is not unlike other studies in that it generated unanticipated findings. When I began this study, I was concerned with the willingness of the participants to be fully open and honest. I desired that the interview would foster a sense of trust between those being interviewed and me. My concern proved to be unfounded. The female participants and their candor shocked me, and I felt that we were able to carry on a conversation. Indeed, all the women provided rich data. However, I did find that those whose interviews were conducted over the phone appeared to be more even more open than those interviewed either in person or via Skype. While the women were open, the men were more guarded yet seemed to answer more thoughtfully but honestly.

As discussed previously, I was surprised by the lack of inclination of men to participate even after the conditions of anonymity were explained thoroughly. Looking forward, future research may uncover other motives (appearance of misogyny, potential sexual harassment, or loss of power/position).
Contribution to Applied Practice

The data collected in this study contributes to a better understanding of how women navigate promotion in male-dominated industries. Findings indicated that women do prepare differently than men for promotion. Additionally, the findings suggested that women utilize disparate power bases to influence those granting promotions. Further discussion of the implications of this research, as well as models of power usage, will be expounded in Chapter Five.
Chapter 5

Discussion, Implications, Recommendations

Overview

The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study was to explore how women navigate promotion in male-dominated industries, in this case, manufacturing. The research questions guiding this research focused on the process of promotion, if the process of promotion for women were different from those of men, and how women were promoted. Further, the study explored whether women used power to garner promotion, and, if so, how they used it.

Organization of the Remainder of this Chapter

The chapter’s first section includes the study’s contribution. The second section of the chapter presents a discussion of the data and offers four models as related to the collected data. Recommendations, limitations, and areas of future research follow. The chapter ends with the researcher’s reflections. Following Chapter Five are the references and all appendices relevant to the study.

Contribution of the Study

The data collected in this study contributes to a better understanding of how women navigate promotion in male-dominated industries in several ways. Firstly, an exploration of how women navigate promotion in male-dominated industries allows researchers to investigate gender disparities in the workplace. Secondly, investigating the experience of women in the manufacturing sector may aid in developing potential
solutions for promoting qualified minorities, including women, to the highest levels of leadership within businesses. Thirdly, to the knowledge of this researcher, French and Raven’s (1959) power model(s) has(have) not been investigated from the perspective of the lower-ranking member of the dyad.

**Discussion and Implications**

As discussed in Chapter Two, Raven (1992, 1998, 2008), in his IPIM model, described the process through which the power holder selects, implements, and evaluates the most appropriate use of a particular social base (Getty, 2006). The model consists of six main stages and may be viewed from either the power holder or the target of influence (Raven, 1992). Those six stages are as follows:

1. Motivation to Influence
2. Assessment of Available Power Bases
3. Assessment of the Costs of Differing Influence Strategies
4. Preparing for the Influence Attempt
5. Choice of Mode of Influence
6. Assessing the Effects of Influence

Situational factors such as social norms, work setting, organizational culture, and corporate position with personality factors such as self-esteem, need for power, desire for control, and self-preservation influence power tactic choice.

For both men and women, earning a promotion increases job satisfaction and morale (Kosteas, 2011). Data from this study concurred with those findings. As
women received a promotion, their morale, and a sense of purpose within the company became more positive. However, when women were passed over for promotion, especially when they felt they were more qualified, their morale decreased.

Evidence gathered from the data indicated that women have more difficulty gaining a promotion than men. Men appeared to take advantage of social and work networks more quickly and easily than women. Social and work roles appeared to favor men more readily, thereby increasing the opportunities for advancement. With the lack of women in the workforce in all the companies represented, women had no noticeable social network of which they could take advantage. Further, lacking women in senior leadership roles, women in this study did not have many female mentors or role models to emulate.

To a significant extent, women in this study either sought or were seeking promotion to some level within their companies. For each, the level of advancement varied, dependent upon the individual career and work-life goals of each lady. Regardless of the level, each woman observed, through personal experience, some form of discriminatory actions against themselves or colleagues in the promotion process.

The third research question addressed the success factors women may use to navigate promotion, and if those factors are related to power constructs. Evidence from this study revealed that the factors women utilized to garner promotion were related to power constructs. Further, those factors are indicative of power and
influence dynamics. Referring to the Raven’s (2008) IPIM model and French and Raven’s (1959) bases of social power, a pattern emerged from the data.

**Models**

When one regards the power dynamic from the perspective of the promotee and not that of the power holder, one can understand the power tactic(s) that both men and women used. Because most of the power holders were male, the female participants approached promotion prepared to a degree to expect resistance. To mitigate resistance, the women adjusted their power tactics based on the gender of the power holder. Marsha explained that having a woman rather than a man making the promotion decision, the approach would be different. “Absolutely, they [women] would change their strategy. Then it will just be merit-based.” The female power holder would not “view women as a sexual object,” as a man would.

**Power Tactic Choice**

When choosing a power tactic, the promotee first identified the purpose and motivation for the tactic. Figure 10 illustrates the process of a power tactic choice. In the case of promotion, the promotee seeks to be promoted; therefore, s/he will use some means of an influence tactic. That influence tactic is based on the social power base choices of French and Raven (1959): legitimate, reward, coercive, expert, and referent power. Then, the promotee assesses the situation surrounding the promotion. Knowing the type of promotion, who the person(s) who is(are) facilitating the promotion, what are the requisite skills, knowledge, or experience, who are the other
candidates, what is the time frame of the decision, what is the promotion process, all of these questions are critical to determining if the promotion is worth the cost of resource use to undertake an appropriate power tactic. In other words, is the reward of promotion worth the potential risk of the power tactic?

After the determination is made to use a power or influence tactic, the promotee plans to deploy the tactic. That preparatory action could mean gaining more knowledge, promoting oneself, recognizing networking possibilities, or identifying the most appropriate coercive tactic. Once the preparation is made to the promotee’s satisfaction, s/he deploys the tactic to attempt to influence the power holder. A time element is needed; however, the time required will vary, depending upon the chosen power tactic. For example, gaining supplementary training or undertaking an additional degree may take longer than a coercive tactic, such as a sexual advance. When the power tactic is complete, the promotee again assesses the success of the tactic—Was the tactic successful enough to garner the desired promotion? If so, the promotee gains the promotion. If not, the promotee may desire to reassess the situation and repeat the process.

Figure 10. Choice of Power Tactic
Female Power Tactic Choice-Male Power Holder

Evidence from this research suggested that women approach promotion differently, given the gender of the power holder. Consequently, a power tactic choice varies based on the power holder’s gender. Figure 11 presents the model explaining how women chose a power tactic if the power holder is male. Data collected in this research suggested that women tended to use three of the five power bases of French and Raven (1959): expert, legitimate, or coercive (with reward) power.

Figure 11. Female Power Tactic Choice-Male Power Holder

The most accessible power tactic was coercive power. Women in the study either personally used or witnessed the use of coercive tactics. These tactics most often involved the use of the woman’s sex (appearance, flirtation, or sexual relations). The solid line indicates the immediate availability and use of the tactic. Once deployed on the power holder, the promotee will either receive or not receive the promotion. Based on the results of the data collected, the majority of those who utilized coercive tactics, primarily the use of sex, received a promotion of some degree.
To make themselves more viable candidates for promotion without the use of coercive power tactics, some women chose to expand their education and experience with degrees, certifications, training, or undertaking additional responsibilities. These women attempted to develop and use expert power. Because of the time involved in garnering the knowledge and experience, a dotted line connects the female to the attempt, with the dotted line representing the time needed to gain the education or experience (Figure 11).

Similar to expert power, referent power requires time to develop networks and cultivate positive relationships between the promotee and the power holder. Again, the dotted line represents the amount of time that will be necessary to develop and strengthen those ties. In both expert and referent power choices, the attempt, when the appropriate steps in time have been taken, will positively or negatively influence the power holder. If the promotee does not receive the promotion, she may elect to repeat the process. If she receives the promotion, her choice of power tactic was successful.

The presence of an influential and active mentor moderated the choice of a power tactic. In other words, when a woman has an influential mentor, the mentor has navigated the process, and the promotee benefits from the experience of the mentor. It is unclear how or if the gender of the mentor may affect the moderation effect. That experience will moderate the breadth and need for a power tactic to the extent that the
mentor may influence the promotion process, except if coercive power were used. Coercive power did not appear to be moderated by mentorship.

It is imperative to discuss how reward power may be used as part of coercive power. As previously discussed, the outcome for the power holder who was coerced is the reward. For example, if a promotee promises some form of *quid pro quo* in exchange for the promotion, the incentive of the trade for the promotion is the product of reward power. Logically, the more valuable the perceived reward is for the power holder, the greater likelihood the promotee will use coercive power successfully. Should the incentive hold little value to the power holder, the coercive tactic will not be effective.

**Female Power Tactic Choice-Female Power Holder**

Findings from the research indicated that women approach female power holders differently (Figure 12). In the few instances of female power holders, women in the study appeared to benefit more from positions of increased knowledge or experience. The critical aspect was that female power holders tended to view women from the perspective of “can she do the job with her skills and experience?” Consequently, female promotees relied on their education, experience, and training.

Women approached the promotion slightly more confidently that they may receive fairer treatment from a female power holder. Coercive tactics did not appear to be a tool that women chose to utilize with female power holders. Participants who had a female power holder believed that they benefited from a closer relationship
because they felt the female power holder seemed to mentor and respect them. As such, women would either use expert power by gaining more knowledge or training or referent power by gaining the respect of the female power holder. The outcome would be the success or failure of the power tactic chosen.

Once more, the presence of a mentor, either as the power holder or another person, moderated the power choice if expert or referent power were utilized.

**Figure 12. Female Power Tactic Choice-Female Power Holder**

**Male Power Tactic Choice**

Men in the study, in interviews and observed experiences, did not change tactics because of the gender of the power holder (Figure 13). Since the vast majority of power holders in manufacturing are male, men tended to approach promotion in the same manner. Power holders did not appear to question the validity or knowledge of the male promotee as they did the female promotee. As research cited earlier in the study suggested (Brass, 1985; Davies-Netzley, 1998; Greguletz, Diehl, & Kreutzer,
2019; Hurst, Leberman, & Edwards, 2018; O’Neil, 2004; Ratcliffe, 2002; Roebuck & Smith, 2011), men took advantage of networks, making full use of referent power.

Men in this study, in both observed (by the women in this study) and personal experience, made use of legitimate, expert, and referent power. As most of the power holders are male and networks are more readily available, referent power was frequently utilized. Because men are perceived to possess the necessary skills and aptitude for promotion, legitimate power, and expert power were readily available and conferred to the male promotee. Evidence from this study suggested that men use the three power tactics interchangeably, and the gender of the power holder did not influence the power tactic choice. It did seem logical that if the power holder were female, referent power in the form of networking would not be as viable as an option. However, there is no evidence from the study to support that assumption.

![Figure 13. Male Power Tactic Choice](image)

**Recommendations**

Findings from this study indicate that women may benefit from having a strong, influential mentor, particularly if the mentor is female. Therefore, firms should create a mentoring program that will help women not only in the job promotion
process but also in the acclamation to the organizational culture within the company. Mentoring should not be considered merely as a part of the onboarding process. On the contrary, continued mentorship over time aids both women and minorities in job satisfaction and retention along with promotion (Fuller et al., 2015; Roebuck & Smith, 2011).

Firms should increase training opportunities for employees in inclusion and sensitivity to aid with an increased presence of women in the workplace. Encouraging leadership to promote qualified women into leadership roles outside the traditional clerical and HR roles may foster a greater understanding of the capabilities of female leadership in traditionally male work areas. Additionally, creating an environment where all employees may freely interact and establish networks may foster an environment where employees learn from each other. Such an environment may reduce tensions and build a sense of inclusion amongst all members of the workforce.

From a legal standpoint, firms must do as much as possible to dissuade the use of sexual harassment in the workplace (McLaughlin et al., 2012). Sexual harassment and sexual discrimination are crimes. Failure to appropriately address and correct situations of sexual harassment or discrimination may open the firm to both criminal and civil legal ramifications. It is incumbent upon management to protect all its workforce. Sexual harassment and discrimination training should be part of annual leadership education. Employees should feel comfortable reporting issues to
management and HR, and their complaints should be appropriately addressed and investigated, with the proper measures being taken if warranted.

Finally, the promotion of women will undoubtedly be enhanced by the presence of more qualified candidates. Solutions here are several-fold. Firstly, firms should seek and hire qualified women to work in their companies outside of the traditional clerical roles. Secondly, focused recruiting of women at the collegiate, secondary, and trade schools through educational resources, classes, and internships may increase the number of women in the applicant pool. Finally, continued dialogue between all stakeholders and potential candidates that promote the inclusion of women and other minorities may assist in the reduction of the stigma and power of stereotypes.

**Limitations**

As in all research, this study has limitations. The purpose of the study was to explore gender-based issues in the promotion of women in manufacturing. One of the limitations of this study is the lack of male participation. Establishing a more robust baseline for comparison between the disparate experiences of men and women in manufacturing and any male-dominated industry would prove useful for the understanding of power usage in a promotion. Securing male participation would be vital for future research to explore further how men and women use power tactics.

Because of the qualitative research, another limitation of this research is the relatively small number of participants when compared to a more extensive
quantitative survey(s) and testing of the models presented. Additionally, this study explored gender-related issues as defined by biological sex (refer to definitions for further details). Sexuality or issues related to sexuality, sexual preference, gender fluidity, or any similar area was well beyond the scope of this study.

While it is not feasible to interview every woman who works in manufacturing, the sample does not afford any generalizability to the general population. Like all research, findings are dependent upon the veracity of the participants. As previously discussed, I was struck by the openness of all the participants, and I am convinced that each participant frankly and genuinely relayed his or her experiences.

**Future Research**

Firstly, future research should focus on a quantitative measure of the models created from this study. More significant numbers of participants may help in the validation and reliability measures of the models. A quantitative examination of the model is necessary to develop further and refine the models presented in this study.

Secondly, as suggested by some of the evidence gathered in Rose’s interview, exploring when women are promoted and supervise other women may yield data suggesting women may hamper women in a promotion. Research (Holmes, Marra, Lazzaro-Salazar, 2016; Kirkwood, 2007; Sternberg, 2019) has described tall poppy syndrome whereby women seem to undercut those women who are promoted to higher levels; however, an exploration of that phenomenon was beyond the scope of
this present research. Nevertheless, an investigation of the tall poppy syndrome and how power tactics may influence that phenomenon may prove fruitful.

Thirdly, an exploration regarding concerns of race or other minorities in promotion was beyond the scope of this study. A peripheral finding from this study points to the necessity to analyze cultures and sub-cultures using, for example, Hofstede’s research could be utilized to explore how much influence culture has on the promotion of women and their subsequent use of power. Finally, future research might compare men in female-dominated industries, such as nursing, with the findings from this study to see if men in those fields experience similar or disparate situations as women in manufacturing.

Researcher’s Reflections

During both the pilot and final studies, the theme of respect was repeated by many of the female participants. All the women felt they deserved better respect from their male colleagues. The ultimate goal, I think, for the use of power tactics by women was to gain a level of equal or better than equal footing than men in the promotion process. In the ideal world, promotion would be based on merits, education, and experience. However, reality is less objective.

Another underlying facet that was never articulated well by the participants was a feeling of “why.” Many of the women described situations they did not understand—Why were my opinions not valued? Why am I treated differently? Why did I not get promoted? Women seemed to struggle to become visible in their
workplaces as equal to the men who already occupied the positions. Perhaps, the next step for women is to begin to see themselves not as women who are trying to occupy roles traditionally held by men but as women who deserve to possess the place of authority for which they are qualified.

This intransient double bind of role congruity women face is still prevalent but is slowly changing. It is my sincere hope that the discursive nature of this dissertation will stimulate discussion and further theoretical development on both female promotion in male-dominated industry as well as how power strategies are developed and used. To that end, this study encourages discourse that challenges stereotypes while examining the processes of promotion. As a man, I realize that potential solutions to issues presented in this study are incumbent on both men and women that will bring about a more inclusive leadership paradigm in manufacturing.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent

The Florida Institute of Technology, Nathan Bisk School of Business
Doctoral Student: Jamie Birdwell
Title of Project: Navigating the Glass Ladder: A Qualitative Exploration of the Challenges Women Leaders Experience throughout the Process of Promotion in the Manufacturing Industry

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

I am inviting you to take part in a research study. This form will tell you about the study, and I will also review it with you if you decide to participate. At any point, you may ask me any questions that you have. When you are ready to decide, you can contact me and let me know if you want to participate or not. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate, I will ask you to sign this statement and will provide you with a copy to keep.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?

The purpose of this research is to examine how women are promoted within male-dominated industry. You are being invited to be interviewed because you meet the criteria of women who have been promoted or may be a candidate for promotion within the manufacturing industry.

Why is this research study being done?

The purpose of the study is to explore the career progression to leadership for women who work in manufacturing. The research will explore women’s perspectives of their path to leadership.

What will I be asked to do?

As the researcher, I will be looking for you to participate in the following ways:

1. Complete a brief questionnaire about your background and your career progression.
2. Identify a pseudonym to be used throughout the course of the research.
3. Participate in an audio-recorded 45-60 minute either face-to-face or by phone in-depth interview to talk about your experiences of advancing to a top leadership position.
4. Participate in a member-check process to verify the interview transcript and the interpretation of the interview.
Where will this take place and how much time will it take?

Completing the background questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes. Individual interviews will take approximately 45-60 minutes. The interviews will take place at a time and location (in-person, by phone, or by video through Skype) that is mutually agreed upon between each participant and me.

Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?

There are no known significant risks involved in being a participant in this study.

Will I benefit by being in this research?

There are no direct benefits for your participation in the study. However, the information learned from the study may provide valuable insights to support women’s progression to leadership positions. Your participation and experiences could potentially assist in identifying strategies that may benefit other women who want to advance to leadership.

Who will see the information about me?

Your participation in the study will be completely confidential. All participants will be asked to identify a pseudonym that will be used throughout the research process, and the agency you work in will not be identified. As the researcher, only I will be aware of each participant’s identity.

No reports or publications will use information that can identify you in any way.

The data collected for this study will be kept by me and will not be shared with others. All audio files will be destroyed following the completion of the research. In rare instances, authorized people may request to see research information about you and other people in this study. This is done only to be sure that the research is done properly. I would only permit people authorized by organizations such as Florida Institute of Technology to view the study data.

If I do not want to take part in the study, what choices do I have?

You are not required to take part in this study. If you do not want to participate, you do not have to sign this form.

What will happen if I suffer any harm from this research?

There are no known significant risks involved in being a participant in this study.
Can I stop my participation in this study?

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your participation or non-participation will in no way affect other relationships. You may discontinue your participation in this research program at any time without penalty or cost.

Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?

You can contact me (Jamie Birdwell) at xxxxxxxxxx@my.fit.edu, or by calling 850-XXX-XXXX or my advisor, Dr. Emily Vogt at xxxxxxxxxx@fit.edu, or by calling 321-XXX-XXXX.

Who can I contact about my rights as a participant?

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact

Florida Institute of Technology, IRB
150 West University Blvd.
Melbourne, FL 32901
Email: FIT_IRB@fit.edu Phone: 321-XXX-XXXX

You may call anonymously if you wish.

Will I be paid for my participation?

There is no cost to participate in this study.

Will it cost me anything to participate?

There is no cost to participate in this study.

Signature Page Follows
I agree to take part in this research.

Signature of person agreeing to take part  Date

Printed name of person above

Signature of person who explained the study to the participant above and obtained consent  Date

Printed name of person above
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Recruiting Letter/Email to Prospective Participants

Thank you for participating in this interview. I am Jamie Birdwell, and I am a doctoral student at the Florida Institute of Technology. I am conducting research of women in different levels of management within male-dominated workplaces, particularly in manufacturing.

The purpose of this research is to examine how women are promoted within male-dominated industry. You are being interviewed because you meet the criteria of women who have been promoted or may be a candidate for promotion within the manufacturing industry.

I would like to hear your perspectives on various aspects of your career as well as your personal experiences within manufacturing. The information gathered from this research may produce a better insight into the experiences women have faced or may produce relevant new frameworks that may help us understand how women navigate hurdles to get a promotion.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you may stop at any time or refuse to answer any question without any sort of penalty. There should be minimal risks for participating in the study, and there are no costs or monetary benefits.

This interview is strictly confidential and should not take up more than one hour of your times. To make sure I capture your responses wholly and correctly, the
audio of the interview will be recorded. Individuals will not be identified by name in reporting of the study’s results. I am required to ask that you sign the approved consent form indicating your understanding and agreement to participate in the study.
Appendix C

Recruiting Letter/Email to Prospective Power Holders

Thank you for participating in this interview. I am Jamie Birdwell, and I am a doctoral student at the Florida Institute of Technology. I am conducting research of women in different levels of management within male-dominated workplaces, particularly in manufacturing.

The purpose of this research is to examine how women are promoted within male-dominated industry and to better understand how they prepare for promotion. You are being interviewed because you meet the criteria of one who has the authority to promote in your workplace within the manufacturing industry.

I would like to hear your perspectives on various aspects of the promotion process and as well as your personal experiences during the promotion process within manufacturing. The information gathered from this research may produce a better insight into the experiences of both women and the person(s) conducting the promotion or may produce relevant new frameworks that may help us understand how women navigate the promotion process within manufacturing.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you may stop at any time or refuse to answer any question without any sort of penalty. There should be minimal risks for participating in the study, and there are no costs or monetary benefits.
This interview is strictly confidential and should not take up more than one hour of your times. To make sure I capture your responses wholly and correctly, the audio of the interview will be recorded. Individuals will not be identified by name in reporting of the study’s results. I am required to ask that you sign the approved consent form indicating your understanding and agreement to participate in the study.
Appendix D

Interview Protocol: Promotees: Female

Before we begin, we’d like to tell you a little bit about our study.

We are interested in how women are promoted in manufacturing. In other words, we want to understand how and when women are considered for promotion and how women prepare for that promotion. We are also interested in finding out whether there are certain strategies women feel useful during the promotion process.

In this interview, I would like to learn about what you think about these issues. So, I would like to ask you a few questions about your own experiences. Please feel free to say anything you think – we are not looking for anything in particular; we are simply interested in different people’s experiences and points of view. Also, all information will be kept completely confidential.

1. In thinking back on your career thus far, how would you describe and characterize your overall experience as a woman working in a male-dominated field?

   Probes: Why do you characterize the experience this way?

   What have been some of the struggles you’ve faced, if any?

2. How do you think your experiences compare to other women in male-dominated occupations?
Probes: What do you think contributed to the differences?

3. What do you think are the factors that influence women’s success in male-dominated occupations?
   Probes: What factors do you control, and what factors are just part of the job culture?
   How do those factors compare to those of men?

4. How did you get to your current position in your company?
   Probes: What factors made your journey easy or difficult?

5. Where do you think you will be in 10 years?
   Probes: How do you think you will get to that position?
   What strategies do you think you will need to use to achieve your goals?

6. What are the personal, educational and institutional experiences that contribute to the upward mobility of women as they advance into senior level positions?
   Probes: What strategies have you developed along the way to garner promotion?
   How do you feel your journey was compared to other women?
   How do you feel your journey was compared to other men?
7. How does gender influence the experiences of women as they advance in their careers?

   Probes: Tell me if you think gender has played any positive or negative role for you in your pursuit of career success?
   
   What do you think are the general advantages and/or disadvantages to being a woman in the profession?
   
   From your perspective, had you been a man, would the institutional, family, and personal barriers you described have been different? If so, how?

8. How do you understand the term “power?”

   Probes: How does your understanding of power differ from that of influence?

9. Tell me about a time when you witnessed a female colleague use power or status or maybe you may have used power or status to influence a promotion decision?

   Probes: How did this affect you (emotionally, physically, job attitudes)?
   
   How did this affect the other individuals involved (emotionally, physically, job attitudes)?
10. How may a person try to influence, use power, or use status to aid in the promotion process?

   Probes: How do you feel that these strategies may change at entry, mid, and senior levels?

11. In your experience, how do women use influence, power, or status in the promotion process, if they do at all?

   Probes: How are these strategies different than men?
   How do you think, if at all, these strategies change if the supervisor is female versus male?

12. What strategies or skills have senior women leaders employed to overcome barriers?

   Probes: What insights have you gained about women’s promotion over the years?

   What skills, strategies, or support are most critical if women are to succeed as senior-level leaders?

   What advice would you give to women who are beginning their careers in manufacturing?
Appendix E

Interview Protocol: Promotees: Male

Before we begin, we'd like to tell you a little bit about our study.

We are interested in how women are promoted in manufacturing. In other words, we want to understand how and when women are considered for promotion and how women prepare for that promotion. We are also interested in finding out whether there are certain strategies women feel useful during the promotion process.

In this interview, I would like to learn about what you think about these issues. So, I would like to ask you a few questions about your own experiences. Please feel free to say anything you think – we are not looking for anything in particular; we are simply interested in different people’s experiences and points of view. Also, all information will be kept completely confidential.

1. In thinking back on your career thus far, how would you describe and characterize your overall experience in manufacturing?

   Probes: Why do you characterize the experience this way?
   
   What have been some of the struggles you’ve faced, if any?

2. How do you think your experiences compare to others?

   Probes: What do you think contributed to the differences?

3. What do you think are the factors that influence a person’s success in manufacturing occupations?
Probes: What factors do you control, and what factors are just part of the job culture? How do those factors compare to those of women?

4. How did you get to your current position in your company?

Probes: What factors made your journey easy or difficult?

5. Where do you think you will be in 10 years?

Probes: How do you think you will get to that position? What strategies do you think you will need to use to achieve your goals?

6. What are the personal, educational and institutional experiences that contribute to upward mobility as they advance into senior level positions?

Probes: What strategies have you developed along the way to garner promotion? How do you feel your journey was compared to women? How do you feel your journey was compared to other men?

7. How does gender influence the experiences of anyone as they advance in their career?
Probes: Tell me if you think gender has played any positive or negative role for you in your pursuit of career success?

What do you think are the general advantages and/or disadvantages to being a man in the profession?

From your perspective, had you been a woman, would the institutional, family, and personal barriers you described have been different? If so, how?

8. How do you understand the term “power?”

Probes: How does your understanding of power differ from that of influence?

9. Tell me about a time when you witnessed a female colleague use power or status or maybe you may have used power or status to influence a promotion decision?

Probes: How did this affect you (emotionally, physically, job attitudes)?

How did this affect the other individuals involved (emotionally, physically, job attitudes)?
10. How may a person try to influence, use power, or use status to aid in the promotion process?

Probes: How do you feel that these strategies may change at entry, mid, and senior levels?

11. In your experience, how do women use influence, power, or status in the promotion process, if they do at all?

Probes: How are these strategies different than men? How do you think, if at all, these strategies change if the supervisor is female versus male?

12. What strategies or skills have senior women leaders employed to overcome barriers?

Probes: What insights have you gained about women’s promotion over the years? What skills, strategies, or support are most critical if women are to succeed as senior-level leaders? What advice would you give to women who are beginning their careers in manufacturing?
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Interview Protocol: Power Holder

Before we begin, we'd like to tell you a little bit about our study.

We are interested in how women are promoted in manufacturing. In other words, we want to understand how and when women are considered for promotion and how women prepare for that promotion. We are also interested in finding out whether there are certain strategies women feel useful during the promotion process.

In this interview, I would like to learn about what you think about these issues. So, I would like to ask you a few questions about your own experiences. Please feel free to say anything you think we are not looking for anything in particular; we are simply interested in different people’s experiences and points of view. Also, all information will be kept completely confidential.

1. Can you describe how you prepare and conduct a promotion?

2. How do you consider candidates for promotion?

3. What do you expect a candidate to do to prepare for a promotion appropriately?

   Probes: Do you feel men and women prepare the same or differently during the process?

4. What are the things, characteristics, or criteria you consider most important when reviewing candidates for promotion?

5. Can you describe an instance where someone who was up for promotion acted in a manner that was not appropriate for the position?

6. How do you understand the term “power?”
7. How do you understand the term “influence?”

8. Do you feel that in your workplace there are clear roles for men and separate roles for women?

9. Can you describe the characteristics you feel important for a supervisor to possess in order to be successful?

10. Can you describe any situation within your firm where a man would be a better manager than a woman?

11. Can you describe any situation within your firm where a woman would be a better manager than a man?

12. How should a woman prepare for a promotion within your firm? How does that preparation change as the managerial level changes?

13. Have you ever felt as if a person being considered for a promotion tried to influence your decision in any way?

   Probe: Can you describe an instance where a man tried to influence you?

   Can you describe an instance where a woman tried to influence you?

   How successful was that tactic?

14. What qualities do you think a successful manager within your firm should possess and display?
15. In your experience, can you describe an instance where another person making the promotion decisions may have been influenced during a promotion process by anyone going for a promotion?
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Interview Script

INSTRUCTIONS

Good morning (afternoon). My name is Jamie Birdwell. Thank you for coming. The purpose is to get your perceptions of your experiences in your firm regarding promotion. There are no right or wrong or desirable or undesirable answers. I would like you to feel comfortable with saying what you really think and how you really feel. If at any time you feel you need to take a break or you feel uncomfortable, please let me know.

TAPE RECORDER INSTRUCTIONS

If it is okay with you, I will be tape-recording our conversation. The purpose of this is so that I can get all the details but, at the same time, be able to carry on an attentive conversation with you. I assure you that all your comments will remain confidential.

CONSENT FORM INSTRUCTIONS

Before we get started, please take a few minutes to read this consent form (read and sign this consent form). (Hand Participant the consent form.) (After Participant returns consent form, turn the tape recorder on.)
Appendix H

Demographics Questionnaire: All Participants

Gender: Please indicate your gender.
__ Male
__ Female

Education: Please indicate your highest level of education completed.
__ No High School
__ Some High School
__ High School Diploma or Equivalent
__ Some College
__ Associate Degree
__ Bachelor’s Degree
__ Master’s Degree
__ Doctorate Degree

Position: Please indicate your current position within the organization.
__ Worker
__ Supervisor
__ Manager
__ Executive

What is your title, rank, or area? __________________________________________

How long have you been in your current position? ___________________________

Tenure: Please indicate the number of years you have been employed by the
organization.
__ less than 1 year
__ at least 1 year but less than 5 years
__ at least 5 years but less than 10 years
__ at least 10 years but less than 15 years
__ at least 15 years but less than 25 years
__ at least 25 years but less than 50 years
__ at least 50 years or more

50 years or more
Appendix I

Prospective Participant Screening Tool

Age: Are you at least 21 years old?

__ Yes
__ No

Gender: This particular study seeks to explore the experiences of those who have received promotions. From what perspective do you view this phenomenon?

__ Male
__ Female

Do you work within what could be classified as the manufacturing industry?

__ Yes
__ No

Are you currently, or in the past, a decision-maker in the promotion process for an employee?

__ Yes
__ No
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IRB Submission

Notice of Exempt Review Status
Certificate of Clearance for Human Participants Research

Principal Investigator: Jamie Birdwell
Date: August 6th 2019
IRB Number: 19.120
Study Title: Navigating the Glass Ladder: A Qualitative Exploration of the Challenges Women Leaders Experience throughout the Process of Promotion in the Manufacturing Industry

Your research protocol was reviewed and approved by the IRB Chairperson. Per federal regulations, 45 CFR 46.101, your study has been determined to be minimal risk for human subjects and exempt from 45 CFR46 federal regulations. The Exempt determination is valid indefinitely. Substantive changes to the approved exempt research must be requested and approved prior to their initiation. Investigators may request proposed changes by submitting a Revision Request form found on the IRB website.

Acceptance of this study is based on your agreement to abide by the policies and procedures of Florida Institute of Technology’s Human Research Protection Program (http://w05.flt.edu/crm/irb) and does not replace any other approvals that may be required.

All data, which may include signed consent form documents, must be retained in a secure location for a minimum of three years (six if HIPAA applies) past the completion of this research. Any links to the identification of participants should be maintained on a password-protected computer if electronic information is used. Access to data is limited to authorized individuals listed as key study personnel.

The category for which exempt status has been determined for this protocol is as follows:

2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior so long as confidentiality is maintained.
   a. Information is recorded in such a manner that the subject cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the participant and/or
   b. Subject’s responses, if known outside the research would not reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject’s financial standing, employability, or reputation.
CATEGORIES OF EXEMPT RESEARCH

- Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as:
  - a. research on regular and special education instruction strategies, or
  - b. research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula or classroom management methods.

- Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior unless:
  - a. the subjects are identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects and
  - b. any disclosure of the subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability or reputation.

  Note: This exemption does not apply to survey procedures or interviews involving minors.

- Research involving the use of educational tests, survey or interview procedures, or observation of public behavior if:
  - a. the subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office, or
  - b. the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

- Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records or specimens if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, indirectly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

- Research and demonstration projects that are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads and that are designed to study, evaluate or otherwise examine:
  - a. public benefit or service programs,
  - b. procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs,
  - c. possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures, or
  - d. possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

- Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies if:
  - a. wholesome foods without additives are consumed, or
  - b. food is consumed that contains food ingredients found to be safe by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

RESEARCH FUNDING

If any part of this study will be funded by an external funding source, you must note the funding source and award solicitation number below.

None
Florida Institute of Technology

RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS
EXEMPT APPLICATION

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AS THOROUGHLY AS POSSIBLE:

1. List the objectives of the proposed project.

This study seeks to explore the experiences of women as they seek promotions at three levels of management (entry level, middle level, or senior level) in male-dominated industry. An exploration of their male counterparts may show if the experiences of women in the manufacturing sector differ from that of men. Further, as women face promotion, do they use power or influence tactics to increase the likelihood of promotion?

Research Questions

Q1. What are the experiences of women leaders in their promotability in the manufacturing industry?
Q2. Do women encounter similar or disparate challenges in job promotion as their male counterparts?
Q3. What are the success factors contributing to the process of promotion for women in the manufacturing industry? Are such factors connected to constructs of power?

2. Describe the research project design/methodology. Discuss how you will conduct your study, and what measurement instruments you are using. Attach all research materials to this application. Please describe your study in enough detail so the IRB can identify what you are doing and why.

For the hermeneutic phenomenological study, participants will be both female and male. The female participants would have disparate levels of experiences from those newly entering the workforce to seasoned veterans. They would also have varying levels of experience with promotions, thereby supplying an opportunity to explore expectations versus experiences. The men (and some women) in this study would be the power holders, those who oversaw or in some way participated in the promotion of women. From their vantage, exploration of their experiences in promotion would yield data regarding the perception of the power tactics women may have used, and whether that power use may have impacted the female leader’s promotion.

Women and men at three distinct levels within the manufacturing industry will be interviewed. For the promotee, I will interview those who are in their early career (year one to year five) of leadership (for example, manager or supervisor), mid career level (year six through year fifteen and who are, for example, department level management, senior manager), and executive level (year sixteen and above who are, for example, C-Suite or plant level leader). Men (and some women) who may be interviewed are those who are power holders, those who currently, or have in the past, conducted promotions. It is essential to speak with individuals at different levels within organizations as well as at various points within their career to ascertain whether challenges faced differed (or not) at various levels of the organization. For promotees, up to five will be interviewed per level, whereas up to five total will be interviewed for powerholders.

Participants will be selected from the manufacturing industry. Each participant will be interviewed in person, over the phone, or via online video-conference such as zoom. The interviews should last approximately one hour. As needed, follow-up interviews may be conducted. Please see the attached protocols.

Each interview will be recorded via audio recorder. The interviews will be uploaded to a secure website (Weloty.com) and will be transcribed. Weloty.com will provide signed non-disclosure agreements and guarantee the safeguard of the audio files and transcriptions.

The transcriptions will be returned to me for data analysis. Using NVivo software, the transcriptions will be analyzed. The interview protocols for both the promotee and the power holder are included.
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3. Describe the characteristics of the participant population, including number, age, sex and recruitment strategy (attach actual recruitment email text, recruitment forms, etc.).

Both women and men will be interviewed. At three distinct levels of leadership—entry (1-5 years), mid (6-15 years), and senior levels (more than 15 years)—promotese will be interviewed. Three men and three women from each level will be interviewed for a total of 18 (9 men, 9 woman). The promotese are those who have either received or are currently seeking a promotion within the manufacturing industry.

Additionally, those who grant promotions (powerholders) will be interviewed. A total of five powerholders, regardless of sex, will be interviewed.

Because those being interviewed are already employed and are in some level of leadership within the manufacturing industry, no one under the age of eighteen will be included in the study.

Ethnicity, race, background, and other demographic features not previously mentioned will preclude a person from being included as a potential member of the study.

As I am Senior Vice President of a manufacturing company, I have a rapport with members of the manufacturing industry. Those potential members may provide further information regarding other potential candidates. A recruiting email will be sent to all potential participants. Also, in case of potential phone recruitment, a phone recruitment script is attached. See attached.

4. Describe any potential risks to the participants (physical, psychological, social, legal, etc.) and assess their likelihood and seriousness. Describe steps that will be taken to mitigate each risk.

There are minimal risks associated with this study. The risk of loss of confidentiality is always a paramount concern. I will make every effort to keep the information strictly confidential. All participants will be asked to sign an informed consent form and the transcription service (wpslr.com) has agreed to sign a non-disclosure agreement. Submitting to their website is through an encrypted and secure portal/ interface. All participants will be given a unique code for protect their identity while allowing me the ability to categorize the data appropriately. Also, a participant may find that some of the questions asked as part of this study may raise sensitive issues, resulting in mild emotional discomfort. The participant may refuse to answer any of the questions asked and may take a break at any time during the study, both during the initial and follow-up interviews (if conducted). In addition, the participant may withdraw from this study at any time without negative consequences.

Once the transcribed interviews are returned to me, wpslr.com will destroy the recordings. The pseudonym key will be kept on an external hard drive separate and apart from the location of the transcriptions that will be stored on a separate, password protected computer. Doing so will further decrease the likelihood of breaching the anonymity of the participants and protect their identities. The transcriptions’ files will also be password protected.
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RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS
EXEMPT APPLICATION

5. Describe the procedures you will use to maintain the confidentiality and privacy of your research participants and protect data. If video or audio recordings will be made, you must review the video/audio recording policy found on the IRB website and address precautions you will take in this section.

Each participant's interview will be recorded and uploaded to a secure website (www.webly.com) for transcription. Webly.com is a recognized academic transcription service and will provide a nondisclosure agreement. They will also guarantee the confidentiality of the recordings. Prior to uploading, the participant's recording will be labeled in such a way as to maintain the confidentiality of the participant and a profile of each participant will be created.

The transcription will be returned to me through webly.com's secure website, and I will upload the data to Nvivo software for data analysis. Again, the recordings/transcriptions will be coded and labeled in such a way as to protect the identities of the participant. The participant will be given a copy of their transcription and asked if the transcription reflects what they said and their intent. Only I will see all of the transcriptions and know who the person was.

Once the transcribed interviews are returned to me, webly.com will destroy the recordings. The pseudonym key will be kept on an external hard drive separate and apart from the location of the transcriptions that will be stored on a separate password protected computer. Doing so will further decrease the likelihood of breaching the anonymity of the participants and protect their identities. The transcription files will also be password protected.

6. Describe your plan for informed consent (attach proposed form).

Each potential participant will be given a copy of the informed consent. The informed consent will be read by the participant and signed by both the participant and me. I will explain the nature of the study, potential risks, confidentiality, and the other benefits of the informed consent prior to the signing. I will ask for questions or need for clarification, and address any concern they may have. Taking the template provided by Florida Tech, I created an informed consent with headers. Please see the attached form.
7. Discuss the importance of the knowledge that will result from your study (benefits to the field and to society) and what benefits will accrue to your participants (if any). Include information about participant compensation if appropriate.

The potential knowledge from this study will help expand our understanding of the role of women in male-dominated industries, specifically how and when women are promoted. The participants will not receive any benefits from the study short of sharing their stories and contributing to the research. There is no compensation for participation in the study.

8. Explain how your proposed study meets criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board review (as outlined on page 2 of the form).

Because the participants are being interviewed and will be sharing personal experiences, the risks are minimal. Every precaution will be taken to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of each participant. No one under the age of 18 will be interviewed.
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SIGNATURE ASSURANCES
I understand Florida Institute of Technology's policy concerning research involving human participants and I agree:

1. to accept responsibility for the scientific and ethical conduct of this research study.
2. to obtain prior approval from the Institutional Review Board before amending or altering the research protocol or implementing changes in the approved consent form.
3. to immediately report to the IRB any serious adverse reactions and/or unanticipated effects on subjects which may occur as a result of this study.
4. to complete, on request by the IRB, a Continuation Review Form if the study exceeds its estimated duration.

[Signature] Date 7/29/19

ADVISOR ASSURANCE: IF PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR IS A STUDENT
This is to certify that I have reviewed this research protocol and that I attest to the scientific merit of the study, the necessity for the use of human subjects in the study, the student's academic program, and the competency of the student to conduct the project.

Major Advisor Signature [Redacted] Date 7/25/19

Major Advisor (print) [Redacted]

ACADEMIC UNIT HEAD: IT IS THE PI'S RESPONSIBILITY TO OBTAIN THIS SIGNATURE
This is to certify that I have reviewed this research protocol and that I attest to the scientific merit of this study and the competency of the investigator(s) to conduct the study.

Academic Unit Head Signature [Redacted] Date 7/25/19

Academic Unit Head (print) [Redacted]
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Informed Consent

The Florida Institute of Technology, Nathan Bisk School of Business
Doctoral Student: Jamie Birdwell
Title of Project: Navigating the Glass Ladder: A Qualitative Exploration of the Challenges Women Leaders Experience Throughout the Process of Promotion in the Manufacturing Industry

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

I am inviting you to take part in a research study. This form will tell you about the study, and I will also review it with you if you decide to participate. At any point, you may ask me any questions that you have. When you are ready to decide, you can contact me and let me know if you want to participate or not. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate, I will ask you to sign this statement and will provide you with a copy to keep.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?

The purpose of this research is to examine how women are promoted within male-dominated industry. You are being invited to be interviewed because you meet the criteria of women who have been promoted or may be a candidate for promotion within the manufacturing industry.

Why is this research study being done?

The purpose of the study is to explore the career progression to leadership for women who work in manufacturing. The research will explore women's perspectives of their path to leadership.

What will I be asked to do?

As the researcher, I will be looking for you to participate in the following ways:
1. Complete a brief questionnaire about your background and your career progression.
2. Identify a pseudonym to be used throughout the course of the research.
3. Participate in an audio-recorded 45-60 minute face-to-face, in-depth interview to talk about your experiences of advancing to a top leadership position.
4. Participate in a member-check process to verify the interview transcript and the interpretation of the interview.

Where will this take place and how much time will it take?

Completing the background questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes. Individual interviews will take approximately 45-60 minutes. The interviews will take place at a time and
location (in-person, by phone, or by video through Zoom) that is mutually agreed upon between each participant and me.

**Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?**

There are no known significant risks involved in being a participant in this study.

**Will I benefit by being in this research?**

There are no direct benefits for your participation in the study. However, the information learned from the study may provide valuable insights to support women’s progression to leadership positions. Your participation and experiences could potentially assist in identifying strategies that may benefit other women who want to advance to leadership.

**Who will see the information about me?**

Your participation in the study will be completely confidential. All participants will be asked to identify a pseudonym that will be used throughout the research process, and the agency you work in will not be identified. As the researcher, only I will be aware of each participant’s identity.

No reports or publications will use information that can identify you in any way.

The data collected for this study will be kept by me and will not be shared with others. All audio files will be destroyed following the completion of the research. In rare instances, authorized people may request to see research information about you and other people in this study. This is done only to be sure that the research is done properly. I would only permit people authorized by organizations such as Florida Institute of Technology to view the study data.

**If I do not want to take part in the study, what choices do I have?**

You are not required to take part in this study. If you do not want to participate, you do not have to sign this form.

**What will happen if I suffer any harm from this research?**

There are no known significant risks involved in being a participant in this study.

**Can I stop my participation in this study?**

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your participation or non-participation will in no way affect other relationships. You may discontinue your participation in this research program at any time without penalty or cost.
Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?

You may contact me (Jamie Birdwell) at [redacted] or by calling [redacted] or my advisor, Dr. Emily Vogt at [redacted] or by calling 877-582-4941.

Who can I contact about my rights as a participant?

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact

Florida Institute of Technology, IRB
150 West University Blvd.
Melbourne, FL 32901
Email: FIT_IRB@fit.edu Phone: 321.674.7347

You may call anonymously if you wish.

Will I be paid for my participation?

There is no cost to participate in this study.

Will it cost me anything to participate?

There is no cost to participate in this study.

Signature Page Follows
I agree to take part in this research.

Signature of person agreeing to take part  Date

Printed name of person above

Signature of person who explained the study to the participant above and obtained consent  Date

Printed name of person above
Non-Disclosure Agreement for Transcription Services

I hereby agree that any audio recorded information I obtain as a transcriber during Jamie Birdwell’s research will be kept confidential on a permanent basis.

I am not to inform anyone else about any of the content of the interviews. I also refrain from making any copies of the recordings of the interviews. The recorded interviews will be kept safe on a password-protected computer.

Moreover, the recorded material will be deleted immediately upon the completion of the transcription. None of the content will be forwarded to any third party under any circumstances.

Date
August 19, 2019.

Signature