

Florida Institute of Technology

Scholarship Repository @ Florida Tech

Theses and Dissertations

8-2020

**Together We Can An Analysis of Barriers to Women in Leadership
and the Unique Challenges Facing Women of Color**

Alexandria Redmond

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.fit.edu/etd>



Part of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons

Together We Can
An Analysis of Barriers to Women in Leadership and the Unique Challenges
Facing Women of Color

by

Alexandria Redmond

A thesis submitted to the College of Psychology and Liberal Arts of
Florida Institute of Technology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Melbourne, Florida
August, 2020

We the undersigned committee hereby approve the attached thesis,
“Together We Can: An Analysis of the Barriers to Women in Leadership and the
Unique Challenges Facing Women of Color.”

by
Alexandria Redmond

Gary Burns, Ph.D.
Professor
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Major Advisor

Rachael Tilka, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Behavior Analysis

Katrina Merlini, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Jessica L. Wildman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Lisa A. Steelman, Ph.D.
Dean & Professor
College of Psychology & Liberal Arts

Abstract

Title: Together We Can: An Analysis of the Barriers to Women in Leadership and the Unique Challenges Facing Women of Color

Author: Alexandria Redmond

Advisor: Gary Burns, Ph. D.

The purpose of this study is to examine and develop a scale on the current challenges facing women in leadership while giving special attention to the unique challenges facing women of color in leadership. The current study is the first of a multi-study scale development project for the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale (PBWLS). This paper aims to bring together literature on gender and ethnic differences in leadership and obstacles for women and women of color in attaining high-level positions in the workforce, and it also seeks to address measurement gaps in the literature. The final sample included 161 participants who were surveyed using a cross-sectional correlational design, and they were asked to report perceived barriers to leadership, along with their emotional exhaustion, career satisfaction, motivation to lead, and career attainment levels. Classical test theory was used to develop and test the PBWLS. The PBWLS demonstrated predictive power for emotional exhaustion and motivation to lead. Black and Latina women were shown to report more barriers on average than White women. Women in the workplace face several barriers when trying to attain leadership positions, and these barriers have negative outcomes, but experiencing these barriers have not deterred their motivation. Recommendations for supporting women in leadership are mentioned, including providing organizational professional development and mentorship programs.

Keywords: Leadership, Stereotypes, Social Identity, Women, Women of Color

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
Acknowledgement	vii
Dedication	viii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
The Current State of Women in Leadership	3
Chapter 2 Barriers to Women in Leadership	5
Stereotypes	5
Emotional Displays at Work	7
Broken Rung and the Glass Ceiling (Starting from Way Behind)	7
The Glass Cliff	8
Examining Identity and Counter-Stereotypes	9
The Queen Bee Phenomenon	11
Feedback Inequities	12
Chapter 3 Women of Color in Leadership and Their Unique Challenges	14
Double Jeopardy and Intersectionality	14
The Invisibility and Hyper-visibility of Women of Color	15
An Interlude: Critical Race Theory and Feminism	16
Stereotypes of Women of Color	16
Exclusion, Social Isolation, and Commitment to Community (Starting from Way Behind)	17
Chapter 4 Current Study	19
Hypothesis Development	20
Chapter 5 Method	23
Participants	23
Procedure	23
Measures	24
Chapter 6 Results	26
Chapter 7 Discussion	35
Theoretical Implications	36
Practical Implications	37
Limitations and Future Directions	37
Conclusion	39
References	40

Appendix Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale Items45

List of Tables

Table 1-- Barriers to Women Leaders Factors and Facets	20
Table 2-- Descriptive Statistics and Item-Total Correlations for Overall, Two- Factor, and Facet Level Analysis	27
Table 3-- Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations	30
Table 4-- Regression Analyses for the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale	31
Table 5-- ANOVAS and t-statistics for Race/Ethnicity and Career Attainment	34
Table 6-- Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale Items	45

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my thanks to my academic and thesis advisor, Dr. Gary Burns. Thank you for working with me for the past two years and always being a listening ear for the many questions I had. I quite literally could not have completed this without you. Many thanks to my thesis committee: Dr. Rachael Tilka, Dr. Jessie Wildman, and Dr. Katrina Merlini for your help and guidance on this research study. Dr. Merlini if it had not been for your invaluable input and feedback, I would not have been able to turn a little literature review into a Masters thesis.

I am abundantly grateful for my family for their support, love, and prayers during this first stretch of my graduate school journey. I would not be where I am today without you. Thank you to my friends who have been just a call or text away when I'm feeling overwhelmed. Thank you to my professors for their continued support. Thank you to the Cheetah Girls for inspiring me at such a young age to go after my dreams.

Last but certainly not least, thank You God for without You I am nothing and can do nothing.

Dedication

To Nana: the fiercest leader I knew. Thank you for instilling in me a love for learning and reading. I miss you dearly, and you were right—Life has never been more engaging!

Chapter 1

Introduction

Most millennial women who are familiar with The Disney Channel will remember one of their first childhood introductions to the ideas of female leadership and intersectionality: The Cheetah Girls. The Cheetah Girls were a staple for empowering young girls to be leaders and go after their goals whether that was through songs like “Girl Power” or even “Cinderella,” which states, “I can slay my own dragons, I can dream my own dreams, my knight and shining armor is me.” These lyrics emboldened young girls to take charge of their own destiny and not give into people who would try to deter them from reaching their full potential. The Cheetah Girls acknowledged that they had to draw inspiration from the “divas” or mentors who came before them in order to achieve success. They also affirmed, “our spots are different colors, we make up one big family though we don’t look the same,” recognizing that even though they each came from different cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds, they had to make a commitment to one another to work together while chasing after their dreams. Although millennial women are no longer young girls, they must still seek to take the early lessons they learned from the Cheetah Girls and apply them to life in the workplace.

Historically, it has been common for people to dismiss the contributions hard-working women in America have made in their careers. Women have obtained a higher number of bachelor degrees than men, and they have remained in the workforce and requested promotions at similar levels as their male counterparts, yet the leadership gap for women persists (Chisholm-Burns, Spivey, Hagemann, & Josephson, 2017; McKinsey & LeanIn, 2018; Smith, 2014; U.S. Census, 2010). Research has shown that this issue is due, in large part, to a collection of barriers women face in the struggle to get into leadership (Brescoll,

2016; Heilman, 2012; McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019; Vickenburg, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011). Barriers, as stated in this review and study, refer to the obstacles women come into contact with in the workplace; these obstacles can hinder career progress and lead to emotional stress in women (Brescoll, 2016; Gatrell & Cooper, 2007, Heilman, 2012). Stereotypes that are attributed to women are particularly difficult barriers; this includes, among other beliefs, the idea that women are and should be more communal than men (Brescoll, 2016; Heilman, 2012; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2016; Ryan et al., 2016; Smith, 2014). Stereotypes are so pervasive that they not only act as barriers, but they also contribute to barriers, such as the glass ceiling and the glass cliff (Brescoll, 2016; Ellemers, Rink, Derks, & Ryan, 2012; Glass & Cook, 2016; Heilman, 2012; McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019; Ryan et al., 2016; Vickenburg et al. 2011).

Women of color must also cope with stereotypes and other barriers. Their situation is unique because of the added influence of their racial/ethnic experiences on the barriers (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Dickens, Womack, & Dimes, 2018; Rosette, Koval, Ma, & Livingston, 2016). This tension of identities can bring about both positive and negative outcomes, but it remains largely negative as they juxtapose their identities— their racial and ethnic background and their gender, as well as their responsibilities, such as their career aspiration and their commitment to community (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; Dickens et al., 2018; Nixon, 2017; Rosette et al., 2016; Sesko & Biernat, 2010).

While many studies have examined these barriers separately and discussed their theoretical underpinnings (Bear, Cushenbery, London, and Sherman 2017; Brescoll, 2016; Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Combs, 2013; Derks, Van Laar, & Ellemers, 2016; Dickens et al., 2018; Ellemers et al., 2012; Heilman, 2012; Hoyt & Murphy, 2016; Meister, Sinclair, & Jehn, 2017; Nixon, 2017; Ryan et al., 2016; Viernes Turner, 2002), few studies have investigated and measured these barriers quantitatively (Arvate, Galilea, & Todescat, 2016; Glass & Cook, 2016; Hurley & Giannantonio, 1999; Leicht, de Moura, & Crisp, 2014; Rosette et al., 2016; Sesko & Biernat, 2010) and to my knowledge, no study has compiled the current list of constructs mentioned in this study and measured these barriers collectively. This study

aims to address this measurement gap in the literature by compiling the barriers in this study into an overall barriers to women leaders scale; this scale will be validated using Classical Test Theory. This scale can be used not only to further research on the issues that prevent women from getting into leadership, but it can also be used as a tool for employers to understand how prevalent barriers are in their organization and to provide insight for women on how barriers can impact them. The scale development is discussed in more detail in the Current Study section of this paper.

To lay the groundwork for this study and establish why analyzing barriers to women leaders matter, I conducted a brief review of the current state of women in leadership. This section offers a general summary of the gender leadership gap, and it highlights how the value women bring to an organization when they are in leadership positions.

The Current State of Women in Leadership

Despite holding 50%-60% of advanced degrees, women in the United States make up only about 25% of senior-level leadership positions in the most top-performing organizations, and they constitute an even smaller portion of Chief Executive Officers (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017; Smith, 2014; U.S. Census, 2010). These numbers become abysmal when taking private companies into account where women make up markedly less than 10% of senior employees (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). This means that they comprise a sizeable portion of entry-level jobs (Chisolm-Burns et al., 2017; Ellemers et al., 2012) and remain in mid-level management jobs (if they are at all promoted) rather than earning more advantageous titles, such as President, Vice President, Director, etc. (Catalyst, 2014; Ryan et al., 2016; United Nations, 2015).

The lack of women in leadership is antithetical to the main purpose of most organizations: to make money. The inclusion of women leaders has been shown to make a significant, invaluable effect on financial performance, and innovation at work, amongst other positive outcomes for organizations (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). Companies with a high number of women in leadership on average outperform their counterparts who lack such diversity

in the areas of returns on investment, sales, and equity (Adams, 2016; Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017; Ellemers et al., 2012; Smith, 2014). It is suggested that they even help the image of the organization because having women in leadership signifies that organizations value and are committed to diversity (Smith, 2014).

Evidence shows that women in general and women leaders are also more ethical decision-makers (Smith, 2014). That is, they engage in greater levels of oversight in their personal and professional life, which can lead to less legal issues for organizations, such as embezzlement and fraud (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017). Advocates for women in leadership maintain that this significant effect on organizational outcomes could be due to the diversity of ideas women bring (Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017; Smith, 2014) when they have “a seat at the table.” The participation of women leaders in business not only benefits the organizations in which they work, but research has shown it also has a strong impact on global economic growth, philanthropy and social responsiveness (Adams, 2016; Chisholm-Burns et al., 2017; Ellemers et al., 2012). If their participation predicts so many desirable organizational outcomes, why, one might ask, is there still a gap?

Chapter 2

Barriers to Women in Leadership

In the following section, I give a comprehensive review of the literature on barriers women face when getting into organizational leadership positions, including stereotypes, the broken rung, the glass ceiling, emotional displays, the glass cliff, self-identity issues, the Queen Bee Phenomenon, and feedback inequities. Drawing from research on the barriers that women of color experience, I then discuss double jeopardy and intersectionality, invisibility and hypervisibility, stereotypes specific to women of color, exclusion, social isolation, and commitment to community. The purpose of this review is to synthesize the diverse body of available literature on barriers for women leaders and identify suitable content for developing the perceived barriers to women leaders scale later in this study.

A database search using different combinations of the terms “women in leadership”, “women of color in leadership”, “leadership”, “women”, “women of color”, and “leaders” was conducted. Various scholarly journals (e.g., *The Leadership Quarterly* and *Research in Organizational Behavior*) were included in this review of the literature. Articles were only included if they had a significant focus on differences between men and women in leadership, challenges facing women in leadership, or challenges facing women of color in leadership in the United States. Articles regarding compensation issues and sexual harassment were not included because as they went beyond the scope of this project. While sexual harassment is a rampant issue in the workplace, the inclusion of this subject delves into issues of legality. Compensation is a prominent issue for women as well, but specific findings may vary across industries. The focus of this study is on the general social factors that impede a women’s progress in the workplace.

Stereotypes

People tend to hold generalized beliefs about other groups of people. These assumptions can be positive or negative, but their designation does not change the fact that they are

stereotypes. Stereotypes are overarching constructs that are themselves barriers to women leaders (Heilman, 2012), yet they also act as the building blocks for several other barriers to women leaders (Brescoll, 2016; Heilman, 2012; McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019; Vickenburg et al. 2011). Schneider and Bos (2014) reviewed stereotypes of female politicians and provided a thorough list of several stereotypes of women, including the assumptions that women are affectionate, compassionate, emotional, moral, honest, kind, etc. These beliefs seem to arise from the broad belief that women are and should be more communal than men (Brescoll, 2016; Heilman, 2012; Mendelberg & Karpowitz, 2016; Ryan et al., 2016; Smith, 2014).

One study by Heilman (2012) discussed and analyzed the outcomes for the different types of stereotypes of women in the workplace: descriptive (i.e., perceptions of how people operate) and prescriptive stereotypes (i.e., perceptions of how people should operate). Heilman (2012) asserted that descriptive stereotypes could sometimes be positive and, therefore, beneficial to women, but these stereotypes can create problems when they are attributed to women who do not seem to “fit” a specific organizational role, and then beliefs of incompetence arise. Not only are women viewed as “not a good fit” for senior-level positions, but also expectations of their performance are low (Heilman, 2012). Although descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes can overlap, outcomes of prescriptive stereotypes mostly deal with the repercussions of women acting in ways that are not consistent with how people think females should act (Heilman, 2012). This includes engaging in activities, such as self-promotion, misbehavior, and confrontational communication, amongst others, which is unfair considering men are expected to engage in those activities and are not punished to the same degree for engaging in them (Heilman, 2012). Descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes can have a negative impact on women’s self-evaluations and emotional well-being (Heilman, 2012). Stereotypes have also been shown to weaken a woman’s motivation for getting into leadership (Hoyt & Murphy, 2016). Stereotypes have been shown to hinder women’s career advancement (Derks et al., 2016; Faniko, Ellemers, & Derks; 2016; Meister et al., 2017) in the workplace and their overall well-being (Combs, 2003; Heilman, 2012). To put it another way, people’s

stereotypical beliefs about who a woman is and how she should behave in the workplace can be increasingly damaging to a woman's sense of herself both inside and outside of work because these beliefs can act as barriers and may lead to self-doubt and to a decrease in emotional well-being.

Emotional Displays at Work

A commonly held belief in the United States is that women display and express emotions more frequently than men do. While this might be generally true, the belief that women are always highly emotional is not accurate. A prevalent excuse for the lack of female leadership appointments is that women are too emotional to make sound, unbiased judgments. In a recent study, Brescoll (2016) explored this belief and found that women criticized at work for both showing too much emotion and not enough emotion.

Specifically, women are expected to be warm and caring, but they are viewed negatively if they display stereotypically masculine emotions, like pride and over-confidence (Brescoll, 2016). Furthermore, women cannot seem unemotional at work because that too, is perceived negatively (Brescoll, 2016). In other words, women are in a catch-22 situation regarding emotional displays. This perception of women stems from the stereotypical assumption that women are more communal than men, and it can lead to bias in selection, therefore, harming women's ability to move forward in their careers (Brescoll, 2016; Heilman, 2012). Moreover, research has found that women leaders tend to receive lower ratings of effectiveness if they express sadness or anger (Lewis, 2000). Brescoll (2016) also noted that engaging in this balancing act of emotions could be taxing on a woman's emotional resources. This is harmful because it could potentially lead to greater emotional exhaustion for women employees.

Broken Rung and the Glass Ceiling (Starting from Way Behind)

Women are half of the workforce, but they are mostly resigned to low-level ranks and jobs that do not facilitate upward progression (i.e., flat careers). A McKinsey & Company and LeanIn.Org (2019) report lists two major barriers regarding the hiring and promotion of

women: the glass ceiling and the broken rung. The broken rung considers and highlights the fact that women are employed as managers at lower rates than men are in both the selection and promotion process; just 72 women for every 100 men are employed as managers (McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019). These numbers continue to drop for women of color, specifically for black and Latina women (McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019). The glass ceiling refers to the tendency for women to remain in these types of lower-level positions, so in addition to not being selected for higher positions women are not able to progress in their careers. McKinsey & Company and LeanIn.Org (2019) suggests that the broken rung is the largest obstacle facing women in the workplace because managerial positions are the first step in corporate leadership. This finding matters because if women are underrepresented in managerial positions, there will be a shortage of women who can be recommended for further leadership positions (McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019). The broken rung is a serious barrier; however, little research has been done in addition to McKinsey and Lean In's (2019) study on this construct.

As long as these particular barriers persist at the beginning of their careers, women may be underrepresented in senior leadership roles. Moreover, since men comprise most senior-level positions because of hiring and promotional practices, it follows that the male perspective appears to be the dominant perspective on corporate leadership teams. This might make it easier for stereotypes and bias to seep into decisions.

The Glass Cliff

Studies have shown that men believe women are more apt at handling conflict situations; thus they appoint women leaders to jobs with a greater risk potential; this phenomenon is called the glass cliff (Ellemers et al., 2012; Glass & Cook, 2016; Ryan et al., 2016). The glass cliff is manifested primarily in situations of organizational crisis (Glass & Cook, 2016; Ryan et al., 2016). If an organization is in this type of circumstance, the opportunity for women leaders to step in is prime, but this makes women leaders open and a target to criticism inside and outside the company if performance is less than ideal (Ryan et al., 2016). This could contribute to situations in which women are being set up to fail because

they are only being promoted to extremely high-risk jobs, and any negative results for the company will be attributed to them, regardless of the environment in which they were placed.

Ryan et al. (2016) list Carly Fiorina, Erin Callan, and Mary Barra, amongst others, as examples of this. All are women who were named to senior-level positions right before their organizations faced some undesirable event; some women were promoted during periods of turbulence, thus making their job even tougher (Glass & Cook, 2016; Ryan et al., 2016). Research has suggested that this phenomenon occurs because perceptions of what constitutes strong leadership characteristics (i.e., traditional masculine characteristics) change when companies go through a troublesome experience and the stereotypical belief that feminine traits (e.g., being more communal) make women more equipped to deal with conflict become salient (Ryan et al., 2016). Others have admitted that women may seek these types of risky positions in order to prove themselves as leaders, yet they also maintain that women in this positions lack the support and the authority, either informal or formal, to make necessary changes to the organization; these hardships then lead to outcomes, such as lower career satisfaction and even emotional outcomes (i.e., depressive symptoms) (Glass & Cook, 2016). This notion of the glass cliff can also be present in contexts beyond that of a standard business environment (e.g., politics and school) (Ryan et al., 2016). Historically their opportunities to lead are even fewer and far between than their majority counterparts, so it is important to note that the glass cliff phenomenon is more difficult for women of color (Ryan et al., 2016).

Examining Identity and Counter-Stereotypes

Clearly, stereotypes are a monumental barrier to women in leadership, and most stereotypes seem to come from the same basic idea that women are more communal and social than men. When women exhibit behaviors that are in excess or counter to their stereotypes, they are punished for it.

Leicht and colleagues (2014) examined the impact on counter-stereotypic gender role models on gender stereotypes and bias. They conducted three 2 (stereotype vs. non-stereotype) x 2 (prototypical vs. non-prototypical) between-subject experiments that exposed participants to non-stereotypical employee candidates for a job (i.e., a female mechanic), and they analyzed their general attitudes towards the candidate, whether they trusted the candidate, their intention of voting for the candidate, and whether they were going to campaign on behalf of this candidate (Leicht et al., 2014). Overall, results found that participants eliminated previous gender biases, and they preferred the candidates who were counter-stereotypical role models, which demonstrates that leadership teams can be primed to positively consider an atypical leader by exposing them to counter-stereotypical role models (Leicht et al., 2014). This study also found that counter-stereotypic gender role models decreased the likelihood of women self-stereotyping (Leicht et al., 2014). Although this is just one relatively recent study, it is reasonable finding that exposure to different types of women, women who do not “fit” a type is a key component of countering some of the negative effects of stereotypes.

Another recent study found that the detrimental effects of stereotypes can be weakened through a process model tackling identity asymmetry (Meister et al., 2017). Identity asymmetry can be defined as people’s beliefs about a person that are contrary to that person’s own self-conception, and it can include concepts like stereotypical gender roles. Meister et al. (2017) used a grounded theory-development approach for model development to analyze when women feel misidentified and how to overcome this misidentification. They observed in interviews that women leaders typically experienced both personal and professional identity asymmetry; while all experiences were important, the most crucial points of misidentification came during periods of transition (Meister et al., 2017). Two types of identity transitions were discovered in their research personal identity transitions, or change in one’s personal life and professional-role identity transitions, or change in a position at work (Meister et al., 2017). Meister et al. (2017) found in these interviews that women often went through at least one of these transitions before having noteworthy feelings of asymmetry. Particularly, women felt that they were

not viewed as leaders; however, time (i.e., age and tenure) and power (e.g., formal authority) factors influenced this such that increased time and power lessened the feelings of misidentification (Meister et al., 2017). Meister et al. (2017) suggest following specific cognitive and behavioral steps to eradicate or weaken the misidentification and asymmetry: change others' perceptions about it or adapt to it, outlast it, or evade it (Meister et al., 2017).

At first glance, it could be assumed that this finding is not novel. But on closer inspection, this model is critical to analyses on women in leadership and their career advancement because it takes a qualitative look at the experiences of women who are in the workforce right now (Meister et al., 2017). It examines points at which personal and professional lives can converge in a woman's self-identity, and it identified the fact that stereotypes have the ability to create a cognitive dissonance in what women know to be true about themselves and how others can change their thoughts about themselves, specifically in times of transition (Meister et al., 2017). These cognitive and behavioral steps along with group exposure to counter-stereotypical gender role models are key treatments for women to combat descriptive, prescriptive, and proscriptive stereotypes and regain control of their own self-perception.

The Queen Bee Phenomenon

In reaction to sexist stereotypes, women leaders face the challenge of the queen bee phenomenon. This harmful label refers to women who strive towards personal success in traditionally masculine workplace settings by acting more masculine and keeping women in the workplace at a distance (Arvate et al., 2018; Derks et al., 2016; Faniko et al., 2016). It is said to be manifested in a few different ways: women act more masculine, women remove themselves mentally and physically from those of their own gender, and women advocate and support existing gender hierarchical structures (Derks et al., 2016). Derks et al. (2016) suggest that the queen bee phenomenon is a form of social identity threat, and it is a bit fluid so that a woman can exhibit this in some situations and not others and to greater or lesser degrees.

Despite its temporary benefit of individual career success, there are substantial ramifications. Women leaders who display queen bee behaviors actively contribute to the leadership gap in this way – they effectively make it harder for other women to excel in the organization because they are not actively encouraging and developing junior women to help get them to attain and succeed in leadership roles (Derks et al., 2016). This is detrimental to women who are in lower-ranking roles because it compromises their assurance of receiving unbiased, fair, non-stereotypical feedback, and it takes away the opportunity to gain women mentors and role models, which are crucial to success (Derks et al., 2016; Hoyt & Murphy, 2016). Queen bee behaviors also negatively impact the organization because it reinforces structural gender inequality and inadvertently encourages misidentification, like a woman completely disregarding her gender and trying to be “one of the guys” (Derks et al., 2016). In fact, women who behave in this manner may have the worst effect of all in that they may lose their own support system of other women, and they are still punished somewhat for behaving in a way that is incongruent with the “communal” stereotype (Derks et al., 2016). Arvate et al. (2018) challenged the authenticity of the queen bee phenomenon by insisting that their study showed most women leaders seek to improve the condition of other women in the workplace, and they argued that women leaders are not mean “queen bees.” But, they seemed to have overlooked Derks et al.’s (2016) point out that men can also be queen bees and that these situations are not always readily visible. Anyone who is a part of a group that is negatively stereotyped can exhibit queen bee behaviors (Derks et al., 2016). For example, older workers could distance themselves from others in their age group in order to avoid ageist stereotypes (Derks et al., 2016). Still, this queen bee phenomenon appears useful because it sheds even more light on the difficult problems of social identity and misidentification for women in leadership, and it reveals the consequences of such things, as well as provides theoretical support for the positive impact of senior-level women role models.

Feedback Inequities

A major theme in past research (Bass 1991; Brenner, Tomkiewicz, & Schein, 1989; Buttner, 2001; Heilman, 2012; Rosener, 1995; Smith, 2014) has explored the fact that men,

and sometimes women, have held various beliefs (e.g., descriptive, prescriptive) about women in leadership. These beliefs could have positive and negative, mostly negative, impact on women's ability to move forward in their careers. A way in which stereotyping and bias shows itself is in perceptions and feedback on performance. Bear and colleagues (2017) examined in a proposed theoretical model how performance feedback can act as a power retention mechanism (feedback is a vehicle through which existing power structures between men and women can be reinforced), thus contributing to the gap in women in leadership. They found that women are at a disadvantage when it comes to accessing social networks and receiving equitable feedback – that is expectations for performance and actual feedback given were different for women than it was for men (e.g., organizational citizenship behaviors often less optional for women) (Bear et al., 2017). Bear and colleagues (2017) also suggested that these inequities regarding feedback could lead to a decrease in women's motivation to lead or the desire they have to get into leadership.

In order to resolve this challenge, Bear et al. (2017) suggested that responsibility rests on both the organization to make the necessary changes and on each woman in the organization to take organizational feedback with caution. While it can be agreed that organizations should seek to take corrective steps in regard to inequitable feedback, it cannot be accepted that individual women should be held accountable for an error on the part of a company. Senior leadership should not offer biased and inequitable performance evaluations based on stereotypical standards and expectations. Women in the workplace should not be expected to look the other way when situations of injustice occur. Though it may be temporarily beneficial to do so, it might have long-term consequences (e.g., harming their self-identity and hindering motivation their motivation to lead) (Bear et al., 2017). Women already experience many barriers on their road to leadership, and they do not need to agree to any additional responsibilities that will add to the challenge of closing the gap. Unfortunately, this is exactly the case for women and women of color.

Chapter 3

Women of Color in Leadership and Challenges They Face

In discussions of women in leadership, it is important to identify the unique experiences of women of color in the workplace, especially in the United States. It is no secret that America has had a storied history in terms of how underrepresented groups have been treated in comparison to their majority counterparts. This should be of particular concern for organizations as workforce demographics continue to shift making minority groups the majority (Hurley & Giannattonio, 1999). Women of color currently represent 18% of entry-level positions, yet only 4% of C-Suite positions; this rate cannot stay the same with changing demographics (McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019).

Double Jeopardy and Intersectionality

Women of color have a “double jeopardy” when it comes to issues at work because they have all of the struggles of being a woman, yet they also have to cope with the additional strain of being a racial and ethnic minority group member in the United States and all of the outcomes of that. The formal double jeopardy hypothesis suggests that women who are of a racial minority are confronted with prejudice for being a female and for their racial heritage (Dickens et al., 2018; Rosette et al., 2016). Hurley and Giannattonio (1999) did not find support for the notion of “double jeopardy” because interactions between race and gender were found to be significantly related to positive career attainment, but the researchers agreed both gender and race independently were negatively related to career attainment. Positive results for the interaction of race and ethnicity on career attainment could be attributed to the composition of the sample because all participants were employed at the same company.

Moreover, evidence of the multiplicative effect of gender and race on outcomes for women of color comes from the concept of intersectionality. Intersectionality refers to concurrent

involvement in two or more social groups and the significance those identities bring to the person that holds them (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Dickens et al., 2018; Rosette et al., 2016; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). Past studies examining intersectionality have agreed that injustices resulting from the combination of social identities can cause and endorse systems of oppression (Rosette et al., 2016), and it can reinforce power differences, like less social, political, and economic power (Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005).

The Invisibility and Hyper-visibility of Women of Color

People who belong to multiple underrepresented groups report feelings of both invisibility and hypervisibility (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Dickens et al., 2018; Sesko & Biernat, 2010). Invisibility (i.e., being unrecognized and undervalued) and hypervisibility (i.e., being extremely visible) have positive and negative outcomes. If a person is highly valued, hypervisibility can be a good thing, but if she is not, it can cause uncomfortable situations. Conversely, invisibility is preferable if a person's uniqueness causes her to be alienated from the majority group, yet it is unfavorable when her accomplishments are disregarded. Buchanan and Settles (2018) note that balancing one's visibility is emotionally taxing and harmful, and they also note that this could have a negative impact on job satisfaction. In a study, Black women were shown to have their contributions attributed to other employees, and their peers often failed to accurately distinguish them from other black women exemplifying invisibility (Sesko & Biernat, 2010). Still, there are many situations (e.g., stereotypical expectations) in which some would choose invisibility over hypervisibility.

One way in which women of color attempt to become invisible and manage this conflict of hypervisibility due to their multiple identities is by identity shifting. Identity shifting is the practice of hiding one's social identity to become less visible; therefore, becoming less susceptible to the negative outcomes associated with bias and stereotypes (Dickens et al., 2018). For example, a Hispanic woman who is fluent in Spanish may not ever speak that language around coworkers. Nevertheless, any advantage gained from hiding an identity is quickly offset by the psychological resources and work satisfaction lost and the emotional

exhaustion incurred from engaging in this process (Dickens et al., 2018). Identity shifting can hinder a person's ability to make real, authentic relationships (Dickens et al., 2018). Though this framework of identity shifting (Dickens et al., 2018) was developed with Black women in mind, it can most likely be generalized to include other women of color.

An Interlude: Critical Race Theory and Feminism

Nixon (2017) explored how women of color who were Chief Diversity Officers in higher education dealt with this duplexity. Five women of color were interviewed in this qualitative study, and results found that the women dealt with a drain on their emotional resources when in positions of leadership (Nixon, 2017). Results were based upon critical race theory and critical race feminism (Nixon, 2017). Critical Race Theory was developed in response to detractors of the Civil Rights Movement (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Nixon, 2017). Critical Race Theory maintains the view that racism is systemic, yet in spite of this, people who belong to the racial and ethnic majority rarely encourage systematic change. Critical Race Feminism elaborates on this theory by introducing gender as another critical identity component (Nixon, 2017; Sulé, 2011). The goal of critical race theory and critical race feminism is to provide a theoretically grounded platform for underrepresented voices – aiding in the pursuit of real empowerment and change for these groups (Collins, 2000; Hooks, 1984; Nixon, 2017; Sulé, 2011). The Chief Diversity Officers felt as though they had to actively encourage institutional change for people like them in addition to dealing with stereotypes (Nixon, 2017).

Stereotypes of Women of Color

Although there are general stereotypes that I discussed earlier, there are also stereotypes that are specifically about women of color; these stereotypes come from those associated with a woman's racial/ethnic group. The stereotypical successful manager prototype characteristics (e.g., competence, ambitious, diligent) were shown to fit stereotypes of White and Asian American women much more than it fit Hispanic and African American women (Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005). It is interesting to note that though Asian

American stereotypes were more closely aligned with the leadership prototype, they were still looked over for leadership positions (Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005). Rosette et al. (2016) found similar outcomes when analyzing descriptive, prescriptive, and proscriptive stereotypes for Black and Asian American women; Black women were perceived as dominant, intimidating, and hard-working, but not necessarily competent, and Asian American women were perceived as competent yet shy. Both groups' stereotypes had some positive aspects of the prototypical leader (e.g., hard-working), nevertheless, they were still overlooked for leadership because of their perceived lack of competence and confidence, respectively.

Exclusion, Social Isolation, and Commitment to Community (Starting from Way Behind)

These conclusions add weight to the findings from previous studies on barriers to women in leadership (Ellemers et al., 2012; Glass & Cook, 2016; Meister et al., 2017; Ryan et al., 2016). Yet, discussions of the experience women of color address what many others have failed to acknowledge, racism has a multiplicative effect on these barriers (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Dickens et al., 2018; Rosette et al., 2016; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). That is, women of color have to juggle multiple social identities and withstand racist microaggressions, racist and sexist stereotypes, racial and ethnic tokenism, and social isolation while trying to advance both their careers and the cause of other women and men of color (based on a commitment to their racial and ethnic community regardless of gender) – a job which naturally requires many compromises.

It has also been established that informal socialization processes are crucial for career advancement because they determine who is welcomed in the in-group and who is resigned to the out-group in workplace settings; this determines which employees are given more developmental opportunities and which employees are left feeling isolated (Combs, 2003). These components (i.e., developmental opportunities and inclusion) matter because they are important for attaining and succeeding in leadership positions (McKinsey & LinkedIn,

2019). Sadly, people of color and women have been excluded in their organizations (Combs, 2003).

Most findings were predicted in an earlier qualitative study done by Viernes Turner (2002). Women of color in higher education including, Native-Americans, Asian-Americans, African-Americans, and Latina women were interviewed, and they revealed that they felt a sense of duty to their community, isolated, and that race/ethnic origin was a key part of their identity (over and above gender). They also mentioned that they felt as though students challenged their authority. In response to these issues, Viernes Turner (2002) advocated for more socialization through networking, mentoring and professional development, and this researcher recommended fostering a more inclusive environment for women of color; it was suggested that these methods could encourage women of color to stay, resulting in benefits for universities and the women themselves, including new research contributions and better alignment for the multiple identities they must balance. Additional significant differences between White women and women of color in the area of socioeconomic barriers were found (Key et al., 2012). Women of color were more likely to report growing up in extreme poverty and experiencing financial hardship, which are salient early developmental factors that impact future career attainment (Key et al., 2012).

Anyone familiar with the plight of women of color would agree that taking on leadership roles is a great burden to bear. It is not difficult to imagine the struggles they must fight against. Oftentimes, they are discriminated against, typecast and pigeonholed into certain positions and regaled as the token of diversity, yet they are renege when attempting to make a large-scale change and passed over for other senior-level positions, positions which their majority-group member counterparts receive. Women of color have to sacrifice their real desire to help their community, through dismantling institutional racism and prejudice, in favor of making countless personal and professional compromises this complexity, this intersectionality is unique to women of color.

Chapter 4

Current Study

This current research study seeks to provide more clarity to the issue of barriers to women in leadership. The aim is to review the measures of barriers previous literature on women and women of color in leadership have identified and construct a combined measure that will demarcate the extent to which barriers are perceived and experienced by women and women of color across industries. This new scale is the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale (PBWLS); this scale includes items measuring the barriers reviewed above for both women in general and women of color. While this project created new items to fill gaps, it sought to use existing items of the areas reviewed above as a framework to build upon.

I have tried to provide a general overview of gender issues in leadership in addition to highlighting the barriers to women leaders, which is the focus of this thesis. I have found that overall, women often engage in an unrelenting balancing act. They try to retain a sense of self while also trying to fit into organizational cultures that reinforce negative stereotypes and reward identity asymmetry, which then leads to negative outcomes. However, research on the barriers to women in leadership remains difficult to generalize because it is complex. Barriers can manifest differently depending on the interactions between stereotypes, biases, social identity, and other constructs—the research is even more complicated when identifying how barriers uniquely impact women of color. Thus far, findings on the barriers have been varied and somewhat disjointed because of these complexities. To organize these findings in a succinct way for the development of the instrument, I outlined two overarching factors that arose from reoccurring themes in the literature: stereotypes and identity-based issues (as recommended by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2016). I then placed the barriers (facets) that best fit into either one or both categories in their respective places (see Table 1). It should be noted that feedback inequities were not included in this compilation of barriers because it was

deemed to be not relevant enough for inclusion into either of the factors for this initial scale development process. In order to validate this scale, I present hypotheses based on the literature review above to test the predictive power of this new instrument.

Table 1-- Barriers to Women Leaders Factors and Facets

Table 1. <i>Barriers to Women Leaders Factors and Facets.</i>	
General Barriers & Stereotypes	Identity Issues
Stereotypes of Women Leaders	
Glass Ceiling	Self-Identity
Broken Rung	Queen Bee Phenomenon
Emotional Displays	Double Jeopardy & Intersectionality
Glass Cliff	Invisibility & Hypervisibility
Stereotypes of Women of Color	Exclusion/Social Isolation
Exclusion/Social Isolation	Commitment to Community

Hypothesis Development

I expect increases in perceived barriers of both factors (i.e., stereotypes and general barriers and identity issues) to positively correlate to emotional exhaustion, which is feelings of the loss of emotional resources (Kampa, J., Rigotti, T., & Otto, K., 2017). I anticipate this positive correlation because a number of studies have reported that barriers to women leaders have and can lead to emotional distress in women (Brescoll, 2016; Gatrell & Cooper, 2007; Glass & Cook, 2016; Heilman, 2012). Additionally, other leadership research has looked at emotional exhaustion's link to leadership (Kampa, J., Rigotti, T., & Otto, K., 2017).

Hypothesis 1: Higher levels of perceived barriers will be associated with higher levels of emotional exhaustion in women.

Moreover, research studies focusing on women of color (Buchanan and Settles, 2018; Dickens et al., 2018; Nixon, 2017) have highlighted the emotional distress that comes with juggling various social identities (i.e., gender and race/ethnicity). Thus, I expect the above correlation to be significantly stronger for non-white women than it is for white women.

Hypothesis 2: Race/ethnicity will moderate the relationship between perceived barriers and emotional exhaustion, such that for non-white women the relationship will be stronger than that of white women.

Furthermore, motivation to lead has been identified as an important outcome in the leadership literature (Badura, Grijalva, Galvin, Owens, & Joseph, 2020). Studies in this review (Bear et al., 2017; Hoyt & Murphy, 2016) has analyzed this outcome, so in accordance with their results, I expect the overall measure of barriers and both factors (i.e., stereotypes and general barriers and identity issues) will negatively relate to motivation to lead.

Hypothesis 3: Higher levels of perceived barriers will be associated with lower levels of motivation to lead in women.

One article (Glass & Cook, 2016) also demonstrated that career satisfaction, or the extent to which a person is content with their career, decreases with the presence of barriers, so I will test this in order to gain more insight into this finding. I anticipate a similar negative trend between barriers and career satisfaction. These hypotheses and a research question about the role of race are presented below.

Hypothesis 4: Higher levels of perceived barriers will be associated with higher levels of career satisfaction in women.

Women of color experience barriers based on both their gender and their race/ethnicity (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; Dickens et al., 2018; Nixon, 2017; Rosette et al., 2016; Sesko & Biernat, 2010). Due to the complex nature of the combination of those two social identities, I anticipate that there might be a difference in levels of perceived barriers by women of color and white women.

Research Question 1: Will racial/ethnic subgroups differ on levels of perceived barriers reported?

A number of studies have observed how individual barriers impact women's career advancement (Derks et al., 2016; Ellemers et al., 2012; Faniko et al., 2016, Ryan et al., 2016) and some researchers have looked at career attainment (Hurley and Giannattonio, 1999). These are similar outcomes, but this study will focus on career attainment as an outcome to understand whether reported barriers are related to low attainment levels.

Research Question 2: Will levels of perceived barriers differ based on career attainment levels reported?

Chapter 5 Method

Participants

Participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk. The final sample included 161 female participants after people who were not qualified or missed attention checks were removed. Participants were represented from several industries (finance, human resources, marketing, etc.) and from various levels of employment. Much of the sample was employed full-time (85%) while the rest of the sample were either part-time workers or retired. In addition, most of the sample had either a Bachelor's degree (52%) or a Master's degree (23%). The average age was 37.80 years ($SD = 12.12$). The most represented racial/ethnic group was White participants at 49%, followed by Black (African American, Haitian, Caribbean, Jamaican, Bahamian) participants at 25%, and Hispanic or Latinx participants at 13%. Asian (Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Filipino, Indian), American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian (Other Pacific Islander), Middle Eastern, and participants identifying as Multiple Ethnicities each represented less than 10% of the sample. One participant did not report her race/ethnicity.

Procedure

During scale development, this study utilized the existing literature on barriers to women and women of color in leadership to create items. I searched preexisting scales to identify which barriers already had developed items for barriers. Five scales were then chosen and adapted to fit an overall barriers scale. These five scales included Karelaia and Guillén's (2014) Identity Conflict Measure, Moore, Grunberg, and Greenberg's (2004) Stereotyped Beliefs about Women Managers Scale, Lewis and Neville's (2015) Gendered Racial Microaggressions for Black Women Scale, Scott and Martin's (2013) Gender and Racial Stereotype Endorsement Scale, and Krishnan's (1991) Attitudes Towards Women as Managers Scale. In addition, I used the literature to write items for barriers that were

unrepresented in preexisting scales, and I created extra items for barriers that were represented in preexisting scales after adapting the items. Item writing followed best practices for item writing and development (Downing & Haladyna, 2006; Spector, 1992). I then combined all items into one overall scale; in total, 79 items were written and adapted. I then had three raters blindly sort each item into dimensions to check for accuracy and to ascertain that each item fell into at least one dimension even if that dimension was incorrect. Most items were mapped onto multiple dimensions. One item was not assigned to a dimension by any of the raters. All items were deemed suitable to test on the sample, except one was dropped due to redundancy. Thus, the remaining 78 items were tested on the sample. The Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale and four additional measures were compiled in a Qualtrics survey and distributed to MTurk members. Three attention check items were included, and participants who missed them were removed. Demographic information was also collected. All items were self-report to measure the perceptions of the participants. The study utilized a cross-sectional, correlational research design.

Measures

Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale. The constructed scale had 78 items, and it is used to measure barriers women leaders face. Options range from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7). A sample item is “I have to accept lower level jobs because I am a woman.” Nine items were reverse coded. The reliability of the scale had an alpha of $\alpha = .98$. The scale was later reduced to 60 items (see Table 6 in Appendix A).

Emotional Exhaustion. Wilk and Moynihan’s (2005) Measure of Emotional Exhaustion was also used. It is a 4-item questionnaire used to measure the frequency of feelings of emotional exhaustion. Options range from once a month or less (1), once a week (2), several times a week (3), once a day (4), and several times a day (5). A sample item is “I feel burned out from my work.” No reverse coding was necessary. The reliability of the scale had an alpha of $\alpha = .93$.

Career Satisfaction. Career satisfaction was assessed by the Career Satisfaction Scale (Seibert et al., 2013). It measures career satisfaction using 12 response items on a 5-point Likert Scale from Extremely Dissatisfied (1) to Extremely Satisfied (5). A sample item is “The rank or level to which I have been promoted.” No reverse coding was necessary. The reliability of the scale had an alpha of $\alpha = .90$.

Motivation to Lead. Chan and Drasgow’s (2001) Motivation to Lead Scale was also used. It is a 27-item questionnaire on a 7-point Likert Scale. This is used to measure attitudes towards leadership. Options range from Extremely Dissatisfied (1) to Extremely Satisfied (7). A sample item is “It is not right to decline leadership roles.” No reverse coding was necessary. The reliability of the scale had an alpha of $\alpha = .89$.

Career Attainment. Career attainment was operationalized by two items. One item asked if a participant is currently in a leadership position (yes/no). Another item asked what level leadership they are (Mid-level, Senior-level).

Race/ethnicity. Race/ethnicity is an observed variable. It was reported using mean level analyses, and it was assessed through a dummy code for moderation analyses in which 0 = White women and 1 = Women of Color (i.e., non-white women).

Chapter 6 Results

Following the classical test theory steps for scale development (Drasgow et al., 2007; Spector, 1992), items were viewed by experts to ensure content relevance. The 78 PBWLS items were checked for missing values, and the percentages of missing values ranged from .01 to .03. The full PBWLS yielded an average of $M = 3.71$ and $SD = 1.23$. An initial exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the potential number of factors. The resulting scree plot largely supported the presence of a single factor for the PBWLS. A total of 49.85% of the variance in items was explained by the first factor, while only an additional 6.13% was explained by a second factor. For this reason, the correlation and regression analyses will focus on the overall scale score.

Descriptive statistics for each of the 78 items, along with item-total correlations for the overall scale, can be found in Table 2. The item-total correlations for the overall scale had a wide range from .01 to .85. In order to determine internal consistency, a reliability analysis was performed using Cronbach's alpha. The PBWLS reported a high alpha level of .98 for the overall scale. Though the regression and correlation analyses will focus on the overall scale, item-total correlations were also analyzed (as shown in Table 2) for the general barriers and stereotypes (correlations ranged from -.07 to .86) and the identity issues subscales (correlations ranged from .07 to .83). Item-total correlations at the facet level were also reported in Table 2. Based on the results of Table 2, 18 items were removed due to low item-total correlations. For example, item 2 was flagged for removal because it had a low item-total correlation with the overall scale, and item 11 was flagged for removal because it had a low item-total correlation at the facet level. After removing these items, the alpha for the remaining 60 items was $\alpha = .99$. This indicates that at the overall level there was still considerable redundancy in items; however, this strategy allows for future work examining the individual facets.

Table 2-- Descriptive Statistics and Item-Total Correlations for Overall, Two-Factor, and Facet Level Analysis

Item Classification		Item	Descriptive Statistics		Corrected Item-Total Correlation		
Two-Factor	Facet		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Overall	Factor	Facet
General Barriers & Stereotypes	Stereotypes of Women Leaders	1	2.82	1.42	.118	.107	.228
		2	3.08	1.55	-.094	-.088	.117
		3	3.66	1.96	.753	.766	.634
		4	3.58	1.90	.854	.863	.768
		5	3.71	1.91	.802	.817	.793
		6	4.35	1.63	.470	.512	.464
	Glass Ceiling	7	3.38	1.84	.803	.812	.731
		8	3.90	1.82	.700	.712	.706
		9	4.04	1.79	.806	.824	.790
		10	4.13	1.91	.725	.747	.780
		11	3.35	1.70	-.050	-.074	.034
		12	3.19	1.55	.158	.155	.331
	Broken Rung	13	3.58	1.88	.783	.811	.773
		14	3.61	1.88	.775	.775	.707
		15	3.62	2.04	.806	.814	.767
	Emotional Displays	16	4.07	1.85	.740	.759	.703
		17	3.58	1.88	.796	.781	.767
		18	3.50	1.91	.805	.791	.800
	Glass Cliff	19	3.32	1.81	.740	.738	.692
		20	3.92	1.95	.807	.816	.789
		21	4.00	1.84	.798	.816	.796
		22	4.18	1.76	.758	.785	.825
		23	4.10	1.78	.772	.775	.789
		24	3.93	1.88	.828	.842	.859
		25	3.58	1.94	.816	.811	.813
		26	3.51	1.78	.818	.829	.799
		27	3.94	1.75	.664	.665	.671
		28	4.09	1.70	.388	.425	.392
		29	3.93	1.86	.738	.741	.722

Table 2 (continued)

Descriptive statistics and item-total correlations for overall, two-factor, and facet level analysis.

Item Classification		Item	Descriptive Statistics		Corrected Item-Total Correlation		
Two-Factor	Facet		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Overall	Factor	Facet
General Barriers & Stereotypes	Stereotypes of Women of Color	30	3.72	1.88	.695	.675	.724
		31	3.74	1.89	.785	.778	.795
		32	3.18	1.94	.752	.735	.775
		33	3.42	1.98	.765	.766	.827
		34	4.49	1.59	.308	.327	.393
		35	3.49	1.94	.731	.742	.805
		36	3.54	1.95	.744	.730	.795
		37	3.45	1.93	.794	.784	.855
		38	3.62	1.89	.749	.744	.825
		39	3.38	1.95	.710	.701	.686
		40	3.01	1.97	.825	.823	.867
		41	3.19	2.10	.756	.741	.789
		42	3.62	2.10	.690	.681	.674
		Exclusion & Social Isolation		43	3.12	1.83	.803
44	3.15			1.95	.791	.781	.748
45	3.60			1.90	.806	.796	.719
46	3.59			1.98	.763	.775	.735
47	3.68			1.91	.739	.757	.735
Identity Issues	Self-Identity	48	5.24	1.47	-.082	-.112	-.024
		49	3.32	1.90	.748	.749	.787
		50	3.45	1.88	.810	.789	.781
		51	3.12	1.88	.766	.744	.713
		52	3.55	1.91	.777	.737	.696
		53	3.68	1.93	.615	.615	.659
Queen Bee Phenomenon		54	3.33	1.97	.813	.786	.302
		55	2.86	1.35	.063	.093	.353
		56	3.21	1.49	-.077	-.071	.453
		57	3.42	1.82	-.194	-.162	.310
		58	2.91	1.44	.013	.062	.464

Table 2 (continued)

Descriptive statistics and item-total correlations for overall, two-factor, and facet level analysis.

Item Classification		Item	Descriptive Statistics		Corrected Item-Total Correlation		
Two-Factor	Facet		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Overall	Factor	Facet
		59	3.41	2.03	.798	.775	.771
		60	3.08	2.00	.837	.841	.817
		61	3.55	1.96	.757	.790	.756
	Double Jeopardy & Intersectionality	62	3.40	1.78	.803	.809	.811
		63	3.88	1.79	.611	.633	.643
		64	4.28	1.69	.437	.453	.432
		65	4.04	1.78	.671	.659	.639
		66	3.59	1.93	.818	.790	.787
		67	3.98	1.87	.726	.713	.774
		68	3.66	1.79	.739	.748	.787
Identity Issues		69	3.87	1.89	.784	.753	.774
	Invisibility & Hypervisibility	70	3.84	1.98	.689	.690	.761
		71	3.60	1.99	.786	.762	.785
		72	3.59	1.91	.837	.827	.758
		73	3.26	1.97	.773	.761	.668
		74	4.15	1.81	.539	.484	.609
		75	4.22	1.70	.401	.376	.555
	Commitment to Community	76	4.98	1.66	-.182	-.172	.319
		77	3.51	1.87	.735	.740	.499
		78	3.13	1.98	.835	.837	.590

Note. $n = 161$. Reverse coded items are italicized.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations for each scale can be found in Table 3. The PBWLS demonstrated strong correlations with both the measure of emotional exhaustion ($r = .80, p < .001$) and the measure of motivation to lead ($r = .76, p < .001$). Although the relationship was in the expected direction, PBWLS scores were not significantly related to the measure of satisfaction ($r = -.03, p = .713$).

Table 3-- Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Table 3.								
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations								
Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Overall	3.68	1.36	-					
2. General Barriers & Stereotypes	3.74	1.48	.99**	-				
3. Identity Issues	3.60	1.23	.98**	.94**	-			
4. Emotional Exhaustion	2.53	1.26	.80**	.79**	.78**	-		
5. Motivation to Lead	4.48	.84	.76**	.76**	.72**	.62**	-	
6. Career Satisfaction	3.78	.70	-.03	-.02	-.05	-.07	.41**	-

Note. $n = 161$. $p < .001$ **

Three simple linear regressions were conducted to use the PBWLS score to predict emotional exhaustion, motivation to lead, and career satisfaction. Due to the fact that majority of the barriers were found in a single factor, the hypotheses for analyzing the perceived general barriers and stereotypes and the perceived identity issues were collapsed together for reporting into the overall score for the PBWLS, but both the factor and the overall regression analyses can be found in Table 4.

Table 4-- Regression Analyses for the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale

Table 4.							
Regression Analyses for the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale							
Model	ΔF	ΔR^2	R	R^2	b	t	SE
Emotional Exhaustion							
Hypothesis 1			.80	.63	.74	16.54*	.045
1A			.79	.62	.67	16.13*	.042
1B			.78	.61	.80	15.70*	.051
Hypothesis 2							
Step 1			.80	.63			
PB					.75	15.80*	.047
RACE					-.05	-.42	.128
Step 2	1.50	.003	.80	.64			
PB					.69	10.53*	.066
RACE					-.48	-1.29	.370
REPB					.12	1.22	.094
Motivation to Lead							
Hypothesis 3			.76	.57	.47	14.58*	.032
3A			.76	.58	.43	14.94*	.029
3B			.72	.51	.49	12.94*	.038
Career Satisfaction							
Hypothesis 4			.03	.00	-.02	-.40	.041
4A			.02	.00	-.01	-.20	.037
4B			.05	.00	-.03	-.65	.045

Note. $n = 161$ ($n = 160$ for the race/ethnicity dummy code). $p < .001^*$. It is important to remember that each of these analyses reflect simple regressions, as the correlation between the two-factor solution was too strongly correlated. PB = Overall Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale, RACE = Term for the race/ethnicity dummy code. REPB = Interaction term for Race/Ethnicity and the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale.

Results for the first regression analysis showed that the PBWLS score significantly predicted the emotional exhaustion score, $b = .74$, $t(160) = 16.54$, $p < .001$. The PBWLS explained a significant proportion of variance in the emotional exhaustion score, $R^2 = .63$,

$F(1,159) = 273.44, p < .001$. Sixty-three percent of the variance in emotional exhaustion was accounted for by the PBWLS score. Thus, Hypothesis 1 (i.e., a and b) was supported.

Regarding the moderation analysis, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted ($n = 160$, as one participant failed to report her race/ethnicity). In step 1, the PBWLS score and Race/Ethnicity dummy code were predictors, and they explained a significant amount of variance in emotional exhaustion; $R^2 = .63, F(1, 159) = 135.80, p < .001$), satisfying the first requirement for the moderation analysis. In step 2, the interaction term of PBWLS score and race/ethnicity was added in the model, and it did not significantly explain additional variance ($\Delta R^2 = .003; \Delta F = 1.50$) failing to support the second requirement for the moderation analysis. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Results for the third regression analysis showed that the PBWLS score also significantly predicted the motivation to lead score, $b = .47, t(160) = 14.58, p < .001$. The PBWLS explained a significant proportion of variance in the motivation to lead score, $R^2 = .57, F(1,159) = 212.43, p < .001$. Fifty-seven percent of the variance in motivation to lead was accounted for by the PBWLS score. Thus, Hypothesis 3 (i.e., a and b) was not supported. The finding was not in the hypothesized direction. Women who experienced more barriers had a greater motivation to lead.

The results for the fourth regression analysis showed that the PBWLS score did not significantly predicted the career satisfaction score, $b = -.02, t(160) = -.40$. Thus, failing to support Hypothesis 4 (i.e., a and b).

ANOVA and t -statistic results for Research Questions 1 and 2 can be found in Table 5. Regarding Research Question 1, the results for mean level differences showed that Black ($M = 4.59, SD = 1.00$) and Latina ($M = 4.15, SD = 1.40$) participants reported more perceived barriers on average than their White counterparts ($M = 3.25, SD = 1.33$). A one-way ANOVA was conducted to test the significance of these mean level differences. ANOVA results showed that there was an overall significant mean difference among the three group means of White, Black, and Latina women, $F(2,137) = 16.37, p < .001$, with an

eta-squared of .193, indicating that 19.3% of the variance on PBWLS is explained by their race/ethnicity. Three independent-samples *t*-tests was performed to compare the mean PBWLS levels between White, Black, and Latina women. Results from the first test of 119 participants (79 White women, 40 Black women) showed that white women's scores on PBWLS were significantly lower than Black women's scores, $t(117) = -6.17, p < .001, d = -1.14$ with a medium effect size of .50. Results from the second test of 100 participants (79 White women, 21 Latina women) showed that white women's scores on PBWLS were significantly lower than Latina's women's scores, $t(98) = -2.74, p = .007, d = -.55$ with a small effect size of .27. Though several other races/ethnicities were represented in this sample, participant levels were too low to report findings on average differences for them.

In addition, results for Research Question 2 showed that women who reported that they were not currently in a leadership position reported slightly less barriers ($M = 3.46, SD = 1.29$) on average than those who reported they were currently in a leadership position ($M = 3.82, SD = 1.40$). Moreover, women in mid-level leadership positions ($M = 3.90, SD = 1.40$) had a slightly higher average for barriers than women in senior-level leadership ($M = 3.36, SD = 1.31$). Two additional one-way ANOVAs were conducted to test the significance of the mean level differences for career attainment. ANOVA results showed that there was not an overall significant mean difference based on leadership position, $F(1, 98) = 2.61, p = .108$, suggesting that those who were currently in a leadership position did not statistically differ in mean level barriers reported from those who were not currently in a leadership position. Regarding those in Mid-level and Senior-level leadership positions, ANOVA results showed that there was again no overall significant mean difference among the two groups $F(1, 98) = 1.95, p = .166$, suggesting that those who were in senior-level leadership positions did not statistically differ in mean level barriers reported from those who were in mid-level leadership positions.

Table 5-- ANOVAS and t-statistics for Race/Ethnicity and Career Attainment

Table 5.									
ANOVAS and t-statistics for Race/Ethnicity and Career Attainment									
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
White Women	3.25	1.33	79	16.37	<.001	.193			
Black Women	4.59	1.00	40				-6.17	<.001	-1.24
Latina Women	4.15	1.40	21	.43	.514		-2.74	.007	-0.55
Leader	3.82	1.40	100	2.61	.108	.016			
Non-Leader	3.46	1.29	58						
Senior-Level	3.90	1.40	85	1.95	.166	.020			
Mid-Level	3.36	1.31	15						

Note. The overall ANOVA for White, Black, and Latina women did not meet Levene's statistic. The variance in Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale scores across White and Black women were not statistically equivalent.

Chapter 7

Discussion

This research paper was the first step in a multi-study scale development study for an overall measure of barriers to leadership for women. I offered a detailed review of the current barriers (Arvate et al., 2018; Brescoll, 2016; Derks et al., 2016; Ellemers et al., 2012; Faniko et al., 2016; Glass & Cook, 2016; Heilman, 2012; McKinsey & LeanIn, 2019; Ryan et al., 2016; Vickenburg et al., 2011) women in leadership face, including stereotypes of women leaders, the glass ceiling, the broken rung, isolation and exclusion, the glass cliff, and the queen bee phenomenon, amongst others (see Table 1). Following that review, I examined the literature on the specific challenges women of color face when trying to get into leadership, including double jeopardy, intersectionality, stereotypes of women of color, invisibility and hypervisibility, etc (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; Dickens et al., 2018; Nixon, 2017; Rosette et al., 2016; Sesko & Biernat, 2010). Then, I compiled them into one scale initially separated into two factors (see Table 1), and the resulting overall measure of barriers, the PBWLS, had a strong reliability of .99 (even after removing 18 items).

The PBWLS was also strongly positively correlated with emotional exhaustion, showing that higher levels of PBWLS scores predicted a greater frequency of emotional exhaustion (Kampa et al., 2017). This positive correlation supports previous study findings that barriers to women leaders can lead to emotional strain in women (Brescoll, 2016; Gatrell & Cooper, 2007; Glass & Cook, 2016; Heilman, 2012; Kampa et al., 2017). I did not, however, find evidence for the moderating role of race/ethnicity in the relationship between PBWLS scores and emotional exhaustion. This result was unexpected given that many researchers (Buchanan and Settles, 2018; Dickens et al., 2018; Nixon, 2017) highlighted the fact that women of color, specifically, deal with high levels of emotional exhaustion. Results for motivation to lead were surprising in that they were the opposite of what previous research supported (Bear et al., 2017; Hoyt & Murphy, 2016), while I

anticipated that higher levels of PBWLS scores would be associated with lower levels of motivation to lead, I found a positive correlation relationship. Though I found evidence of a significant association of PBWLS scores and motivation to lead, I did not find significant results for any relationship or association between PBWLS scores and career satisfaction, which did not lend support for Glass and Cook's (2016) finding.

Moreover, the PBWLS predicted 63% of the variance in emotional exhaustion and 57% of the variance in motivation to lead. These findings show that barriers to women leaders can lead to emotional drain for women, yet their recognition of the challenges they face could demonstrate their strong motivation to lead. This study did not provide evidence to suggest career attainment levels differed based on PBWLS scores (Hurley and Giannantonio, 1999). However, Through the use of this measure, I was also able to find significant subgroup differences between White women and women of color (i.e., Black and Latina women) in the mean level of barriers reported (19.3% of the variance in PBWLS scores were due to race/ethnicity), providing support for the fact that women of color have a unique experience with barriers to leadership (Buchanan & Settles, 2018; Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; Dickens et al., 2018; Key et al., 2012; Nixon, 2017; Rosette et al., 2016; Sesko & Biernat, 2010).

Theoretical Implications

This study's primary theoretical contribution is that it addressed the measurement gaps in the barriers to women in leadership literature by creating the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale. No study has compiled the barriers before in this way, so this measure is novel. Not only is it novel, but it yielded high reliability and had predictive power. This study also brought together literature on gender and racial/ethnic differences obstacles for women and women of color in attaining high-level positions in the workforce. Limited studies (Key et al., 2012) have synthesized the challenges women and women of color face when trying to attain leadership positions. In addition, this study corroborated the findings of a positive relationship between emotional exhaustion (Brescoll, 2016; Gatrell & Cooper, 2007; Glass & Cook, 2016; Heilman, 2012) and the barriers, as well it provided evidence

for a positive relationship with motivation to lead and the barriers, which is contrary to prior research (Bear et al., 2017; Hoyt & Murphy, 2016). These findings should be explored further. The results also demonstrated significantly higher levels of reported experience with barriers to leadership for Latina and Black women, suggesting that they face a greater number of challenges than their white counterparts.

Practical Implications

Women and women of color have been passed over for leadership roles for much too long. First, this study is beneficial to organizational leaders because it serves as a guide to understanding why the leadership gap between men and women persists, especially for women of color. It provides insight into the fundamental reasons for why women have continued to be underrepresented in leadership positions at work. Organizations would be wise to offer professional development and mentorship programs for all women (e.g., matching them up with senior female leaders), so they can have more access to and opportunities in senior-level leadership positions. Companies should also endorse ways to combat bias and discrimination that comes from racist and sexist stereotypes, including offering racial/ethnic and gender sensitivity workshops and workshops on intersectionality, critical race theory, and feminism, especially given that women of color report higher levels of barriers to leadership. Organizations should also be aware that experiencing these obstacles to leadership can have consequences, particularly increased burnout for women. Moreover, organizations should recognize that women in their company who readily identify barriers to leadership may have an increased desire or motivation to attain leadership positions. Organizations should take the necessary steps to remove the obstacles that get in the way of women in leadership. If organizations do this, they can experience the gains that are to be made from having women in leadership positions.

Limitations and Future Directions

This research study made many contributions to organizational science. However, there were some limitations to this research. First, though, this study aimed to bring together

various areas in the literature regarding women in leadership, women of color in leadership, stereotypes, and intersectionality. It did not cover the entire scope of issues facing women in the workplace, including sexual harassment and compensation. Future research should seek to study how improving initial formal and informal workplace socialization efforts, creating inclusive climates, and developing initiatives to address intersectionality in the workplace for women of color can help close the leadership gap.

Second, I was not able to comprehensively build a nomological network for the purposes of this study, as recommended by Podsakoff and colleagues (2016). I did, however, follow some of their (Podsakoff et al., 2016) recommendations by identifying types of barriers to leadership, organizing those types of barriers into themes and facets which I used to create two general factors; I then refined the scale into an overall factor, according to preliminary factor analysis results (Podsakoff et al., 2016). Future research should further analyze the nomological network for perceived barriers and develop a thorough theoretical framework model from which to work. This sample is also comprised of mturk workers, and some research has advised against using mturk workers due to identity and attention issues (Cheung et al., 2017). Though steps were taken to ensure the quality of the data, including adding sample requirements, future research should endeavor to test this measure on a multiorganizational sample to ensure the data is of the highest quality and is generalizable. Additionally, there are concerns about common method variance in this study, in fact, the PBWLS demonstrated strong correlations with both emotional exhaustion and motivation to lead, but these concerns can be alleviated in part because the correlation between PBWLS and career satisfaction did not show the same strength. Furthermore, this sample did not include men, so any interactive or additive effects of both gender and race could not be analyzed.

This study also utilized Classical Test Theory, which has been demonstrated to not fully capture all that is necessary for scale development (Kline, 2005). Future research should aim to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis to ascertain the validity and reliability of this instrument more assuredly. Lastly, the high reliability of .99 for the 60-item measure suggests that there still may be some redundancy in the scale. Future research should

explore options to further reduce the PBWLS, so the non-redundant items can remain in the scale and the excess items can be removed. This future scale can then be used as a short diagnostic survey for organizations to assess which barriers women in their organization experience, so they can find ways to address them.

Conclusion

Overall, the Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale yielded high reliability and did correlate with and predict outcomes, including emotional exhaustion and motivation to lead. While this is a good first step in the scale development process, this study alone is not sufficient in analyzing the barriers women face in leadership. There is still much to be done to achieve equality for women leaders in the workplace and to close the gender leadership gap. However, one thing remains obvious all women and men must be united in the movement to promote and advocate for women in leadership. After all, according to the Cheetah Girls, “Together We Can.”

References

- Adams, R. B. (2016). Women on boards: The superheroes of tomorrow? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 371-386.
- Arvate, P. R., Galilea, G. W., & Todescat, I. (2018). The queen bee: A myth? the effect of top-level female leadership on subordinate females. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(5), 533-548.
- Badura, K. L., Grijalva, E., Galvin, B. M., Owens, B. P., & Joseph, D. L. (2020). Motivation to lead: A meta-analysis and distal-proximal model of motivation and leadership. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(4), 331-354.
- Bass, B. (1991). Debate: is it time to stop talking about gender differences. *Harvard Business Review*, 69(1), 151-153.
- Bear, J. B., Cushenbery, L., London, M., & Sherman, G. D. (2017). Performance feedback, power retention, and the gender gap in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(6), 721-740.
- Brenner, O. C., Tomkiewicz, J., & Schein, V. (1989). The relationship between gender role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(3), 662-669.
- Brescoll, V. L. (2016). Leading with their hearts? how gender stereotypes of emotion lead to biased evaluations of female leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 415-428.
- Buchanan, N. T., & Settles, I. H. (2018). Managing (in)visibility and hypervisibility in the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.
- Buttner, E. H. (2001). Examining female entrepreneurs' management style: an application of a relational frame. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(3), 253-269.
- Catalyst (2014). Women in the United States. <http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-united-states>.
- Chan, K., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 481-498.
- Cheung, J. H., Burns, D. K., Sinclair, R. R., & Sliter, M. (2017). Amazon mechanical turk in organizational psychology: An evaluation and practical recommendations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(4), 347-361.

- Chisholm-Burns, M. A., Spivey, C. A., Hagemann, T., & Josephson, M. A. (2017). Women in leadership and the bewildering glass ceiling. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, 74(5), 312-324.
- Chung - Herrera, B. G., & Lankau, M. J. (2005). Are we there yet? an assessment of fit between stereotypes of minority managers and the Successful - Manager prototype. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(10), 2029-2056.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Combs, G. M. (2003). The duality of race and gender for managerial african american women: Implications of informal social networks on career advancement. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 385-405.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Derks, B., Van Laar, C., & Ellemers, N. (2016). The queen bee phenomenon: Why women leaders distance themselves from junior women. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 456-469.
- Dickens, D. D., Womack, V. Y., & Dimes, T. (2018). Managing hypervisibility: An exploration of theory and research on identity shifting strategies in the workplace among black women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,
- Downing, S. M., & Haladyna, T. M. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of test development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Drasgow, F., Whetzel, D. L., & Oppler, S. H. (2007). Strategies for test validation and refinement. *Applied measurement: Industrial psychology in human resources management*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Ellemers, N., Rink, F., Derks, B., & Ryan, M. K. (2012). Women in high places: When and why promoting women into top positions can harm them individually or as a group (and how to prevent this). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 163-187. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2012.10.003
- Faniko, K., Ellemers, N., & Derks, B. (2016). Queen bees and alpha males: Are successful women more competitive than successful men? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(7), 903-913.
- Gatrell, C., & Cooper, C. L. (2007). (No) cracks in the glass ceiling: women managers, stress and the barriers to success. *Handbook on women in business and management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 57-77.

- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Routledge Publishing.
- Glass, C., & Cook, A. (2016). Leading at the top: Understanding women's challenges above the glass ceiling. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 51-63.
- Heilman, M. E. (2012). Gender stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 113-135.
- Hooks, B. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hoyt, C. L., & Murphy, S. E. (2016). Managing to clear the air: Stereotype threat, women, and leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 387-399.
- Hurley, A. E., & Giannantonio, C. M. (1999). Career attainment for women and minorities: The interactive effects of age, gender and race. *Women in Management Review*, 14(1), 4-13.
- Kampa, J., Rigotti, T., & Otto, K. (2017). Mechanisms linking authentic leadership to emotional exhaustion: The role of procedural justice and emotional demands in a moderated mediation approach. *Industrial Health*, 55(2), 95-107.
- Karelaia, N., & Guillén, L. (2014). Identity conflict measure.
- Key, S., Popkin, S., Munchus, G., Wech, B., Hill, V., & Tanner, J. (2012). An exploration of leadership experiences among white women and women of color. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 25(3), 392-404.
- Kline, T. J. (2005). Classical test theory: Assumptions, equations, limitations, and item analyses. *Psychological testing: A practical approach to design and evaluation*, 91-105.
- Krishnan, R. (1991). Attitudes towards women as managers scale.
- Leicht, C., de Moura, G.R., & Crisp, R. J. (2014). Contesting gender stereotypes stimulates generalized fairness in the selection of leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(5), 1025-1039.
- Lewis, K.M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: how followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(2), 221-234.
- Lewis, J. A., & Neville, H. A. (2015). Construction and initial validation of the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale for Black women. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 62(2), 289.

- McKinsey & Company, & LeanIn.Org (2018). Women in the workplace. <https://womenintheworkplace.com/>
- McKinsey & Company, & LeanIn.Org (2019). Women in the workplace. <https://womenintheworkplace.com/>
- Meister, A., Sinclair, A., & Jehn, K. A. (2017). Identities under scrutiny: How women leaders navigate feeling misidentified at work. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(5), 672-690.
- Mendelberg, T., & Karpowitz, C. F. (2016). Women's authority in political decision-making groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 487-503.
- Moore, S., Grunberg, L., & Greenberg, E. (2004). Development and validation of a scale to measure beliefs about women managers. *Current Psychology*, 23(3), 245-256.
- Nixon, M. L. (2017). Experiences of women of color university chief diversity officers. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 10(4), 301-317.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York. McGraw-Hill.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2016). Recommendations for creating better concept definitions in the organizational, behavioral, and social sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(2), 159-203.
- Rosener, J. (1995). *America's competitive secret: utilizing women as a management strategy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosette, A. S., Koval, C. Z., Ma, A., & Livingston, R. (2016). Race matters for women leaders: Intersectional effects on agentic deficiencies and penalties. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 429-445.
- Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., Morgenroth, T., Rink, F., Stoker, J., & Peters, K. (2016). Getting on top of the glass cliff: Reviewing a decade of evidence, explanations, and impact. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 446-455.
- Sanchez-Hucles, J. V., & Davis, D. D. (2010). Women and women of color in leadership: Complexity, identity, and intersectionality. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 171-181.
- Schneider, M. C., & Bos, A. L. (2014). Measuring stereotypes of female politicians. *Political Psychology*, 35(2), 245-266.
- Scott, A., & Martin, A. (2013). *Endorsement of Gender and Racial Stereotypes*.

- Seibert, S., Kraimer, M., Holtom, B., & Pierotti, A. (2013). Career Satisfaction Scale.
- Sesko, A. K., & Biernat, M. (2010). Prototypes of race and gender: The invisibility of black women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(2), 356-360.
- Smith, A. E. (2014). Getting to the helm: Women in leadership in federal regulation. *Public Organization Review*, 14(4), 477-496.
- Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Suhr, D. (2006). Exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis. *SAS Users Group International Conference* (pp. 1 -17). Cary: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Sulé, V. T. (2011). Their rightful place: Diversity narratives, women of color agency and transformation of the academy. In G. Jean-Marie & B. Lloyd-Jones (Eds.), *Women of color in higher education: Changing directions and new perspectives* (pp. 135–161). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.
- United National (2015). UN women. <http://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/leadership-and-political-participation/facts-and-figures>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). Current population survey, 2010 annual social and economic supplement, table 2: educational attainment of the population 25 years and over, by selected characteristics, 2010.
- Viernes Turner C.S. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 74-93.
- Vinkenburg, C. J., van Engen, M. L., Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2011). An exploration of stereotypical beliefs about leadership styles: Is transformational leadership a route to women's promotion? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 10-21.
- Wilk, S., & Moynihan, L. M. (2005). Measure of emotional exhaustion.

Appendix

Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale Items

Table 6-- Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale Items

Table 6

Perceived Barriers to Women Leader Scale Items

Item Classification		Item Content	
Two-Factor	Facet	Item	
General Barriers & Stereotypes	Stereotypes of Women Leaders	*1	People in my organization believe that women have the capability to acquire the necessary skills to be successful managers
		*2	People in my organization believe that to be a successful executive, a woman does not have to sacrifice her femininity
		3	People in my organization believe that women are not ambitious enough to be successful in business
		4	People in my organization believe that women are not assertive enough to be successful in business
		5	People in my organization believe women are not competitive enough to be successful in business
		6	People in my organization would say women are more community oriented than men are
	Glass Ceiling	7	Women don't get promoted in my organization
		8	My company only hires women as mid-level managers
		9	Men get promoted over me
		10	Men get promoted faster than women do at my company
		*11	My career growth has not been stunted
		*12	Women don't have trouble getting promotions in my organization
		13	Upward mobility at my job seems impossible because I am a woman
	Broken Rung	14	Even though I'm qualified, I am never hired as a manager
		15	I have to accept lower level jobs because I am a woman
		16	Men who have the same qualifications as me get hired to better positions than I do
		Emotional Displays	17

		18	People in my organization think I show too much emotion
		19	People in my organization think I show too little emotion
		*20	I run into obstacles in my role as a leader because I am a woman
		21	My ideas get challenged more because I am a leader who is a woman
		22	I have to perform much better than male colleagues who are managers in order to succeed
		*23	Despite my accomplishments, I have to continually prove myself as a leader in comparison to male colleagues
	Glass Cliff	24	My work is judged more critically than my male colleagues
		*25	I feel that other managers do not take me seriously because I am a woman
		26	I get less resources than male managers do because I am a woman
		27	I take on more risky tasks than other managers because I want to be taken seriously as a leader
		*28	My company gives me more challenging tasks because they believe women can handle it
		29	I feel like my company would fire me as a manager if I failed at a really challenging work task

Table 6 (continued)

Perceived Barriers to Women Leaders Scale Items

Item Classification		Item	Item Content
Two-Factor	Facet		
General Barriers & Stereotypes	Stereotypes of Women of Color	30	Someone at work assumed I was sassy and straightforward
		31	Someone at work assumed that I am too independent
		32	Someone at work made me feel like I was exotic

	33	I have been told that I am too assertive
	*34	People at work have assumed I am strong
	35	Someone at work told me to calm down
	36	Someone at work assumed I was “angry”
	37	Someone at work accused me of being angry when I was speaking calmly
	*38	Someone at work accused me of being annoyed when I was fine
	39	People have told me I am too docile to be a leader
	40	People have told me I am too angry to be a leader
	41	People at work have asked to touch my hair
	42	People at work have trouble pronouncing my name
	43	People at work often forget to include me in group emails
	44	People at work often miss scheduled meetings with me
	45	I've felt excluded from networking opportunities
	46	I often feel lonely at work
	47	I often feel like I can't relate to anyone at work
	*48	Being a leader does not conflict with my being a woman
	49	I feel uncomfortable being a woman when I am with a group of other managers
	50	I think that I am not influential enough because I am a woman
	51	Being a manager makes me less feminine
	*52	I have to behave in a 'typically masculine' way to be taken seriously as a leader
	*53	In comparison with my male colleagues, I feel more uncomfortable taking credit for my successes
	*54	Women at my company have made sexist remarks to me
	55	I feel supported by women leaders at my company
	56	Women at my company have taken the time to show me the ropes
	57	I have a mentor who is a woman at my company
	58	Women leaders at my company are willing to mentor me

Table 6 (continued)
Perceived Barrier to Women Leaders Scale Items

Item Classification		Item Content	
Two-Factor	Facet	Item	
		59	People in my organization have imitated the way they think my race/ethnicity speaks
		60	People in my organization have made negative comments about my skin tone
		61	Someone assumed I speak a certain way
	Double Jeopardy & Intersectionality	62	I feel like I have to code-switch at work
		63	My race/ethnicity is more important than my gender
		*64	My gender is more important than my race/ethnicity
		65	I feel like I have to juggle multiple aspects of myself at work
		66	People treat me different because of my race/ethnicity and my gender
			*67
Identity Issues		68	My comments have been ignored
		69	Someone challenged my authority
		*70	I have been disrespected in workplace
		71	Someone has tried to "put me in my place" at work
		72	People at work assume I do not have much to contribute to the conversation
		73	I feel like a "token" at work
		74	I feel a responsibility to help people that look like me succeed
		75	I feel a responsibility to help people who are of the same culture as me succeed
		*76	I don't think helping people of my race/ethnicity is a burden
		77	I don't always receive the information I need at work because people forget to tell me things
	Commitment to Community	78	People at work often forget my name

Note. Reserve coded items are italicized., *Items that were removed from the scale.