Examining the Impact of Communication and Leadership Styles of Women: Perceptions of Effectiveness by Subordinates

The Honors Program
Final Research Paper
Samantha Scoca
Dr. Lori Coakley
April 2018

Table of Contents

Abstract

The number of female managers in American companies has been increasing with female management making up 63.4% of S&P 500 companies (Catalyst 2018). Female leaders have traditionally been at a disadvantage by social norms that surround masculine corporate America. Women have often been categorized as communal leaders that focus on the collective efforts of the team they manage (Eagly 1987). They communicate using interpersonally-oriented dimensions including collaboration, relationship building and information sharing as well (Appelbaum et.al 2013). Male leadership and communication styles, on the other hand, have been mentally associated with agentic qualities such as being aggressive and having results oriented outcomes (Eagly 1987). The current body of research asserts that women often face a "double bind" situation where if they act more agentic, than they are considered aggressive and often disliked and if they act communally they are not viewed as an effective leader (Northouse, 2004; Eagly & Carly, 2007).

Looking exclusively at the perceptions of women leaders who manage male and female employees, this qualitative study tries to understand the perceptions that male and female employees have of their female boss's leadership and communication styles. The researcher interviewed 5 triads (N=15) using a grounded-theory approach and semi-structured interviews. The results of this research study suggest that while male and female subordinates positively viewed their female bosses as effective leaders with open communication styles, the attributes used to evaluate their leadership and communication styles differed. Male subordinates applied

more agentic characteristics to assess female leaders while female subordinates applied more communal attributes.

Introduction

The number of female managers in American companies has been increasing with female management making up 63.4% of S&P 500 companies (Catalyst 2018). Female leaders have traditionally been at a disadvantage by social norms that surround masculine corporate America. Women have often been categorized as communal leaders that focus on the collective efforts of the team they manage (Eagly 1987). They communicate using interpersonally-oriented dimensions including collaboration, relationship building and information sharing as well (Appelbaum et.al 2013). Whereas male leadership and communication styles, on the other hand, have been mentally associated with agentic qualities such as being aggressive, results oriented outcomes (Eagly 1987). The current body of research asserts that women often face a "double bind" situation where if they act more agentic than they are considered aggressive and often disliked and if they act communally they are not viewed as a leader (Northouse, 2004; Eagly & Carly, 2007).

This study aims to determine if male versus female subordinates perceive female bosses differently based on their leadership and communication styles. This is important to add to the literature because, with the increase in representation of female leaders it is crucial to understand if the mental associations found in the body of research impact the way female managers are perceived. Looking exclusively at the perceptions of women leaders who manage male and female employees, this qualitative study tries to understand the perceptions that male and female

employees have of their female boss. By studying these differences from an employee prospective we can gain a better understanding of how female executives can more effectively communicate and lead.

Literature Review

Introduction: Gender Differences in Leadership and Communication Styles

The body of research on female leadership and communication is vast and often is conflicting. While many studies have reported that there are no criticisms of female leaders by gender differences, a greater portion of the literature says otherwise (e.g. Davison & Burke, 2000, Heilman et al., 2004; Rudman, Brescoll, 2011; Moss-Racusin, Phelan, and Nauts; 2012). Several studies also reported mixed research in workplace gender communication where some believe that there are different ways that males and females communicate and others deduce no differences at all (Barker 1999).

This article relies on the research that says there are communication norms and biases that surround males and females in the United States that has led to significant differences in the way that gender is perceived in the workplace. The following review of the literature will encompass an explanation of: workplace gender communication patterns, styles of leadership and biases that exist, and boss-subordinate perceptions. These topics will serve as a comprehensive sample of the current body of research.

Workplace Gender Communication

Effective workplace communication is critical to all organizations. Whether gender has a direct impact on workplace communication has been theorized in various paradigms. Two central theories to gendered communication are the ideas of *gender-sameness* vs. *gender-difference* (Barker 1999). Gender-sameness argues that oftentimes the way males and females communicate are in fact very similar. There are few times that they communicate differently and gender should be only one factor that attributes to this (Nadler 1987). There are studies that support this notion and have found no statistical significance for differences in "gender-linked language" (Smythe and Meyer 1994). Contrastingly, Gender-difference, a more popular and widely accepted notion believes that women use a more collaborative way to build relations in order to solve problems whereas men have been known to communicate with a purpose. This is better known as "transaction (male) vs. interactive (female) style in which male communication is characterized by planned conversations with purposes and female conversations are more spontaneous, participative and involve the sharing of information (Natalle 1996, Barker 1999).

Furthering this gender-difference theory, when one looks at what communication dimensions are generally attributed to female leaders Appelbaum and Shapiro state that women leaders focus on "empathy […] information sharing and relationship building" and that women are more "interpersonally-oriented" in their communication styles (2013, pp. 55-56). According to Fine (2009), an important value for women leaders is "open communication" with their teams. Females utilized a teamwork-oriented, open communication approach. Fine's qualitative study found through the interviews that females self-identified open and relationship building

communication as one of the most fundamental aspects to their leadership (Fine, 2009). This inherently differs from the way that men value communication in their leadership style and offers a distinct binary between how men and women communicate in the workplace.

This binary is proven in Helgesen and Johnson's book, *The Female Vision*, where the authors suggest that men and women assess their surroundings differently and pick up on different social cues. Thus leading to these different communication styles. For instance, when analyzing information, women take a very broad approach "continually scanning their environment for information, whereas men are more apt to restrict their observations to what a specific set of actions requires (Helgesen & Johnson 2010). With males more narrow and purpose driven approach, one can see that there is a significant gender-difference in communication styles.

What this sample of workplace communication literature is telling us is that there is a sizeable difference and binary between male and female communications styles. Going into the study we had expected that the majority of female leaders would mirror this collaborative relational style of communication which may compromise perceptions by male subordinates as leaders.

Agentic vs. Communal Attributes

When assessing the research that focuses on male and female leadership styles. There is also an apparent binary in leadership classification between males and females. Women are often classified as using a transformational style of leadership where men have applied a transactional

style. Transformational leadership means that females use a community based approach, often trying to harmonize instead of dictate to the teams they manage (Cole 2004). This transformational style translates into the way a woman communicates to her team. As discussed above, women often take a collaborative and open communication approach. However, a transactional (male) approach is typically equated to leadership qualities in masculine workplace cultures (Eagly & Johannesen, 2003).

This transformational versus transactional rivalry in leadership style, has historical background to it. In American culture, males being have been linked to leadership and females with caregiving. The research suggests that female leadership has been socialized to have inherent biases in the workplace. These associations are conceptualized within the *Social Role Theory*. The Social Role Theory states that traditional male and female roles have prohibited women from being seen as leaders (Eagly 1987). Furthermore, females are at a disadvantage because these mental associations link women to be considered as communal leaders and men as agentic leaders. Communal leaders are often characterized as being relationship oriented and collaborative whereas agentic qualities are focused on results oriented outcomes (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly 2007).

One example proving the social role theory is a study by Walker and Aritz (2015). They observed female MBA students in an organized decision-making simulation. Many of the women were not picked to be the group leaders of the simulation and their ideas were discredited. What they concluded is that the students were not picked because they were not

perceived to hold agentic leadership qualities even though the study proved that the "female leaders outperformed male leaders on the most important leader attributes" (Walker & Aritz 2015, p. 474). What this tells us is that there is a perceived bias against this communal leadership style.

The simple solution would seem to be that women should try to utilize these agentic qualities in order to improve the perception of their leadership. However, when women try to be perceived as more agentic and follow more common leadership qualities, it works to their detriment. Certain research suggests that women are perceived more negatively when they communicate using a more "masculine" agentic style; thus, creating tension between "likeability" and "aggressiveness" (Tannen, 1990; Heilman, 2004; Northouse, 2004; Eagly 2007). This has led women to be in a "double bind" situation where if a woman acts communally than they are not respected but if they act aggressively they are disliked (Rudman & Glick, 1999; Eagly & Carli 2007).

Northouse particularly notes this double bind situation. He states that that these social differences between male and female leadership styles have led to barriers in women's advancement in organizations. Northouse asserts that "women leaders are evaluated more negatively by men when they behave in stereotypically masculine ways, the range of behavior that is seen as appropriate for women leaders is more limited (Northouse, 2012 p. 273).

What we pull from the literature here is that the communal versus agentic qualities tend to dictate the perceptions that people have of their leaders and their effectiveness. When discussing where

the gap is we aimed to see if this agentic versus communal binary as well as collaborative versus purpose driven communication was true.

Prejudice and Stereotypes as Barriers to Entry

This binary that surrounds female leadership lead to prejudices against female leadership. This concept is known as *role incongruity* meaning that cultural stereotypes lead to the hindrance of women leaders. These prejudices are often in the form of lack of promotions and inherent biases in evaluations (Eagly & Karau, 2002). These prejudices that surround female leadership are common and have left damage.

Even though women have proved to possess similar levels of competencies, they still fall short due to inherent prejudices. Utilizing a conceptual model that linked perceptions with competencies and stereotypes, researchers measured female competency in organizational leadership. Participants surveyed asserted that their male managers were more managerially competent than their female managers (Samuel & Mokaleli 2017). Yet the paper argued that this in due in part to existing prejudice toward female leaders. In addition, various studies have measured women to be as competent as men but have found that existing prejudices hold them back and hinder women from gaining career capital: achieving new skills to further their careers (Heilman 1983, 2002; Eagly & Karau 2002; Eagly, 2007). Because women are being held back and are unable to achieve new competencies which comes with new projects and new teams, they fall behind in their careers so when it comes time to promotions they lack the necessary skills for the next level.

One example of this inherent prejudice can be seen through Heilman & Park-Stamm's (2007) Heidi Roizen case study. Heidi Roizen is a successful venture capitalist in Silicon Valley. Her biography and all of its accolades, was given to Harvard MBA students. However, half the class received the biography with the name Heidi and the other half Howard. When students were surveyed they felt that Heidi was too assertive but that Howard was likeable and someone they would want to work for. This study was replicated at other top tier business schools with similar results (2007). What this proves is that there is an inherent cultural bias and prejudice that can be seen among both males and females regarding "acceptable" leadership based on gender.

There is ultimately a tangible form of prejudice that exists in the workplace. This comes in the form of barriers that include hindering female competencies and promotions. These prejudices that often limit female leaders from reaching their full potential has raised questions. When starting this study, we wanted to understand if subordinates held these inherent prejudices against their female bosses and to what degree does that affect how they view their leadership and communication style?

Boss Subordinate Perceptions

There are various studies that report that there are no correlations between subordinate perceptions on gender effects and backlash against powerful women (e.g. Davison & Burke, 2000, Heilman et al., 2004, Brescoll, 2011; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, and Nauts, 2012). However, there is also a few studies that propose certain perceptions that subordinates have of their female boss. In a study on nonverbal communication "females, individually, rated

themselves higher than men in decoding ability, and as a group were perceived by both men and women to be both better decoders and encoders of nonverbal cues (Graham, 1991 p. 58)." Both males and females rated their female colleagues to have higher nonverbal communication skills than men.

Research Questions

Based on the literature review presented above on female communication and leadership styles, this study investigated the following questions due to the gaps in the literature: (1) What is the disparity between the way a woman leader sees her own leadership style and how her team perceives it? (2) How are executive women's communication styles received by team members? (3) Does gender of subordinates play a role in perception of female leaders' leadership and communication styles?

Methodology
Research Design

To understand and assess leadership and communication style perceptions of a female boss, this study examined female executives and their subordinates. The study utilized the Competing Values Management Practices Survey Likert scale survey by Robert Quinn and in-depth interviews (Quinn 1988). The in-depth interviews were conducted using a grounded theory approach which gave us the ability to allow themes to emerge organically and to probe responses for deeper understanding and clarity (Charmaz & Henwood 2008). We utilized semi-structured interviews to help shape the in-depth interviews. The data analysis for the qualitative data is reported in this article.

Participants

Participants were gleaned from a convenience sample of female leaders that were part of our personal network. From there we asked the women who agreed to participate in our network for referrals to women they thought matched our research criteria. For female leaders, the research sample included 2 executive women 2 middle managers and 1 supervisor. Two subordinates were required to participate for each female leader. In total the number of participants included 5 groups of teams where N=15. Because of the length of the in-depth interviews (lasting between 30-60 minutes) it allowed for in depth probing. We sought participants for our study using pre-selected criteria. The female executives and their subordinates were chosen based on the following sampling criteria: (a) the female managed a team of two or more subordinates (b) the team included one female subordinate and one male subordinate that were both willing to participate.

To the 20 female leaders who responded, 5 teams were willing to participate and were eligible by the above criteria. The participants were grouped and labeled by triads. A triad is defined as the female executive and her two subordinates, (one male and one female). The female executive's job titles include: CEO, Executive Director, Manager, and Supervisor, and their experience as leaders in the positions they are in now ranged from 3 months to 19 years. The final sample consisted of 5 triads that spanned various industries including: retail, manufacturing, non-profit, public relations, and information technology.

Data Collection

The Data was collected using quantitative and thematic analysis of the Competing Values Survey as well as interviews. Most interviews were conducted over the phone. One triad was conducted fact to face. Each interview lasted between 30 to 60 minutes and was recorded and later transcribed.

Interviews followed a semi-structured style this allowed the participants to shape the structure of the interview and to dig deeper on some of the common themes that were quantified using the Competing Values Management Practices Survey. A respondent was asked to first fill out the Competing Values Management Practices Survey by Robert E. Quinn and then was followed up with a series of leadership and communication open-ended questions during an interview. It is important to note that the female leaders answered the Competing Values Survey about her own leadership and communication style whereas the subordinates responded to the Survey by answering the questions in regards to their female boss's leadership and communication style.

Interview Protocol

The semi-structured interview questions allow the participants to shape the conversation around what typically happens daily in the workplace and how the boss and the subordinate interact. Questions were more tailored towards describing situations that happen in the office so as to minimize the tendency to lead respondents to particular answers, and to allow for more organic and authentic answers to emerge. Some sample questions included:

1.Tell me about your daily responsibilities, tasks, assignments?

2. Describe how your boss runs a meeting? Do you prefer this method? Do you feel they communicate effectively?

3. What approach does your boss use to solve problems that arise? Do you think it is effective?

By doing semi-structured questions the researchers were able to get a broader picture about the styles of communication and leadership the females used and if this was well liked by the subordinates. Each interview was manually transcribed and read and re-read by the two researchers. The researchers analyzed the transcripts using content analysis to code for themes. Content analysis aims to discover categories in order to derive themes that address the research questions at hand (UC Davis, Doing a Content Analysis). The researchers met to discuss and identify these discursive patterns that existed in the transcripts. The broad categories that guided the initial findings included: leadership style, communication style and areas for improvement.

Results

Out of the 15 participants, there was no single, overarching composite of what a female leader looks like. A few traits emerged that are compatible with the body of research including having an open communication style, being communally driven and relationship focused female leaders. Overall, the participants in the study more or less thought highly of their bosses which was not known going into the study. The researchers were pleased to find this because they went into the

study with the notion that there are cultural biases and prejudices that connote effective female leaders as being unlikeable (Ely 2011).

Through studying the perceptions of subordinates, the researchers believe that there is a new addition to the literature that can be used in further research. The literature often cites that likability is a mutually exclusive category with leading a successful team. What our research proves is that subordinates, depending on their gender, looked at their boss through either a communal or agentic lens to positively review their boss's communication and leadership styles. Male subordinates used an agentic lens and female subordinates used a communal lens to positively perceive their female leader. This idea was derived from both the Competing Values Survey as well as the themes that were extracted from the triad's in-depth interviews.

Competing Values Survey

The results of the competing values survey by Robert E. Quinn proved to contradict one of our research questions. Based on the existing research, we believed that male subordinates on average would rate their female bosses the lowest in each of the categories. However, what was found was that on average the female executive rated themselves the lowest, with an average score of a 5.8 followed by the female subordinate with an average score of a 6.1 and lastly the male subordinate with a score of 6.3 (See Appendix A). While the difference between the subordinate's average score was minimal it was interesting to find that female subordinates overall ranked most of the scores lower than the male subordinate for their female boss.

The most surprising finding was in what categories the female subordinate rated their female boss high in and what the male subordinate rated their female boss high in. What the researchers concluded is that *gender-difference does play a role in the subordinate's perceptions of their female boss.* We conclude that female subordinates focused on the communal aspects of their boss's leadership and communication style whereas the male subordinate focused on the agentic qualities of their female leaders and saw this as favorable traits. Female subordinates rated highly on the collaborative and team-oriented aspects of their female leader's communication and leadership style.

Female Subordinates rated the following items as the highest on the Competing Values Survey:

1. Exerts upward influence in the organization

2. Encourages participative decision-making in the group

3. Treats each individual in a sensitive, caring way

Each of these line items reveals more about the dynamic between female leaders and their female subordinates. In line item (1), we see that female subordinates favor a leader who shows that they have power and influence in the organization. Line item (2) reveals the participative leadership style that is typically equated to female leadership. Lastly, line item (3) reveals the empathetic communication dimension discussed by Appelbaum and Shapiro (2013).

Male Subordinates rated the following items as highest on the Competing Values Survey:

1. Maintains a "results" orientation in the unit

2. Compares records, reports, and son on to detect discrepancies

3. Sets clear objectives in the work unit

These line items perfectly align with the agentic qualities that are typically perceived in male leadership. What is interesting is that these are the qualities that the male leaders valued and liked in their female leader. This goes against the current body of literature that says that when female leaders use agentic qualities, then they are disliked especially by their male colleagues (Eagly 2007). Results oriented outcomes and setting clear objectives typify the agentic and purposive communication styles typically associated with leadership and masculinity.

In-depth Interviews Analysis

When analyzing the interview transcripts, no matter which triad was analyzed the results were the same (See Appendix B). They essentially mirrored the above sentiments that were found in the Competing Values Survey. Female subordinates focused on the relationship they had with their boss and how their boss made them feel. Whereas the male subordinates focused on how transparent their boss was and how results oriented they felt they were. Below are examples of two triads. Each triad follows this same theme: communal versus agentic leadership based on the gender of the subordinate.

Sample Triads A and B

When asked about her own leadership and communication style the female executives stated:

Female Executive A

"I am very strong leader I am very focused on my team and helping them excel and making sure they get things done."

Female Executive B

"I say what needs to be done in a very clear and concise way. I get the correct information to the right person."

The female leaders have a very relationship focused and communal aspect to their view on their leadership style. They focus on their teams and what they can do to make everyone complete their goals.

The male subordinate's statement on the manager's leadership and communication style:

Male Subordinate A

"She's very transparent with strategy and facts and information that is relevant on my level" and is a "straight forward clear communication, she is prepared for every meeting and is a problem solver."

Male Subordinate B

"She drives for results. She is very results oriented, very metric driven." And "Communication is very open and direct."

As seen here, the male subordinates clearly use agentic terms to describe how they view their female leader. The words *transparent* and *clear communication* are often attributed to female leadership. However, in the context of agentic leadership we can see that the males identified with this kind of leadership and communication style.

The female subordinate's statement on the manager's leadership and communication style:

Female Subordinate A

"Always asks how we are doing she is very personable." And "She is always rooting for her employees."

Female Subordinate B

"She has an open door policy and gives honest feedback and her undivided attention" and "She is high energy all the time really passionate about what she does."

One can see here that the female subordinates are focused on how the female manager made them feel as well as how the manager helped that subordinate move up in the organization. Female subordinate B focused particularly on the open communication aspect of her female leader as well. However, the difference between what the male subordinate states and what the female subordinate states is that the female subordinate focuses on how the open communication affects her on a personal level.

Discussion

Does the double bind barrier actually exist? Do all male subordinates' asses their female boss using agentic criteria and vice versa for the female subordinates? Not necessarily. As evidenced in this study, there is some existing research that may explain why these results emerged the way

that they did. More than half of the subordinates participating in this research are mid-way through their careers. What can potentially explain why more males viewed their female leaders positively through an agentic lens is that males see women as successful managers overtime. In recent research, males are now seeing their female colleagues as analytical, ambitious and assertive than they have when they are 15 years into their careers (Duehr & Bono 2006).

Another theory that supports the results found in the study is that one can argue that the female leaders studied used androgynous communication. Androgynous communication is when a communicator uses a mix of masculine and feminine communication styles in the workplace. Androgynous communication behavior has led to the most successful workplace communicators because these communicators are the most flexible in their behavior. Kar and Manor (2012) studied this and found that "women paid a higher penalty for not being perceived as 'androgynous' (mixing 'femininity' and 'masculinity'). The female leaders who were most successful in the triads could be argued that they knew how to shape their messages based on whom they were speaking to.

There is also an explanation to why female subordinates focus so much on the relationship that they have with their boss and how much their boss will help them with higher ups. Research has examined whether or not women in top leadership positions would help other women move up within the workplace. Kurtulus and Tomaskovic-Devey from the University of Massachusetts Amherst found that there is indeed a direct correlation between women in top level positions helping women in lower management positions succeed. The researchers also note that there is a

significant increase in minority women helping other minority women succeed in leadership positions (2012).

What can also be potentially explained is the reason why female subordinates may have ranked their female leader lower in the competing values survey. There is a phenomenon which helps explain why some female subordinates do not get along with their female boss. Sheryl Sandberg and Adam Grant that suggests that in most cases women help women except those who emulate the "queen bee theory" which is not because there are females who are out right mean to other women but instead that "structural disadvantages force women to protect their fragile turf" in the male dominated leadership ranks (2016). Women may feel that their female leader is not helping them get ahead because there are only so many female spots in the organization to go around.

Implications and Conclusion

This study adds to what we understand about subordinate perceptions of leadership and communication styles. Most of the literature to date states that the double bind association between male and female leaders often puts female leaders at a disadvantage. What this study proves is that female leaders can adapt their message and leadership style based in part on the gender of the subordinate that they are managing. We suggest that women can tailor their communication and leadership style with communal aspects for female subordinates and agentic aspects for male subordinates.

This study has several limitations. First we only used triads that utilize female leaders that were in our own personal network. This may present certain inherent biases as we looked at the transcripts. Assessing triads that had a male leader would have been helpful to provide comparison. This leaves potential for future studies. Future research should focus on several approaches to the current study: (1) broaden the sample size (2) compare leaders in the same industries to determine if different subordinate perception criteria is found based on industry (3) use triads that encompass male leaders.

The impact of this research can be summarized by this critical finding. It has offered a unique perspective on what makes an effective leader. Traditionally, there is a double bind association in the way that a female communicates and leads. If she is perceived as too aggressive and purpose driven in her communication style it leads to being disliked. The findings conclude a new caveat to that. This study discovers that there are different attributes for what a female and a male subordinate view as a successful female leader. The female subordinate viewed their executive through a communal lens and male subordinates viewed their leader through an agentic lens. Both males and females had positive sentiments about their boss and through these unique lenses the subordinates did not prove the double bind association. By studying these perspectives from the subordinate point of view we were able to get an indication of where female leadership and communication is heading and how female executives can move forward towards success.

Appendix

Appendix A.

Very infrequently 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very frequently

In doing the job, this manager:
_____ 1. Comes up with inventive ideas
_____ 2. Protects continuity in day-to-day operations
_____ 3. Exerts upward influence in the organization
_____ 4. Carefully reviews detailed reports
_____ 5. Maintains a "results" orientation in the unit
_____ 6. Facilitates consensus building in the work unit
_____ 7. Defines areas of responsibility for subordinates
_____ 8. Listens to the personal problems of employees
_____ 9. Minimizes disruption to the work flow
_____ 10. Experiments with new concepts and procedures
_____ 11. Encourages participative decision-making in the group
_____ 12. Makes sure everyone knows where the unit is going
_____ 13. Influences decisions made at higher levels
_____ 14. Compares records, reports, and so on to detect discrepancies
_____ 15. Sees that the unit delivers on stated goals
_____ 16. Shows empathy and concern in dealing with employees
_____ 17. Works with technical information
_____ 18. Gets access to people at higher levels
_____ 19. Sets clear objectives in the work unit
_____ 20. Treats each individual in a sensitive, caring way
_____ 21. Keeps track of what goes on inside the unit
_____ 22. Does problem solving in creative, clever ways
_____ 23. Pushes the unit to meet objectives
_____ 24. Encourages subordinates to share ideas in the group
_____ 25. Searches for innovations and potential improvements
_____ 26. Clarifies priorities and direction
_____ 27. Persuasively sells new ideas to higher-ups
_____ 28. Brings a sense of order to the unit.
_____ 29. Shows concern for the needs of employees
_____ 30. Emphasizes the unit's achievement of stated purposes
_____ 31. Builds teamwork among group members
_____ 32. Analyzes written plans and schedules

Source: Robert E. Quinn, *Beyond Rational Management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988. pp. 174-176.
Key: Yellow: Female subordinates' high scores, Blue: Male subordinates' high scores, Green: both subordinates scored the same

Appendix B

Sample Triad X	Female Executive X	Male Subordinate X	Female Subordinate X
Management	I am very open with my team	is in the top 2% of performers and forward thinking people	very organized. She likes project list
	I do empower them	she is proficient, meticulous, forward thinking	she is always rooting for her employees
	project management approach with the group	She empowers people to make decisions	very proactive, she's personable, she's very organized
	I always showcase my team's skill set.	conscientious of the people who should be there and why in meetings	
	prioritize workloads	top 2% of professionalism and accomplishing the business needs.	She's big on brainstorming which I think is excellent
	I am very strong leader I am very focused on my team and helping them excel and making sure they do a good job and get things done	is not micromanagement	

Sample Triad X	Female Executive X	Male Subordinate X	Female Subordinate X
Communication	becoming cognizant of listen more talk less	She's very transparent with strategy and facts and information that is relevant on my level.	I always feel confident that she will think of everything that may go wrong or I may not think of.
	I just try to let the business express what they need to and then hold off until the end	communication style is simple and straight forward	meetings are very organized and very structured
	So I try to make sure that everyone's perspective is represented and that there is a good discussion on what the possibilities are	she is prepared for every meeting which leads to a successful meeting	always asks how we are doing she is very personable
		she solves problems with help others	I think she's just always thinks out the situation
		straight forward clear communication. It is friendly, it's receptive, she's very open to discuss things	she is always reaching out to other departments to get other ideas or best practices.

Source: Sample Triad Content Analysis

Works Cited

Appelbaum, S. H., Shapiro, B. T., Didus, K., Luongo, T., & Paz, B. (2013). Upward mobility for women managers: Styles and perceptions: Part 1.

Barker, R., & Zifcak, L. (1999). Communication and gender in workplace 2000: Creating a contextually based integrated paradigm. Technical Writing and Communication, 29(4), 335–347.

Cole, N. D. (2004). Gender Differences in Perceived Disciplinary Fairness. Gender, Work & Organization, 11(3), 254-279.

Catalyst, *Pyramid: Women in S&P 500 Companies (February 2, 2018*).

Duehr, E., & Bono, J. (2006). Men, Women, And Managers: Are Stereotypes Finally Changing? *Personnel Psychology, 59*(4), 815-846.

Doing a content analysis. (n.d.). Retrieved from UC Davis website: http://psc.dss.ucdavis.edu/ sommerb/sommerdemo/content/doing.htm

Eagly, A. (2008). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. Human Resource Management International Digest, 16(1).

Eagly, A. H. (1987). Sex Differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbam

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. Journal of Social Issues, 57(4), 781–797.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. Psychological Review, 109, 573–598. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(4), 569.

Ely, Robin J., Herminia Ibarra, and Deborah Kolb (2011). "Taking Gender into Account: Theory and Design for Women's Leadership Development Programs." Academy of Management Learning & Education

E. Natalle, Gender Issues in the Workplace, in Gender Relationships, J. Wood (ed.), Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, California, pp. 253-271, 1996.

Fine, M. G. (2009). Women leaders' discursive constructions of leadership. Women's Studies in Communication, 32(2), 180-202.

Graham, G. (1991). The impact of nonverbal communication in organizations: A survey of perceptions. *Journal of Business Communication, 28*(1), 45-62.

Grounded theory methodology. (n.d.). Retrieved from MH Education website: https://www.mheducation.co.uk/openup/chapters/9780335244492.pdf

Heilman, M. E., & Parks-Stamm, E. J. 2007. Gender stereotypes in the workplace: Obstacles to women's career progress. In S. J. Correll (Ed.), *Social psychology of gender*: Advances in group processes: 47–77. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Halpert, J., Wilson, M., & Hickman, J. (1993). Pregnancy as a Source of Bias in Performance Appraisals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(7), 649-663.

Helgesen, S., & Johnson, J. (2010). The Female Vision. San Franscisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Hirschfeld, R., Jordan, M., Feild, H., Giles, W., & Armenakis, A. (2005). Teams' Female Representation And Perceived Potency as Inputs to Team Outcomes in a Predominately Male Field Setting. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(4), 893-924.

Kark, R., Waismel-Manor, R., & Shamir, B. (2012). Does valuing androgyny and femininity lead to a female advantage? the relationship between gender-role, transformational leadership and identification. *The Leadership Quarterly,23*(3), 620-640. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.12.012

Kurtulus, F. (2012). Do female top managers help women to advance? a panel study using eEO-1 records. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,639*(1), 173-197.

L. Nadler and M. Nadler, Communication, Gender and Interorganizational Negotiation Ability, in Advances in Gender and Communication Research, L. Stewart and S. Ting-Toomey (eds.), University Press, New York, pp. 119-131, 1987.

M. Smythe and J. Meyer, On the Origins of Gender-Linked Language Differences: Individual and Contextual Explanations, in Differences That Make a Difference: Examining the Assumptions in Gender Research, L. Turner and H. Sterk (eds.), Bergin & Garvey, Westport, Connecticut, pp. 51-60, 1994.

Northouse, P. G. (n.d.). *Leadership Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.). Thousands Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

O'Neal, R., Green, M., Gergen, E., & Y. (2016). Exploring the differences that communication medium has on perception of leadership style: Does communication medium affect the leadership rating of the leader? *Business Management Dynamics, 6*(6).

Quinn, R. E. (n.d.). The Competing Values Approach to Management. In *Beyond Rational Management*. (Excerpted from *Beyond Rational Management: Mastering the Paradoxes and Competing Demands of High Performance*, pp. 174-176, 1988, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass)

Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012b). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48(1), 165–179. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008.

Rudman, L. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(5), 1004-1010.

Ryan, M. (2007). The Glass Cliff: Exploring the Dynamics Surrounding the Appointment of Women to Precarious Leadership Positions. *Academy of Management. the Academy of Management Review,32*(2), 549-572.

Sandberg, S., & Grant, A. (2016, June 23). Sheryl Sandberg on the Myth of the Catty Woman. The New York Times, Op-Ed.

Samuel, O., & Mokoaleli, I. (2017). Analysis of gender and leadership role competencies, perceptions and stereotypes in an organisational context. South African Journal of Business Management, 48(2).

Vial, A., Napier, J., & Brescoll, V. (2016). A bed of thorns: Female leaders and the self-reinforcing cycle of illegitimacy. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(3), 400-414. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.12.004

Walker, R. C., & Aritz, J. (2015). Women Doing Leadership: Leadership Styles and Organizational Culture. *International Journal Of Business Communication*, *52*(4), 452-478.

Wood, J. (2003). Gendered lives: Communication, gender, and culture. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.