# Emotion and Warmth Modulation in Women Leaders: A Qualitative Exploratory Study

Danielle L. Pfaff

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
under the Executive Committee
of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
2019

ABSTRACT

Emotion and Warmth Modulation in Women Leaders: A Qualitative Exploratory Study

Danielle L. Pfaff

Gender stereotypes dictate that women are and should be warm, whereas men are and should be competent. While prior work has explored how women manage stereotypic expectations about their competence, there is less research on the lived experiences of women leaders navigating the warmth dimension of these stereotypes. This qualitative study initially explored the possibility that women leaders may modulate emotional displays in service of conveying warmth. The research questions evolved over time and the study ultimately aimed to understand the following research questions: (1) Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace? If so, why, how, and what are the outcomes? (2) Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate warmth displays in the workplace? If so, why, how, and what are the outcomes? The study included data from semi-structured interviews with 22 women leaders in male-typed contexts. The data ultimately revealed that the vast majority of participants engaged in emotion modulation at work. There were a variety of reasons underlying this process, including participants viewing modulating emotions as a component of their competence in their roles, using emotionality as a tool in the workplace, and noting that specific emotions were unacceptable to express in their workplace. They also identified how they managed their emotions, reporting strategies that ranged from within the workplace to outside the workplace, as well as intrapersonal versus interpersonal strategies. Finally, they reported the mostly negative intrapersonal outcomes of modulating emotions, including feelings of fatigue and inauthenticity. With regard to warmth, the majority of participants reported modulating warmth at work. Participants modulated warmth for various reasons, including viewing warmth as a component of

leadership, in response to others' gendered expectations for warmth displays, and reflecting on actual or predicted outcomes of warmth displays to guide subsequent warmth displays. They conveyed warmth in a variety of ways, such as appearing friendly and approachable, resolving conflict with others, and creating a supportive team environment. Finally, they reported myriad outcomes associated with warmth modulation, including fatigue and discomfort, as well as warmth displays reducing credibility or a failure to display warmth resulting in negative professional outcomes. One final theme also emerged, bridging across warmth and emotionality. At times, participants suppressed negative emotions, then amplified warmth behaviors. They also displayed positive emotions, then amplified subsequent warmth behaviors. The findings suggested that women leaders may be modulating both emotions and warmth independently of one another, yet there are also instances where warmth modulation directly follows emotional modulation. This study provides compelling evidence that women leaders engage in labor, outside of explicit role responsibilities, in managing both emotions and warmth in the workplace. Given the depth and complexity of the findings as well as the limitations of this study, additional research is required to replicate these findings with other methodological approaches, designs, and samples. The results point to several theoretical areas that may benefit from greater refinement and differentiation, including the relationship between emotional modulation and warmth modulation. Finally, there are numerous implications for practice at the organization, group, and individual levels.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER TWO (continued)

CHAPTER THREE (continued)

CHAPTER FOUR (continued)

CHAPTER FIVE (continued)

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Table

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am filled with gratitude as I complete this final stage in my doctoral journey. My comments below will not be enough to truly thank all of the people who have enabled me to succeed in this undertaking, but I will try my best.

First, I would like to thank the 26 women leaders who devoted their time and energy to my research study. Without your thoughtful, moving, honest reflections, this dissertation would not have been successful. I am honored you shared your stories with me. Thank you.

Next, I would like to thank my dissertation committee. Caryn Block, I am so grateful that you were willing to sponsor this dissertation. Not only was it qualitative, which presented unique challenges, but it was also conducted during your sabbatical. Thank you. I have learned so much from you, but two primary learnings stand out. First, taking your Research Methods class was eye-opening. To put it simply, you were incredible in front of the room. You made the material come to life, while making everyone feel safe to participate *and* simultaneously holding us to high standards. I loved learning from you about both content and process. My second learning is the awareness you have instilled in me of the power of well-reasoned, clearly-articulated, tightly-written research. From the first proposal I wrote for you a long time ago, you have always pushed me to continually sharpen my point of view and my writing, for which I am deeply grateful. This dissertation would not be where it is today without you.

Next, Debra Noumair, I have had the opportunity to work with you and for you, as well as to learn from you, in a number of ways since my very first semester in this program. In this dissertation process in particular, thank you for being willing to go above and beyond what your role required to support the work. More broadly, what you have taught me is the type of scholar-practitioner I would like to be. Your capacity to bridge the divide between scholarship and

practice is unparalleled. You have had a profound impact on my own learning. Often, the XMA students have this idea that you are magic for what you can "see" in a given person, or group, or organization. That is one of your gifts and the ways in which you can uncover, surface, teach, and research about covert processes has absolutely changed who I am. You were also the first person who made me feel as if the aspects of my personality that I always considered to be liabilities could actually be strengths. Thank you, deeply, for your mentorship.

Lyle Yorks, I am so grateful that you joined my committee from the start and have been such a generous and thoughtful collaborator throughout this dissertation process. Your capacity to communicate the importance and power of qualitative research is what led me to this approach and what sustained me throughout. Thank you for serving on this committee and also for taking extra time to advise me on the methods throughout the process. This dissertation would not have been what it was without you.

Finally, Barbara Levy Simon and Brandon Velez, I so thoroughly enjoyed your feedback at the final stage and wish I could have had you there all along. Thank you for taking up your roles with such rigor and enthusiasm. You were perfect additions to the committee and this final paper is better because of you. Thank you.

I would also like to thank one other faculty member who was not on my committee, but whose influence is absolutely present in this dissertation and in who I am as I leave this program. Sarah Brazaitis, I have enjoyed our work together so much over these years. I think what is most striking to me is that you have always had faith in what I can offer as a scholar and a practitioner—somehow, you have been able to gently push me at just the right moments for my own development and have provided me with support at the same time. I have grown so much because of your mentorship and I thank you for that. And, I thank you for instilling a lifelong

love of group dynamics in me—learning from you has changed the way I think and move in this world.

Next, I would like to thank one special person without whom this dissertation would not have been completed, Kopal Manglik. You were an amazing research assistant and I share this achievement with you. Thank you for your thought partnership, your hard and careful work, and your incredible attitude. I hope you can see your thoughtful contributions throughout this document. I cannot wait to see what you do next and how you continue to grow in this field.

To the staff of the Social-Organizational Psychology Program, thank you. John Handal, you have been a gift and it has been a pleasure to see all that you have accomplished in these past few years. Please accept my deep appreciation for all that you have done and continue to do to allow us, as students, to pursue the task of learning. Ambar Ureña, you do so much each day to create the container in which we all operate. Thank you for your competence and your dedication. Lebab Fallin, thank you for all of your work to support the program. I have loved all that we have accomplished in our work together these past few years.

Next, I would like to thank my wonderful cohort members, Ariel Finch Bernstein, Ginevra Olver Drinka, and Joe Dillard. Ariel, you have always pushed me to believe in myself and to prioritize what I need. Without that prioritization, I would not be graduating this May, so I thank you for that and for all the ways you have helped me to make this happen. You have been loyal and kind, given me real feedback, made me laugh, and have been a true friend. Ginevra, you have always led the way in completing milestones on this journey and encouraging all of us to look toward the future. I have appreciated your humor, thoughtful insights, drive, and friendship. I also appreciate how you have always rigorously held onto both research and practice, pushing me to expand how I think and how I operate. Thank you. Joe, I have always felt

cared for and supported by you. Your love of learning and the respect you have for the opportunity to pursue this PhD has been both grounding and inspiring to me. You have always been so generous and hilarious, and have cared deeply about me and helped me to feel like I have something to offer.

To Lauren Catenacci-Francois and Rebecca Stilwell, thank you for your incredible support as recent alumni of this program and dear friends. Your sage wisdom and comfort allowed me to believe that I could finish this dissertation successfully and find meaningful, exciting, and even fun (!) job opportunities post-graduation. Thank you for your friendship.

To Asha Gipson, Chris St. John, and Stephanie von Numers, I have had the opportunity to work with each of you in multiple capacities during my time at Teachers College. It has been a true pleasure to learn from your unique perspectives. I look forward to toasting each of you as you complete your own doctoral journeys.

Finally, to all of the Social-Organizational Psychology faculty, doctoral students and doctoral alumni, MA students that I have had the pleasure of knowing, and XMA students and XMA alumni, thank you for the ways in which we have worked together, learned together, and laughed together over the years. It has been a true pleasure to be part of this community. More specifically, I also want to say how grateful I am to this community for your support during the dissertation process. This dissertation quite literally would not have happened if it had not been for you being willing to share this study with your networks.

I would also like to highlight how hugely fortunate I am to have received mentorship from four people outside of Teachers College. First, Lisa Shin, you saw something in me during my first year at Tufts and it is because of you that I am achieving this degree. Thank you for teaching me so much about the research process and for having faith in my capacity to deliver

high-quality work. Eve Lewandowski, thank you for the incredible opportunities you exposed me to as an undergraduate senior, as well as a research assistant. I could not have asked for a more generous, thoughtful, empowering mentor whose intellectual curiosity and deep care are a true asset to patients and McLean Hospital alike. Dost Öngür, you believed in my capacity to pursue and achieve whatever advanced degree I sought after working for you, which meant more to me than you will ever know. Thank you for all that you taught me about psychopathology, but also all that you taught me about the type of leader I would like to be. Finally, Gary Hayes, I am profoundly appreciative of you continually providing me opportunities to learn and to expand my professional skillset. You have nurtured my career in myriad ways and I am so grateful for your continued mentorship.

To my family and friends, a huge thank you to all of you for your incredible support during this process. In particular, you also expended your precious time and energy helping me with participant recruitment and I thank you for that.

First, Gena Griffiths, I am so lucky that we are friends and roommates. I doubt that there is anyone else that I could have lived with during this process. You have made me laugh so, so hard, made me feel so cared for, particularly in this final stretch, and have made our apartment feel like a home. Thank you for always supporting me *and* supporting this journey that I have been on. I share this with you.

Kaitlyn Poepsel, thank you for your enduring support from afar throughout the doctoral process. You always seemed to believe that I was capable of finishing this program and earning this degree, and I appreciate the incredible example you set in your own academic achievements. Thank you for your wonderful friendship.

To Claude Heffron, you have changed the way I think about this world, my values, and what it means to be a responsible citizen. Also, thank you for supporting me in this journey, including providing a second home in New Hampshire where you and your family so generously gave me space to think, write, and relax.

While I am fortunate enough to have been supported by many friends, I would like to extend particular thanks to Vanessa Arslanian, Jennifer McMahon, and Mary MacLeod. How lucky I have been to be around so many people who know me so well and who have energized me when I was tired, made me laugh when I was overwhelmed, and showed me kindness when I was discouraged. Thank you.

To Lauren Silverman, thank you for your incredible insights, your resolute support, and your gentle, thoughtful challenges to my assumptions and point of view.

To my entire immediate and extended family, thank you for your support and your patience as I continued to make my way through this program. In particular, Aunt Nancy (Pfaff), thank you for your enthusiasm about this topic. Further, thank you for never wavering in your deep dedication to issues of social justice, which are as pressing as ever in this current climate.

Joseph Pfaff, my wonderful brother. Thank you for your kindness and support throughout this process and of course, throughout our lives. Thank you also for always, no matter what, being able to make me laugh. I also want to say how much I look up to you. You are only 26 years old and have built such a robust life for yourself; you have taken on responsibilities and commitments and have managed to maintain your spirit. You are the best brother I could ask for.

Mom and Dad (Dottie and Joe Pfaff), there is too much to thank you for. Who I am personally and professionally comes from both of you— Mom, I have such respect for your innate curiosity and the joy you experience in exposing yourself to new ideas and new

worldviews. I have realized over these years that you have such a thirst for knowledge, and it has helped me to get in touch with how lucky I am to learn on a daily basis. I also appreciate the high standards you set for your work. Dad, you have shown me throughout your career the type of manager and leader I would like to be. You have always worked incredibly hard, treated your colleagues, no matter their level or title, with kindness and respect, and approached your job with integrity and dedication. Thank you for modeling that for me. I will be lucky if I can emulate half of that. To both of you, it has been profoundly meaningful that you never seemed to doubt my capacity to finish this program. I never once felt as if you were losing faith in me, even if I was not so sure of myself at various moments. Your confidence in me was not only comforting, it was also motivating, and I thank you for that. This achievement belongs to you as much as it belongs to me.

# CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

> I'll go to these events and there will be men speaking before me, and they'll be pounding the message, and screaming about how we need to win the election…. I've learned that I can't be quite so passionate in my presentation. I love to wave my arms, but apparently that's a little bit scary to people…. I know that I can be perceived as aloof or cold or unemotional. But I had to learn as a young woman to control my emotions. And that's a hard path to walk.
>
> --*Hillary Rodham Clinton*
> ("Humans of New York," 2016a; "Humans of New York," 2016b)

Secretary Clinton's remarks provide a powerful exemplar of the concerns experienced by women leaders as they navigate workplace interactions. She described the deliberate monitoring of her emotional displays, in response to being seen as "scary" to those around her. She also described the negative effects of this modulation. Through contrasting her own emotional modulation with the emotionality displayed by male leaders in the same context, Secretary Clinton revealed the possibility that women may be situationally required to engage in this type of emotion management, whereas men are not. While it may be tempting to view Secretary Clinton's comments as idiosyncratic, there is evidence that perceivers often hold expectations for specific behaviors that differ by the gender of the focal actor (Heilman, 2012). These expectations for men's and women's behaviors, as well as perceptions of behaviors, are often a result of gender stereotypes.

Gender stereotypes are defined as generalizations about how men and women are and how they should be (Heilman, 2012). These stereotypes are often unconscious, yet are ubiquitous and pervasive beliefs (Heilman, 1983; Okimoto & Brescoll, 2010) that permeate the broader societal and organizational contexts in which men and women are embedded (Alderfer & Smith, 1982). Women are assumed to exude warmth naturally through displaying a variety of positive emotions (Smith, Brescoll, & Thomas, 2015). When these expectations of women displaying

warmth are violated, such as in the case of appearing "scary" to others, they are penalized (Rudman & Glick, 1999, 2001). Yet, we do not know *how* women leaders manage these stereotypic expectations for their behavior in the workplace. Are they consciously aware of others' expectations? If so, how may they adapt (or choose not to adapt) their displays of warmth accordingly? Further, though Secretary Clinton referenced her behavior in a discrete event, the broader landscape of the workplace requires interactions that range in the extent to which they are formal versus informal, chronic versus isolated, externally-facing versus internally-oriented. How might women leaders be managing their warmth displays across the diverse array of interactions that are a necessity in modern organizational life?

Thus, the purpose of this research study was to examine how women leaders labor in response to others' expectations for their displays of warmth. We already know that there is a dearth of women in top leadership roles in the United States (Catalyst, 2018a; Center for American Women and Politics, 2018) and in other societies across the globe (Catalyst, 2014). Numerous explanations have been proposed to explain this gap, such as women being held to higher standards, greater familial responsibilities, limited professional networks, and a lack of organizational readiness for greater gender representation (Pew Research Center, 2015). However, modulating behavioral responses to stereotypes may constitute an additional burden carried by women leaders at work, further expanding our perspective on the unique challenges faced by women in leadership roles, or who desire taking on leadership roles in the future.

## Gender Stereotypes

We cannot view the emotional modulation described by Secretary Clinton as occurring in a vacuum, merely at the intrapsychic level (Fletcher, Jordan, & Miller, 2000). Instead, it is imperative to note that women leaders are situated in broader organizations and social

environments. Therefore, it is necessary to contextualize women leaders' individual experiences of modulating emotion within the extant gender stereotype literature. Using gender stereotype research as a framework allows us to account for the systemic factors that likely *require* women leaders to engage in emotional modulation. This is, societal gender stereotypes dictate certain expectations about men's and women's attributes and behaviors, which then influence women leaders' emotional modulation as they work to conform to, or challenge, these stereotypic expectations.

Gender stereotypes can be collapsed across two global dimensions. One dimension comprises factors relating to warmth (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999) and communality (Rudman & Glick, 1999). The warmth and communality dimension (hereafter referred to as *warmth* in this study) includes traits related to social interactions and concern for others (Heilman, 2001). Warmth is conveyed through the presence of positive emotions (Smith et al., 2015). The other dimension comprises factors relating to competence (Fiske et al., 1999) and agency (hereafter referred to as *competence* in this study), such as traits related to achievement and strong task performance (Heilman, 2001). Both warmth and competence can be perceived by observers as high or low in a given individual.

Women are stereotypically seen as warm, but not competent, a descriptive stereotype that specifies how women and men *are* (Burgess & Borgida, 1999). In organizational settings, the assumption that women are less competent than men can result in a misalignment between female traits and various roles, affecting such outcomes as hirability, promotion, and performance ratings (Heilman, 2001), among others. Further, the broad spectrum of traits associated with leaders are often male in nature (Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011), resulting in an additional layer of misalignment between gender identity and higher-level

leadership roles. One other potential outcome of gender stereotypes relating to women's supposed lack of competence is the phenomenon of stereotype threat (Steele, 1997). Stereotype threat is defined as the fear of confirming a negative stereotype about one's social identity group (Steele, 1997). A robust body of work has documented women's experience of stereotype threat in situations where they may confirm the stereotype that women are less competent than men in domains such as math and engineering, leading to decrements in performance (Logel et al., 2009; Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999). Research has also documented women's stereotype threat around managerial performance in a male-typed role (Bergeron, Block, & Echtenkamp, 2006).

In addition, women are also seen through the lens of prescriptive stereotypes, which specify how women and men should be (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Prescriptive stereotypes dictate that women *should be* warm and communal, with violations to these perceived expectations resulting in backlash (Rudman & Glick, 2001) in the form of negative reactions to women who do not align with the warmth stereotype (e.g., dislike and derogation; Heilman & Wallen, 2010). Thus, research has indicated that a double-bind (Rudman & Glick, 2001) exists for women in the workplace, whereby women must alternatively dial up and down both their competence and warmth in order to be offered a position in the first place (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman & Glick, 2001), and to be considered appropriate for a promotion (Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, & Heilman, 1991). Because of this double-bind, women in the workplace often find themselves in positions where they make a trade-off between being liked versus being respected (Cuddy, Glick, & Fiske, 2004). More specifically, this double-bind likely influences how and when women leaders reveal or hide the warmth-related emotions they experience at work, based on the stereotypic expectations of those with whom they work and the demands of the situation at hand.

Importantly, past research has shown that the type of work role or occupation undertaken by a woman leader adds an additional layer of complexity to the effects of gender stereotypes. The responsibilities associated with a position and/or the proportional representation of men and women who traditionally hold a job result in positions that are male-typed (i.e., positions requiring competence) or female-typed (i.e., positions requiring warmth) in organizations (Heilman, 1983). Male-typed jobs are typically positions of higher status and with more lucrative outcomes than female-typed jobs (Heilman, 1983). The descriptive stereotype that women are warm but not competent results in a *lack of fit* between women and these male-typed jobs (Heilman, 1983), disadvantaging women at entry into organizations, as well as during their tenure (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Managing the double-bind in male-typed jobs or industries may be particularly heightened or challenging, given women leaders' lack of alignment with the status quo and greater salience of gender identity (Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, & Ruderman, 1978). Therefore, women in these positions are likely to have a unique experience of negotiating gender stereotypes at work.

Thus, prior work has documented the existence of a double-bind for women in the workplace, as well as a lack of fit for women seeking to occupy and excel in male-typed jobs. However, the ways in which women navigate trying to satisfy both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes, at an intrapsychic level, are not yet fully understood. While work relating to stereotype threat has concluded that women are fearful of confirming negative stereotypes about their competence in specific domains (as reviewed by Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002), the ways in which women in male-typed jobs cope with fulfilling the expectation that they display warmth, and how they process the backlash associated with failing to be warm, have received little attention to date. Yet, this represents an important piece of unseen work that women may

enact each day in the workplace and constitutes a form of stereotype threat relating to women's warmth. Women leaders may be fearful of their actions and emotions confirming that they are solely warm (and not competent), *and/or* may be fearful that they are not warm enough, leading to backlash from others. Although women's internal management of warmth displays has not been explored, the process of managing felt and displayed emotions has been investigated in ample research on emotional labor (Hothschild, 1983).

## Emotional Labor

Emotional labor (EL) is defined as the act of managing displayed emotions in the workplace, in service of an organization's goals or for a wage (Grandey, 2000; Hothschild, 1983), and can include suppressing felt emotions, amplifying felt emotions, or even faking emotions that one is not actually experiencing (Grandey, 2000). This process can involve altering both positive or negative emotions, though the most common emotional management strategies generally refer to suppressing negative and amplifying positive emotions (Hülsheger, Lang, & Maier, 2010). As conceptualized by the EL literature, employees manage emotions at the behest of an organization's display rules (Ekman & Friesen, 1971), which serve to govern emotional displays shown to external individuals (e.g., customers) being served by employees. Conforming to display rules can lead to emotive dissonance (Hothschild, 1983), known as a clash between experienced and organizationally-prescribed emotions, which Grandey (2000, 2003) and Hothschild (1983) posited can be resolved through strategies such as surface acting (i.e., management of observable expressions) and deep acting (i.e., intentional management of internal feelings, which in turn leads to a modification of the observable expression).

Emotional labor has been found to relate negatively to job satisfaction (Grandey, 2003; Pugliesi, 1999) and positively relate to burnout (Mesmer-Magnus, DeChurch, & Wax, 2011).

Further, utilizing the surface acting strategy in particular has been shown to be particularly detrimental. At the individual level, surface acting is positively related to work withdrawal (Scott & Barnes, 2011), negative affect (Scott & Barnes, 2011), psychosomatic complaints (Hülsheger et al., 2010), psychological strain (Hülsheger et al., 2010), depersonalization (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Lee, Ok, Lee, & Lee, 2018), and emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003), and is negatively related to feelings of personal accomplishment (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Goodwin, Groth, & Frenkel, 2011; Hülsheger et al., 2010; Kumar Mishra & Bhatnagar, 2010). Therefore, it is clear that the surface acting component of EL can result in meaningful costs to both individuals and organizations. Further, the act of EL, whether individuals engage in surface acting or deep acting, is an additional burden placed on each employee. Despite this robust body of work investigating EL, researchers have been fairly strict in interpreting the definition of EL to be explicit requirements about emotional displays in particular customer-facing organizational roles (e.g., the requirement of smiling when serving food to customers; Barger & Grandey, 2006). The examination of EL in professional workers, as they navigate interactions internally—that is, with supervisors, peers, subordinates, and clients/constituents—has received less attention. Perhaps, this is because display rules in these settings are often tacit and may not fit into the traditional EL framework of overt emotional display requirements.

Yet, Wharton (2009) noted that jobs involving interactions with any other people in the work environment involve EL, and some researchers have conceptualized EL as including both the traditional customer-facing interactions as well as interactions with fellow employees (Bulan, Erickson, & Wharton, 1997; Pugliesi, 1999). Moreover, Simpson and Stroh (2004) have questioned whether the examination of EL should be driven by objective job characteristics/

requirements only, or whether all emotional modulation within the context of the workplace should be considered. Finally, the act of engaging in EL within the frame of employee-to-employee interactions can be argued to align with the traditional definition of EL, as conforming to societal expectations and norms about appropriate behavior helps to create a familiar environment in which employees can pursue an organization's goals (Bulan et al., 1997). In light of this evidence, the present study defined EL more broadly, in service of capturing workplace interactions outside of customer-facing roles, such as those chronic interactions that professionals engage in on a daily basis in the workplace. In this study, all emotional displays, and the drivers behind those emotional displays, were explored.

## Emotional Labor and Gender Stereotypes

Evidence has suggested that women are seen as warm and are punished for failing to fulfill the warmth stereotype (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Further, women face additional obstacles when seeking or holding male-typed jobs, as they are assumed to lack the competence required for the job and/or face backlash if they display competence without warmth (Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman & Phelan, 2008). In addition, evidence exists indicating that employees (regardless of gender) engage in the deliberate management of their emotional displays in response to workplace display rules (Hülsheger et al., 2010). However, to date, there has been limited work examining EL as a potential response to the dictates of gender stereotypes, specifically in relation to the ways in which women in male-typed jobs manage emotional displays of warmth. Just as women experience stereotype threat in relation to stereotypes about their lack of competence, women may be experiencing a different form of stereotype threat in response to others' expectations about their warmth. Women leaders' awareness that women are

*seen* as warm and *should be* warm may influence when and how women display warmth-related emotions at work.

Though Hochschild (1983) initially spoke to gendered aspects of EL, subsequent studies moved away from this conceptualization. With that said, several important findings have emerged from the limited prior work that has examined EL with a particular focus on gender. In a study comparing self-reported rates of EL in women and men in managerial roles, after controlling for job type and function, Simpson and Stroh (2004) found that women reported displaying positive emotions at a higher rate than men. Relatedly, Pierce's (1995) study examined the chronic interactions between majority-female paralegals and a range of organizational stakeholders, finding that women paralegals were perceived to display behaviors consistent with warmth (e.g., friendliness, amiability) more than men paralegals. These are traits typically associated with, and expected of, women (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011), and also are likely to require emotional modulation on the part of women paralegals to achieve these impressions from others.

Yet, Ely (1995) also examined a law firm and found divergent results. Women attorneys shared an implicit pressure to mirror the behaviors of men in their workplace and to avoid displaying feminine traits in order to excel within the organization. Through the lens of gender stereotypes, acting "like men" may mean limiting displays of warmth, given the descriptive stereotype of women as warm and men as competent. These women attorneys may use EL to tamp down their displays of warmth.

Taken together, these findings indicated that managing displays of feminine traits through suppressing or amplifying warmth may be an informally *required* task for women in the workplace. In fact, Wharton (2009) has argued that EL may be an unspoken job requirement for

women in certain professions; its effects are most observable when someone does not perform EL and is therefore judged as less competent. However, a study focusing on women *leaders* and the EL requirements of their roles in male-typed contexts has not yet been conducted, to this author's knowledge. Therefore, this study explored the EL of women leaders in male-typed contexts as they manage descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes.

Though it is likely that displays of both warmth and competence are purposefully managed by women in the workplace (Rudman & Glick, 1999), the dimension of warmth was the focus of this study for several reasons. First, the warmth dimension is particularly ripe for analysis utilizing concepts from EL work, as warmth involves expressing positive emotions (Smith et al., 2015) and the most common real-world EL involves the simultaneous suppression of negative emotion and amplification of positive emotion (Hülsheger et al., 2010). Second, as Cuddy and colleagues (2011) noted, the display of warmth is more easily and frequently modulated within the workplace, whereas competence is a characteristic that employees either possess or do not possess. Third, the warmth dimension plays a unique role in the double-bind faced by women in the workplace. Evidence has shown that when women display competence in the workplace, perceivers erroneously conflate high levels of competence with low levels of warmth (Cuddy et al., 2011). Thus, if women do not simultaneously display warmth, they are seen as violating the warmth stereotype and elicit negative reactions from perceivers, i.e., backlash (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Researchers have even suggested that highly competent women may benefit from deliberately expressing warmth to soften others' reactions to their competence (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Yet, while women are penalized for failing to show warmth, they also may experience poor outcomes when they display warmth at inappropriate times, even through subtle cues such as pregnancy status (Hebl, King, Glick,

Singletary, & Kazama, 2007). Therefore, while competence appears to be necessary for job hiring and promotion, the appropriateness of when and how to display warmth is more ambiguous. Further, it has yet to be explored in women leaders in male-typed jobs.

## The Current Study

In summary, evidence has revealed that gender stereotypes exert a powerful influence on how women are perceived in the workplace. Further, from the perspective of the woman as a "target" of stereotypes, research has indicated that women experience stereotype threat around their supposed lack of competence. Yet, a parallel investigation into how women experience stereotypes about their warmth is necessary. As the double-bind imposed by gender stereotypes relates to both competence *and* warmth, the strategies employed by women to negotiate the warmth component of the double-bind are important to understand. Thus, there is a need to further explore the EL of women leaders as they display, or hide, warmth-related emotions in the workplace.

A qualitative exploratory approach to studying this phenomenon was appropriate for this study. Conducting a qualitative study allowed for the thorough, rich, and detailed exploration of the relationship between gender stereotypes and EL, which is particularly important given the limited prior research on the relatedness of these areas. Using an exploratory approach afforded me the opportunity to explore and describe the experiences of women leaders engaging in EL in male-typed jobs during daily interactions with others in their workplace, in response to gender stereotypes. The central questions that were initially posed were: *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace? If so, why do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace? If so, how do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace?*

Notably, after engaging in data collection and analysis, a revision to the research questions was necessary to account for unexpected findings. Thus, the finalized research questions were:

1. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*
2. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate warmth displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*

This investigation has the potential to help us better understand one facet of women leaders' experiences at work. As gender can be considered an "ongoing social construction, the meaning, significance, and consequences of which vary for individuals across settings" (Ely, 1995, p. 590), this study uncovered valuable information about the emotional and warmth modulation that is performed by women leaders in male-typed contexts. This emotional and warmth modulation may be a type of invisible job requirement (Bulan et al., 1997; Fletcher et al., 2000; Wharton, 2009) that women leaders are expected to fulfill, in order to avoid backlash (Rudman & Glick, 2001). As Secretary Clinton's opening sentiments exemplified, managing emotions to avoid penalization is "a hard path to walk" and likely serves as a ubiquitous, yet tacit, additional burden carried by women leaders in the workplace.

# CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

## Gender Stereotypes

### Origins of Gender Stereotypes

Perceivers tend to hold specific beliefs about how women and men are, known as descriptive stereotypes, and how they should be, known as prescriptive stereotypes. Yet, we may be curious about where these beliefs come from, and how they have come to be so deeply embedded in our collective impressions of women and men. We may even be curious if women and men actually *do* differ in their innate traits and behaviors. Social role theory (Eagly, 1987) helps us to better understand the systemic factors underlying these beliefs and the ways in which these beliefs may relate to real differences in behavior.

Social role theory posits that within the United States and other complex, modernized societies, men and women have historically occupied roles as breadwinner and homemaker, respectively (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000). This division of labor results in a societal gender hierarchy, with men occupying a position of higher power and having greater access to resources (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eckes, 2002). Men and women manifest differentiated behaviors as they take up these distinct roles, allowing perceivers to attribute specific (and divergent) traits to each sex (Eagly et al., 2000).

The homemaker role, and associated traits and behaviors, includes expressing concern for others (Eagly et al., 2000), conveying a mothering and nurturing stance (Fletcher et al., 2000), as well as acting in a facilitative way and expressing friendliness, compassion, concern for others (Eagly et al., 2000), affection, kindness, and sympathy (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Conversely, the breadwinner role involves acting assertively and independently (Eagly et al., 2000), and in a controlling, confident, ambitious, and leader-like manner (Eagly & Karau, 2002). These

archetypes for how men and women behave constitute gender roles, defined as "consensual beliefs about the attributes of women and men" (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574). Gender roles are hypothesized to be ubiquitous and relevant to everyone, as gender is a broad demographic characteristic that has relevance in the majority of interpersonal interactions (Eagly et al., 2000).

Further, because men and women have traditionally taken up these gender roles, and are *expected* to take up these roles, social role theory proposes that both men and women develop the skills necessary to enable success in these different milieus. Therefore, men and women may engage in a type of cyclical affirmation of preconceived beliefs as they pursue success in the context of their traditional roles. In fact, it may be argued that both men and women hold, or contain, different, yet equally necessary, dimensions of the human experience. At the societal level, women may act as containers or carriers for relational attributes, which frees men to take on different, non-relational roles (Fletcher, 1999). Because engaging in relationally-oriented behavior is seen as a deficiency, women are often devalued (Fletcher, 1999). Yet, there is evidence of great investment at the societal level in this dynamic between men and women, as women who challenge the status quo by seeking greater structural power experience strong, negative reactions (e.g., hostility from men; Hebl et al., 2007). These negative reactions may stem from perceivers viewing a woman eschewing her relational and caretaking responsibilities as a threat to the health of those around her, whether at the individual, group (i.e., family), or societal level.

The premises of social role theory can be mapped onto two different, but related, bodies of work. One theoretical stance, put forth by Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, and Xu (2002), involves examining social identity groups, including men/women, and subgroups within genders, on the dimensions of warmth and competence. Warmth is defined as intent, which can be positive or

negative, whereas competence is defined as capability (Fiske et al., 2002). Put differently, warmth is akin to a person's motives in interpersonal relationships or groups, whereas competence refers to whether or not someone can carry out one's intention. Groups may be high on both or low on both but are most likely high on one and low on the other, resulting in mixed stereotype content. In this model, women in a traditional role (i.e., housewife) are seen as warm, but not competent (Fiske et al., 2002).

The second theoretical orientation identifies communion and agency as the two key dimensions that guide actual behavior, as well as perceptions of others' behaviors (Eagly, 1987). Heilman (2001) defined communality as attributes related to social interactions or service to others and agency as traits related to achievement. Through this lens, women are seen as communal but not agentic, whereas men are seen as agentic but not communal.

Taken together, these two bodies of work imply that women and men are likely judged on two dimensions: warmth/communality and competence/agency, hereafter defined as *warmth* and *competence*, respectively. In this study, warmth refers to perceptions of an individual's stance towards others (e.g., kind, caring, collaborative) and competence refers to an individual's likelihood of, and expertise in, accomplishing his/her aims (e.g., intelligent, assertive, confident).

The dimensions of warmth and competence are conceptualized as being in opposition to one another (Eagly et al., 2000), meaning that if a person or entire social identity group is seen as warm, they will likely not be viewed as competent, and vice versa. The expectation that women are warm and men are competent is a type of descriptive norm (Cialdini & Trost, 1998), a set of beliefs about how men and women are naturally inclined to behave. Further, Eagly and Karau (2002) summarized evidence that perceivers believe men and women *should* differ on these two global clusters. This results in injunctive norms (Cialdini & Trost, 1998) in relation to gender

roles, a set of beliefs detailing that men are *supposed* to be competent and women are *supposed* to be warm.

Eagly and Karau (2002) posited that these gender norms translate into gender stereotypes. Stereotypes can be defined as "attributes that are tagged to category labels (e.g., race, sex) and imputed to individuals as a function of their being placed in that category" (Taylor et al., 1978, p. 792). Descriptive gender norms, defined as beliefs about how men and women behave, result in *descriptive* gender stereotypes. Further, injunctive norms, which specify what men and women should do, are akin to *prescriptive* gender stereotypes. These gender stereotypes then become an organizing framework for perceiving and interpreting women's and men's behavior.

To summarize, historical conditions have led to women being seen as homemakers (i.e., possessing warmth *and* lacking competence) and men being seen as breadwinners (i.e., possessing competence *and* lacking warmth)—the effects of which continue to reverberate today. Thus, social role theory provides reasoning for why and how men and women are expected to differ in their traits, as well as a framework for understanding real differences in behavior. Social role theory also offers a distinction between the descriptive and prescriptive aspects of gender stereotypes, which are summarized in the following sections.

**Descriptive Gender Stereotypes**

Descriptive gender stereotypes, defined as traits and behaviors that are seen as characterizing men and women (Burgess & Borgida, 1999), involve the two dimensions of warmth and competence. As social role theory dictates, men are seen as embodying competence, but as lacking warmth (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999) because they are perceived to occupy the breadwinner role, and because they have been historically more likely to display behaviors consistent with this role. Conversely, women are believed to possess warmth, but to lack

competence (Fiske et al., 1999) because of their historical role as homemaker and the likelihood that they have adopted behaviors to succeed in this domain.

These historical roles influence the workplace, where men are seen as more competent than women and women are seen as warmer than men (Heilman, Block, & Martell, 1995). For example, when compared to men, women are rated as significantly less interpersonally hostile (Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004), as more concerned with others (Heilman et al., 1995), and as significantly higher on interpersonal and social dimensions of leadership—all enactments of warmth.

Perceivers also harbor stereotypical ideas about the competence and warmth required by specific jobs. As such, some jobs are viewed as male-typed and others are viewed as female-typed. Male-typed jobs require competence and are those that are lucrative, challenging, and demanding (Heilman, 1983). Female-typed jobs are described as those requiring warmth, nurturing, sensitivity, and communality, as well as those that are lower status (Heilman, 1983; Heilman & Wallen, 2010). Notably, the gender-type of a given job is also influenced by the gender of those who typically occupy the role (Cejka & Eagly, 1999). Thus, when judging gender-type, perceivers leverage both their knowledge of the responsibilities of the role as well as their impression of the proportion of men and women who generally occupy the role.

Leadership and management roles have historically been perceived as consistent with the breadwinner, or male, role (Schein, 1973, 1975). Schein's (1973, 1975) seminal works explored how male and female managers characterize men in general, women in general, and successful managers in general, finding statistically significant correlations between men and successful managers. Put differently, both male and female managers described men and successful managers in a similar way but did not describe women and successful managers in similar terms.

For example, managers were seen as more similar to men than women on the majority of items, including the following sample items: "emotionally stable; aggressive; leadership ability; self-reliant; (not) uncertain; vigorous; desires responsibility; (not) frivolous; objective; well-informed; and direct" (Schein, 1973, p. 98). On the contrary, managers were seen as more similar to women than men on only eight of the 86 items: "understanding; helpful; sophisticated; aware of feelings of others; intuitive; neat; (not) vulgar; humanitarian values" (p. 98).

Schein (1973) argued that these findings provide evidence of an innate "think manager, think male*"* bias, wherein perceivers see an overall congruence between men and managerial roles, but not between women and managerial roles. Further, the specific items wherein women and successful managers overlap relate to the warmth dimension of gender stereotypes, as opposed to the competence dimension. Related to this idea, Heilman (1983) argued that perceivers experience a lack of fit between women and male-typed jobs because women are assumed to lack competence in favor of their innate warmth-related characteristics (Heilman, 1983, 2001). This mismatch between perceptions of women's lack of competence and perceptions of successful employees in male-typed jobs results in low performance expectations and disparate hiring rates.

While multiple decades have passed since Schein's (1973, 1975) and Heilman's (1983) work, recent findings remain consistent. In a meta-analysis, Koenig et al. (2011) found that leader stereotypes are still masculine, meaning that traits traditionally ascribed to men are also associated with managerial roles. Thus, there is congruence between descriptive stereotypes of men and the stereotypes associated with leadership or management roles, disadvantaging women who are not perceived to align with the traditional manager or leader stereotype (Koenig et al., 2011). Because this case of misalignment between gender identity (female) and role-type (male)

may make displays of warmth and competence particularly salient to women leaders, the focus of this study was male-typed jobs.

Notably, in recent times, conceptions of what constitutes a male-typed job have expanded. The same logic used to classify specific roles as either male- or female-typed has been applied to broader levels of analysis, including function; hierarchical level; subfield, professional specialty, or academic field; and industry (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Heilman, 2012). Thus, gender congeniality is now used to refer to the relative male-ness or female-ness of the responsibilities associated with these arenas. A job, function, or industry that requires more competent traits is congenial with men, whereas someone in a job, function, or industry that requires more warm traits is congenial with women (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995). This study defined male-typed jobs in this broader and more multifaceted way. Male-typed jobs refer to those that are traditionally viewed as male-typed (i.e., highly lucrative and challenging positions, as well as those jobs at upper echelons of organizations and leader/manager positions throughout the hierarchy); roles that are held by a majority-male population; jobs that are situated in occupations, functions, industries, and sectors that are majority-male, or perceived to be majority-male; and those roles that are defined in male-congenial terms.

**Outcomes of descriptive stereotypes: Lack of fit.** Thus far, I have reviewed evidence that women are assumed to be warm and lack competence, whereas men are assumed to be competent. Further, perceivers are likely to view a mismatch between women's attributes and the qualities assumed to be required in male-typed jobs. However, moving beyond simple differences in the perceived warmth and competence of men and women in male-typed jobs reveals the complex relationship among gender, perceived competence or warmth, and distal outcomes (e.g., hiring).

For example, when making a hiring decision for a male-typed job, results indicated that women perceived as warm, thus aligned with the descriptive stereotype, were less likely to be hired than warm men (note that this finding trended towards significance at the $p < .05$ level; Rudman & Glick, 1999). Warm women essentially paid a price for their warmth that warm men did not pay. Cuddy et al. (2004) also explored the intersection of gender and communality on hiring decisions as well as promoting and training decisions. When examining these markers of discrimination in a high-status occupation (i.e., male-typed), working mothers, who were seen as warm, were significantly less likely to be preferred for hiring, promoting, and training than non-working mothers (Cuddy et al., 2004). Finally, Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, and Handelsman (2012) also investigated the effects of the descriptive stereotype that women lack competence in a male-typed setting. Faculty in the Hard Sciences were tasked with evaluating identically-described male and female applicants for a laboratory manager position. Findings suggested that faculty rated female applicants as lower in competence than male applicants, which fully mediated the relationship between gender and other outcomes: female applicants were rated as less likely to be hired and less likely to be given career mentoring, and were offered a significantly lower mean starting salary (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012). In summary, women are not only perceived as lacking competence and possessing warmth at baseline, but these perceptions also disadvantage them in a variety of downstream ways at work.

Clearly, descriptive stereotypes present challenges to women over the course of their working life, both at entry into organizations and during their tenure in the workplace (Burgess & Borgida, 1999). Yet, the experiences of women as they manage descriptive stereotypes about their warmth and lack of competence in their day-to-day work lives are not fully understood. Research has documented the detrimental effects of stereotype threat, when women fear

confirming the stereotype that they lack competence in certain tasks (e.g., math tests; Steele, 1997). Both implicit and explicit cues of a "threat in the air" (Steele, 1997, p. 614) relating to women's gender identity can result in decrements in performance. However, the ways in which gender identity cues may affect women's "performance" of warmth has not been explored in a parallel fashion.

Just as work environments can be stereotype-threatening with regard to competence, it is likely that some work environments communicate specific messages to woman leaders regarding their warmth. Because the content of descriptive stereotypes specifies that women are warm and not competent, women may be faced with managing their warmth displays in service of fending off the homemaker archetype. Observers may falsely equate displays of warmth with a competence deficit (Cuddy et al., 2011), resulting in stereotype-threatening conditions for women around displaying warmth in their day-to-day work. Further, Fletcher et al. (2000) highlighted the ways in which behaviors in female employees consistent with a warmth stance are erased, pathologized, seen as off-task, or attributed to the intrapersonal nature of the worker, as opposed to a necessary quality of employees in general. This also serves as a communication, whether explicit or implicit, that warmth is not desirable or respected in the workplace.

Therefore, a potential strategy that women may use is to amplify their displays of competence and minimize their displays of warmth, both to get hired and to get promoted. This is likely to be particularly salient in male-typed jobs where the effects of displaying obvious warmth may be even more detrimental. For example, in a qualitative study examining the experience of female associates in male-dominated law firms, Ely (1995) found that participants reported believing that the firms' partners prized masculine attributes in employees. Because of this, employees spoke to having to tamp down their femininity to be respected.

In summary, the relationship between female gender identity and poor workplace outcomes is often mediated by gendered perceptions of women's warmth and lack of competency. Warmth is conceptualized as standing in opposition to competence (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Thus, women may attempt to minimize displays of warmth in hiring situations and in the workplace in general in order to avoid confirming descriptive stereotypes about their gender.

**Prescriptive Stereotypes**

While the implications of descriptive stereotypes may lead one to believe that women employees will be best served by playing up their competence and limiting their warmth, the effects of *prescriptive* stereotypes must also be taken into account before dictating the most effective behaviors for women at work. Prescriptive gender stereotypes are defined as "the attributes, roles, and behaviors to which men and women are expected to conform" (Burgess & Borgida, 1999, p. 666) and vary along the same warmth and competence dimensions. These stereotypes also stem from the historical expectations of, and behaviors demonstrated by, men and women. They dictate that women *should be* warm and *not* competent, in line with the homemaker role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). On the other hand, they prescribe that men *should be* competent and *not* warm, in line with the breadwinner role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Prior work has revealed numerous outcomes associated with women's perceived violation of prescriptive stereotypes.

**Outcomes of prescriptive stereotypes: Backlash.** It is important to note that when women display competence, a lack of warmth is implied by default because these dimensions are viewed as standing in contrast to one another (Okimoto & Brescoll, 2011). This parallels the descriptive stereotype that if a woman is warm, she therefore lacks competence. Prescriptive

stereotypes imply that if a woman is successful in her job, particularly a male-typed job, she has inherently violated both aspects of the prescriptive gender stereotype: first, she has displayed *unexpected* competence, and second, she has therefore failed to display the *expected* warmth. In support of this idea, successful women managers (i.e., those demonstrating competence) are rated as less concerned with others and more interpersonally hostile than women in general and successful male managers (i.e., lacking warmth; Heilman et al., 1995). Further, women who demonstrate competence in a male-typed job are seen as more interpersonally hostile (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Heilman & Wallen, 2010; Heilman et al., 2004) than their male peers in an identical male-typed job. Competent women in both male- and female-typed jobs are rated as lower in social skills (i.e., an expression of warmth) than equivalent men (Phelan et al., 2008; Rudman & Glick, 1999). Women who seek power (i.e., a competent behavior) through elected office are seen as less warm than identical male peers (Okimoto & Brescoll, 2011).

In fact, characterizations of successful women managers, a male-typed job traditionally requiring competence, include the traits of "bitter, hasty, quarrelsome, selfish, less understanding, independent, high need for power, and high need for achievement" (p. 939) at higher rates than successful male managers or successful managers in general (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989). Further, Heilman et al. (2004) noted, "terms such as bitch, ice queen, iron maiden, and dragon lady are invoked to describe women who have successfully climbed the organizational ladder" (p. 426). In examining the content of these specific traits and terms, a woman's competence seems to be clearly associated with a lack of warmth.

The violation of both aspects of prescriptive gender norms, whether through demonstrating competence and failing to demonstrate warmth, or merely being subject to *perceptions* of failing to demonstrate warmth, tends to result in negative reactions. Rudman and

Glick (1999, 2001) have labeled perceivers' reactions to women clearly displaying competence, without explicitly demonstrating warmth, as a "backlash effect." Women who violate prescriptive gender norms by demonstrating competence or through succeeding at male-typed tasks are rated as less desirable as a boss (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Heilman & Wallen, 2010), less likable (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Heilman & Wallen, 2010; Heilman et al., 2004; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Glick, & Phelan, 2012), and less hireable (Phelan et al., 2008; Rudman et al., 2012).

Beyond these outcomes, the violation of prescriptive norms can evoke emotional reactions from perceivers as well. Cuddy et al. (2004) noted that "female professionals are viewed as high-status competitors, eliciting an envious prejudice that characterizes them as competent, but cold, and that evokes begrudging respect and resentment" (p. 705). Heilman and Okimoto (2011) observed that successful women elicit feelings of moral outrage and Heilman et al. (2004) shared that successful women are seen as uncivil.

Work by Rudman and colleagues may help to explain the strong reactions to women's demonstration of competence and/or women's success in male domains. Through a series of studies, they found that women are more likely to be sabotaged when pursuing a male-typed task or when demonstrating competence than are men (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman et al., 2012). They theorized that sabotage is an attempt to maintain the current gender hierarchy, which is disrupted by women demonstrating competence or success in male-dominated roles. Thus, the outcomes associated with actual or perceived violations to prescriptive stereotypes are likely driven by deeply entrenched beliefs about the gender roles assigned to both men and women in our society.

In summary, ample research has discovered that women who demonstrate success in male-typed jobs or who are described as displaying competence experience *backlash*. This backlash effect stems from the violation of prescriptive stereotypes around how women and men should be.

***The role of warmth in backlash.*** However, it is important to highlight that the backlash experienced by so many successful women stems not from displays of competence per se, but instead from a violation of the warmth norm that is inferred by a woman's competence (Okimoto & Brescoll, 2011). In support of this idea, Rudman and Glick (1999) demonstrated that perceptions of social skills mediate the relationship between applicant gender and hirability, in that competent women were perceived to be low in social skills, and social skills were a key predictor of hirability. Further, Rudman and Glick (2001) found that an agentic man was preferred over an agentic female for a female-typed job, as women's agency implied a lack of communality—a required component of female-typed jobs.

An additional hurdle for competent women may surface in the form of shifting standards when hiring decisions are made between men and women (Phelan et al., 2008). For competent men, warm men, and warm women, raters relied on competence ratings in hiring decisions. Yet, when women were presented as competent, warmth (or lack thereof) predicted hiring over and above competence (Phelan et al., 2008). Related, Heilman et al. (2004) noted that likability (i.e., an expression of warmth) had a significant additive effect in predicting evaluations of hypothetical male *and* female applicants over and above competence. With that said, it is also important to note that *only women* are in the unique position of being disliked for success in a male-typed domain (Heilman et al., 2004).

Attempts to ameliorate backlash also provide more evidence for the importance of warmth violations in inciting negative reactions. Rudman and Glick (2001) showed that providing information that a female applicant is both competent *and* warm eliminates backlash towards women when applying for a female-typed job. Heilman and Okimoto (2007) more deeply explored this idea, finding that backlash is only ameliorated when a woman's warmth can be clearly attributed to her own personality (as opposed to workplace demands). Relatedly, when women have expressed clear competence, motherhood status (e.g., an implicit indicator of warmth) may act as a protector against negative reactions, as mothers are rated equally as likeable as their male peers (both fathers and non-fathers; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Additionally, the suggestions offered by researchers further underscored the importance of warmth in driving the backlash effect. Both Carli (2001) and Rudman and Glick (1999) explicitly suggested that women manage their displays of warmth to avoid the inevitable backlash effect that accompanies their competence.

In summary, the backlash experienced by women who violate prescriptive stereotypes is driven, in large part, by the perception that women who are competent fail to display warmth.

***The role of emotions in backlash.*** In addition to the backlash provoked by women's displays of competence without explicit displays of warmth, women may also be subject to a backlash effect if they display emotions inconsistent with gendered expectations (Ragins & Winkel, 2011). Given the structural roles of women and men, emotions such as confidence, pride, anger, stubbornness, and resolve are viewed as appropriate for men to express given their high status, but not for women to express (Ragins & Winkel, 2011). In particular, displaying anger has been shown to result in detrimental outcomes for women, including being conferred

lower status, lower wages, and lower competence ratings than men who display anger and unemotional women (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008).

In fact, Brescoll (2016) wrote convincingly of the potential for gendered emotional rules to create a situation in which women are cognizant of which emotions are acceptable to display, in order to avoid being seen as completely lacking emotion (e.g., cold, unfeeling) and therefore eliciting backlash *or* eliciting backlash through displaying inappropriate emotions (i.e., those traditionally associated with men). Thus, beyond violations of prescriptive stereotypes that dictate that women should not display competence, women also contend with the backlash evoked by specific emotional displays.

**Outcomes of descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes: Double bind.** Taken together, the implications of descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes create a *double bind* for women leaders, which has been documented by ample prior work. Descriptive stereotypes present hurdles to women in attaining leadership roles in the first place, while prescriptive stereotypes create ambiguity around whether a woman should display competence to align with her leadership role, or warmth to align with her gender role (Koenig et al., 2011).

Women are viewed as warm at baseline, which may impede them from attaining jobs or succeeding in the workplace, particularly in male-typed domains. Yet, if they combat the descriptive stereotype of low competence by demonstrating clear success or acting in a competent way, they are seen as violating prescriptive stereotypes and are subject to a backlash effect if warmth is not simultaneously conveyed (Rudman & Glick, 1999). Women leaders are left to walk a fine line between appearing warm, but not too warm, and are also tasked with managing the competence-related job requirements inherent in a leadership role (Eagly & Carli, 2007). The conflicting messages sent to women about their behavior result in both disparate

impact (i.e., failing to be selected for job opportunities; Burgess & Borgida, 1999) and disparate treatment (i.e., being treated poorly when failing to align with stereotypic expectations; Burgess & Borgida, 1999). Just as women are subject to stereotype threat with regard to their competence in specific domains (as reviewed by Steele et al., 2002), women are likely experiencing threat around modulating their warmth displays at work.

In summary, women leaders are subject to the effects of both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes. The warmth component of these stereotypes presents particular challenges to women leaders due to the double bind. As such, women leaders may consider modulating their warmth displays to either combat the descriptive stereotype that characterizes them as lacking competence or align with the dictates of prescriptive stereotypes to avoid backlash. The act of modulating warmth may be conceptualized as amplifying or suppressing the positive emotions used to convey warmth. The act of managing one's emotional displays at work aligns with a robust body of work investigating emotional labor (EL) in the workplace. Thus, EL research was reviewed as one way to understand women's navigation of the double-bind.

## Emotional Labor

The concept of EL has been studied over a period of decades, initially coined by Hochschild in 1983 as she observed the explicit emotional display rules conveyed to burgeoning flight attendants at company-wide orientations. EL has come to be defined as "the process of regulating both feelings and expressions for the organizational goals" (Grandey, 2000, p. 97) or for pay. Regulation can take the form of "cognitive (reinterpreting an event or situation), behavioral (controlling emotional displays), or physical (reducing arousal through the use of psychoactive substances)" (Pugliesi, 1999, p. 126). True to its roots, EL is most frequently examined in employees with externally-facing roles, such as those interacting with clients,

customers, plaintiffs and defendants, and debtors (Wharton & Erickson, 1993), as employees in these roles tend to be aware of the specific emotions required by the organization to fulfill their jobs effectively (Grandey, 2000). The act of EL "may involve enhancing, faking, or suppressing emotions" (Grandey, 2000, p. 95) in response to an organization's "display rules" (Ekman & Friesen, 1971), which are explicit or implicit dictates that specify which emotions are appropriate for employees to display (Grandey, 2000).

The display rules dictating emotional expression can certainly vary within organizations in myriad ways, but Wharton and Erickson (1993) proposed a useful taxonomy of integrative, differentiating, and masking display rules. Integrative display rules refer to those common situations where negative emotions are suppressed and positive emotions are amplified, such as in customer service where an emotion like happiness is encouraged. However, display rules can also proscribe differentiating emotions, such as in the case of a bill collector, wherein emotions like hostility (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) or urgency (Sutton, 1991) are expected to be expressed. Lastly, masking emotions can be required, such as in the case of a judge in which expressing stoicism is encouraged (Grandey, 2000), or for academic deans who are expected to express neutrality (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). With that said, while EL can involve altering both positive and negative emotions, the most common display rules require employees to suppress negative and amplify positive emotions (Hülsheger et al., 2010), in line with the integrative display rule.

Abiding by display rules can result in emotive dissonance (Hothschild, 1983), wherein the emotions experienced by an employee are not aligned with the emotional displays prescribed by the organization. Various taxonomies have been proposed to explain how employees manage this dissonance, including Grandey's (2000) commonly-used division of emotional management methods into surface acting and deep acting. Surface acting is defined as the management of

observable expressions, without altering one's inner state. This stands in contrast to deep acting, which involves intentionally managing internal feelings, leading to a modification of the observable expression (Grandey, 2000). Surface acting can be characterized as faking emotions, as those employing this strategy still experience a given emotion; they simply mask their emotional experience by substituting an organizationally-acceptable emotion. Those who modify their emotional expressions through deep acting are actually able to ultimately align their experienced and expressed emotions, resulting in authentic displays of emotions (Grandey, 2003). Though it was initially posited that both surface acting and deep acting are detrimental to employee outcomes, subsequent findings have revealed interesting and varied results.

**Outcomes of Surface and Deep Acting**

At an individual level, surface acting has been found to relate positively to emotional exhaustion (Bono & Vey, 2005; Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011); psychological strain (Hülsheger et al., 2010); depersonalization, i.e., detachment in interactions with others (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002, p. 17; Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011; Lee et al., 2017); negative affect (Scott & Barnes, 2011); and psychosomatic complaints (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). Surface acting has also been found to relate negatively to a sense of personal accomplishment (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002). Effects of surface acting at the interpersonal level include a negative correlation between surface acting and customer satisfaction (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011) and perceived supervisor support (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2011). At the organizational level, surface acting is negatively related to organizational identification (Mishra & Bhatnagar, 2010) and perceptions of justice (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2011). Of perhaps greatest interest to organizations, surface acting has been found to relate negatively to job satisfaction (Grandey, 2003; Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011; Pugh, Groth, & Hennig-Thurau, 2011; Pugliesi, 1999) and organizational

attachment (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011), and positively to work withdrawal (Scott & Barnes, 2011), intent to turnover (Mishra & Bhatnagar, 2010), and actual turnover (Goodwin et al., 2011). Thus, the act of superficially altering emotions to abide by organizational display rules seems to result in multiple negative outcomes.

The results of studies assessing deep acting appear to tell a different story. Though initial theorizing has assumed that deep acting would be detrimental to employee outcomes, and empirical results have indicated that deep acting is negatively related to job satisfaction (Grandey, 2003), subsequent research has revealed divergent findings. Hülsheger and colleagues (2010) found that deep acting is actually associated with increased performance. The authors suggested that physiological arousal may occur in both surface and deep acting, but deep acting results in a simultaneous increase in positive outcomes that cancel out negative effects, such as social interaction, therefore explaining why only surface acting was found to be depleting. Hülsheger and Schewe (2011) reported that deep acting is positively associated with emotional performance and customer satisfaction and further suggested that engaging in deep acting in an effort to experience positive emotion may actually stimulate positive spirals, wherein currently felt positive emotion ultimately influences future well-being and provides a buffer against a stressful work environment. Both Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) and Hülsheger and Schewe (2011) found that deep acting is associated with increased feelings of personal accomplishment. In terms of negative outcomes assessed in meta-analysis by Hülsheger and Schewe (2011), the correlations between deep acting and outcomes like satisfaction, strain, and others were not strong, with the only exception being a small positive correlation between deep acting and psychosomatic complaints.

Given these results, it appears that relationships exist among surface acting, deep acting, and various outcomes. Specifically, there appears to be strong evidence indicating that, on the whole, surface acting is associated with poor outcomes for both employees and organizations. However, the findings relating to deep acting are either positive (Hülsheger et al., 2010) or unclear (Judge, Woolf, & Hurst, 2009). Understanding how and why surface acting and deep acting differ in their effects may stem from the way in which emotions are regulated within these two strategies.

**Emotional Regulation**

The Process Model of Emotion Regulation (Gross, 1998a, 1998b) undergirds the surface acting and deep acting distinction in EL. Gross and John (2003) posited that emotions can be seen as "multicomponential processes that unfold over time" (p. 282) comprising three components: behavior, one's own experience, and physiological responses. Due to the temporal element of emotion, Gross (1998a, 1998b) divided the various emotional regulatory strategies utilized by human beings into two broad categories: those that are antecedent-focused and those that are response-focused. Antecedent-focused strategies (also known as reappraisal strategies) involve adjusting one's emotional reaction to an event through modifying one's perception of the event (e.g., reappraising the situation; Grandey, 2000). Antecedent-focused strategies include situation selection, situation modification, attentional deployment, and cognitive change (Gross, 1998a). The response-focused strategy (also known as a suppression strategy) involves individuals adjusting how they display their innate and immediate emotional response to a given situation (Grandey, 2000) through response modulation (Gross, 1998b). Grandey (2000) drew connections between reappraisal and deep acting, and between suppression and surface acting.

There have been findings that suppression of emotion, as opposed to reappraisal of situational perceptions, can lead to increased activation of the cardiovascular and electrodermal systems in situations where highly arousing stimuli are presented (Gross, 2002). Further, Hopp, Rohrmann, Zapf, and Hodapp (2010) found that when participants were told to abide by a customer philosophy valuing friendliness, they demonstrated increased diastolic and systolic blood pressure results than those told to act naturally. In terms of managing emotions at a surface level, Zuckerman, Klorman, Larrance, and Spiegel (1981) found that participants instructed to *exaggerate* their demonstrated emotional responses, another form of emotion modulation, displayed increased physiological arousal relative to those responding naturally or suppressing.

Cognitive effects associated with utilizing suppression or reappraisal strategies have also been reported (Gross, 2002). Various studies reported that individuals instructed to suppress emotions exhibited decreased memory performance, compared to controls on both recognition and recall memory tasks. When participants were exposed to images meant to provoke high or low negative emotion, those instructed beforehand to view the images in a detached way (i.e., reappraisal) did not show memory decrements. Further, Gross reported evidence that suppression, but not reappraisal, had a negative relationship with self-reported memory performance and memory performance on the free-recall task. Also, Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, and Tice (1998) found that participants engaging in an emotion suppression task subsequently performed significantly worse on an anagram-solving task than controls, suggesting that cognitive impairment arose after suppressing emotion.

In line with the finding that surface acting can relate to decreased customer satisfaction, the possible social consequences for interaction partners of individuals utilizing either suppression or reappraisal have also been examined. Gross (2002) reported the results of a study

in which the discussion partners of emotion-suppressing individuals were found to have increased physiological arousal, in comparison to interaction partners for individuals acting naturally or utilizing reappraisal techniques. The results of another study correlating self-reported reappraisal or suppression with ratings of the focal person completed by others showed that individuals reporting a greater use of suppression were less well-liked than those reporting a greater use of reappraisal (Gross & John, 2002).

Therefore, the basic emotional management process of suppression (and to a limited extent, false amplification), which can be seen as underlying the use of surface acting, have been shown to affect individuals negatively in relation to physiological, cognitive, and social outcomes. Reappraising situations, which can be seen to underlie deep acting, has been associated with neutral or even positive outcomes. Emotional suppression, and by extension, surface acting, can have powerful effects on individual, interpersonal, and organizational-level outcomes. The ways in which women leaders in particular manage their emotional displays have yet to be documented through this lens. More thoroughly examining the types of strategies used by women leaders to manage their emotions in the workplace may help us to better understand the additional load that women leaders may be carrying.

**Broadening Our Definition of EL**

While studies of EL have typically focused on service-oriented workers who abide by either explicit or implicit display rules governing customer interactions, there are other ways to define EL. As Wharton (2009) noted, at its core, EL is required in jobs where employees must interact with others. This definition allows for a broader conceptualization of EL, which enables us to capture *all* workplace interactions that involve emotional management. This is a departure from many prior studies yet may serve as a more accurate representation of the emotional

demands involved in chronic workplace interactions, both formal and informal, between employees and their colleagues across all levels. Pugliesi (1999) noted that employees often engage in EL across both client and colleague interactions, implying that EL outside of customer-focused interactions is equally as valid. Further, as the emotional regulation processes summarized above pertain to *all* instances of emotional management at work, not merely those when an employee is tasked with serving a constituent, a broader definition of EL accounts for ongoing emotional modulation.

This definition of EL also serves as a response to those who have called for research that further "identifies how expectations about emotion and emotional expression are built into formal job requirements, informal expectations, and other aspects of work organization" (Wharton, 2009, p. 161) and who have debated whether EL studies should focus on individuals who occupy jobs with clearly-stated emotional requirements, or if all emotional modulation within a workplace context should be studied (Simpson & Stroh, 2004). In fact, several researchers have adopted this broader definition in their work (e.g., Bulan et al., 1997; Pierce, 1995; Pugliesi, 1999) and, as Pugliesi (1999) stated, "some studies have found that the emotion work that occurs in the context of the social relations of the workplace is the most salient and distressing to workers" (p. 129). Thus, a more expansive view of EL aligns with and furthers prior work.

Finally, while this broader conceptualization of EL may not, on its face, inherently align with EL's traditional definition, that of manipulating emotional displays in service of an organization's goals or for a wage (Grandey, 2000), it is arguable that the ways in which employees modulate their emotions *do* contribute to an organization's goals or to the ability of employees to earn their wages. Employees who do not abide by display rules in both customer-

facing interactions *and* in coworker-focused interactions fail to conform to organizational and societal expectations about what constitutes appropriate workplace behavior (e.g., affective requirements; Bulan et al., 1997). In fact, Safdar et al. (2009) summarized evidence of the overarching, yet implicit, influence of country culture on display rules. In the case of customer-facing interactions, there are often explicit guidelines (or, at the very least, strong tacit expectations) dictating display rules as well as clear consequences for violations. In the latter case of coworker-focused interactions, employees are also acting within broader contexts, with entrenched expectations about appropriate behaviors. Though the rules may not be as clearly-identified or communicated, these rules exist nonetheless, and those who do not conform to expectations about their emotional displays may be penalized, ostracized, or overlooked. Nonconformance may inspire negative work-related outcomes, resulting in a failure to contribute to an organization's goals or to earn a wage, thus aligning with the traditional definition of EL. Further, a failure to conform to these tacit expectations for interpersonal interactions is also likely to affect colleagues with whom employees work (through violating widely-embraced societal expectations for work behaviors) as well as the overall work environment. Therefore, embracing a more comprehensive definition of EL allows for a thorough investigation of the myriad ways in which employees may be engaging in EL as they navigate workplace interactions.

In summary, employees are likely to modulate their emotions in daily, chronic interactions. The EL enacted in these interactions parallels the formal EL required by customer-oriented service jobs. Taking a broader view of EL allows for a more thorough investigation of the full range of emotional management performed in the context of the workplace.

## Investigating the Effects of Gender Stereotypes on the Emotion Regulation of Women Leaders

The prior sections provided a summary of literature related to the origins and outcomes of gender stereotypes, the arenas of work classified as male-typed, and the underpinnings of the backlash effect experienced by women who violate prescriptive stereotypes. Next, the construct of EL as it is traditionally defined, as well as the outcomes and processes underlying EL, are reviewed. Finally, a broader conceptualization of EL is outlined, which better accounts for the chronic emotional management that underlies the day-to-day interactions of employees and their colleagues.

Taken together, these findings lay the groundwork for an investigation centered around women leaders' experience of conveying warmth through emotional displays, in daily coworker-oriented interactions, in male-typed contexts. Gender norms at the organizational and societal levels are the backdrop against which women leaders must operate. Leveraging EL allows us to better understand the types of additional work women leaders are required to perform in the workplace because of these broader forces. Importantly, modulating displays of warmth, as opposed to competence, is the focus of this study for several reasons.

First, others have argued that the dimension of warmth so commonly studied in gender stereotype research can be characterized as comprising a collection of positive emotions (Smith et al., 2015) that convey the impression of being supportive, understanding, sensitive, and caring (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007), or acting in a good-natured, sincere, warm, and trustworthy way (Cuddy et al., 2004). Therefore, when choosing to convey warmth, women leaders may be actively managing their emotional displays through surface and/or deep acting. Further, when examining the two dimensions of gender stereotypes (warmth and competence), warmth is the dimension that can be more easily manipulated by a woman in a given situation (Cuddy et al.,

2011; Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007). This frame also aligns with prior work that has explored the specific behavioral manifestations expected of women, but not men, in the workplace, such as appearing self-effacing (Rudman, 1998), modest (Rudman & Glick, 1999), and speaking in a hedging or self-doubtful way (Carli, 1990). The warmth-related displays that are expected of women, and prove to be effective *for* women, are equally as important to research as these other behaviors that allow women to survive, particularly in male-typed positions.

Next, the backlash effect endured by women who violate prescriptive stereotypes is largely driven by others' reactions to women failing to display the expected warmth, as opposed to women simply displaying competence. As Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, and Zhu (1997) found, traits such as "aggressive, selfish, greedy, and cold" were attributed to career women by sexist men. These traits denote perceptions of a complete lack of warmth at the mere suggestion of a woman demonstrating competence. However, this reaction was not confined solely to sexist men. Across both male and female participants, hypothetical female managers displaying success in male-typed jobs were seen as less warm than male managers (i.e., less likable and desirable as a boss and more interpersonally hostile; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Moreover, reactions to women expressing emotions that conveyed a lack of warmth, e.g., anger, were strongly negative (Gibson, Schweitzer, Callister, & Gray, 2009). Given the negative effects of backlash, the need to display warmth represents a key driver of EL in the workplace.

Finally, research has shown that warmth is fundamental to social perception (Fiske et al., 2002). As Cuddy and colleagues (2011) stated, "once a person is suspected to lack warmth, it becomes extremely difficult to reestablish perceived warmth through apparently warm actions (e.g., charitable giving). By contrast, perceived competence can be restored by new successes" (p. 77). Therefore, a woman leader may be particularly invested in ensuring she develops a

reputation as warm through frequent acts of EL, avoiding damaging others' perceptions of her, which are likely to endure over time.

**EL as a Strategy to Manage Warmth Displays**

Viewing EL as a potential mechanism used by women leaders to modulate others' perceptions of their warmth is appropriate because EL involves both the amplification and the suppression of emotions. In this vein, women leaders may not only amplify warmth displays to ensure they do not violate prescriptive stereotypes but may also find themselves in situations where overt displays of warmth are actually *ineffective*, necessitating the suppression of warmth.

On one hand, displaying warmth is effective in some situations, such as in Pierce's (1995) study of women paralegals. Lawyers commenting on the qualities of women versus men paralegals reported that women paralegals were seen as warmer than male paralegals and personnel directors said that they believed women were better equipped for this type of work. To this point, a woman paralegal who did not align with this stereotypic belief was told that she "needed to 'work on her interpersonal skills'" (p. 5). In this setting, warmth was viewed as core to paralegals' success in their role and those who did not display warmth were explicitly instructed to adjust their behavior. Further, Fletcher and colleagues (2000) reviewed prior findings, summarizing that women in the workplace purposefully acted in such a way that their clear care and concern for coworkers were conveyed, whether through verbal or nonverbal signals. They deliberately enacted this behavior in service of participating in effective interpersonal interactions. Women may also be placed in situations where others actively expect them to provide more support than their male colleagues, such as in the case of women professors who reported higher rates of students asking for help with normal academic requirements, special requests, and friendship-related behaviors (El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, &

Ceynar, 2018). In these settings, the pressure placed on a woman by those with whom she is interacting may communicate the expectation that she acts warmly. Finally, Cuddy et al. (2011) went as far as directing women to display warmth by smiling, leaning in, and engaging in active listening. Thus, it is clear that messages are conveyed to women about the necessity of expressing warmth to take up their roles successfully.

On the other hand, if women are seen as *only* warm, which aligns with descriptive gender stereotypes, it may be automatically inferred that they lack competence, as these two poles stand in contrast with one another (Okimoto & Brescoll, 2011). Koenig et al. (2011) noted that women likely aim to avoid appearing too feminine, or put differently, too warm (notably, women may also aim to avoid appearing too masculine as well). Further, the very act of exhibiting warmth, despite the societal expectation that women will do so, may open women up to being devalued or belittled. Displaying behaviors consistent with warmth can be viewed by others as exhibiting weakness (Fletcher, 1999). Moreover, within organizational life, "certain [warmth] behaviors 'get disappeared'—not because they are ineffective but because they get associated with the feminine, relational, or so-called softer side of organizational practice" (p. 3). Therefore, the emotional displays that communicate warmth, such as acting in a kind, friendly, gentle, or caring way, may be *suppressed* by women through the act of EL, as they attempt to avoid adhering to conventional ideas about how women are.

Due to the unclear outcomes of displaying warmth as well as the variability in innate feelings and expressions of warmth within individual women leaders, this dimension presents incredible challenges. Should women leaders display warmth to avoid enduring backlash? Should they minimize their displays of warmth to avoid being pigeonholed as a homemaker? Unfortunately, the answers to these questions likely vary, day to day, workplace to workplace,

and woman to woman. There is no clear guidebook prescribing how and when women should enact or suppress their warmth. However, it is possible, or even probable, that women leaders are constantly monitoring the emotions they display, as they manage gender stereotypes.

For example, in an unpublished pilot study that I conducted on women's modulation of warmth displays, which involved interviews with women holding male-typed jobs, one participant described her daily experiences around how she presents warmth at work: "sometimes you approach a person with your cute feminine self, sometimes you can't do that. It doesn't work on other people when you need something done. You have to be like just direct and business-oriented." Moreover, while Ely (1995) shared that women participants in her study of law firms did not want to appear "too mannish" (p. 617), Fletcher (1999) stated that "female engineers are simultaneously expected to and devalued for acting relationally" (p. 104). These experiences speak to the idea of combatting both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes through engaging in warmth-related EL, yet no clear picture emerges of the most effective way to do this. Further, male-typed jobs add an additional layer of complexity, as they require competence but are more ambiguous in their warmth dictates. What is apparent, however, is that women leaders are carrying the additional burden of purposefully laboring around expressions of warmth in the workplace. As Rudman and Glick (1999) stated, "the prescription to 'be feminine' while simultaneously fulfilling agentic requisites may be a difficult and demanding balancing act akin to driving over rough terrain while keeping one hand on the wheel and the other reassuringly on passengers' backs" (p. 1009). Put differently, in pursuit of fending off stereotypes about being solely warm or completely lacking warmth, women leaders may utilize EL to meet the demands of the situation at hand.

Given the evidence supporting the idea that women likely manage displays of warmth in the workplace as well as the profound and detrimental effects of surface acting, it is imperative to understand better how women may utilize EL to manage both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes. This is particularly important to investigate in male-typed jobs, in which women have been traditionally underrepresented, and which create situations where gender identity (and gender stereotypes) are even more salient (Murphy, Steele, & Gross, 2007). This investigation may uncover an additional burden carried by women leaders, wherein they control their emotional displays in service of affecting others' perceptions of warmth. Yet, the potential deleterious outcomes of this EL cannot be overlooked and must be documented.

**Stereotypes: Emotionality**

Given the extant evidence, this study aimed to explore the possibility that women leaders' displays of warmth are managed with EL, in response to gender stereotypes. Warmth is communicated by displaying positive emotions, which connote kindness and sensitivity (Smith et al., 2015). However, a related body of literature has explored the emotionality of men and women, as well as stereotypes about differential frequencies and intensities of emotional expression in men versus women. This work provides an alternate explanation for the assertion that women's displays of warmth are manipulated in response to gender stereotypes; instead, it may be plausible that women are simply more emotional than men and/or innately more emotionally expressive than men.

Past research has documented the presence of stereotypes about the emotionality of men versus women. Overall, myriad findings suggested there are deeply held and pervasive beliefs that women are more emotional than men (Fischer, 1993; Simon & Nath, 2004). With that said, Fabes and Martin (1991) suggested that blurring the constructs of emotional *experience* and

emotional *expression* results in a lack of clarity pertaining to whether stereotypes actually dictate that women are more emotional than men, *or* if women are stereotyped as more emotionally expressive than men. Differentiating the experience of emotion from the expression of emotion allows for more complexity in examining emotionality stereotypes.

Some work has actually measured emotional expressivity in men versus women, finding that men and women differ in expressing specific emotions. McDuff, Kodra, el Kaliouby, and LaFrance (2017) utilized a facial coding method to explore reactions to a variety of common advertisements, from a sample that spanned five countries. Overall, they found that women exhibited more facial expressions in response to stimuli than men, but this was not universal across emotions. On one hand, women displayed significantly higher rates of smiling than men. Interestingly, this effect held up for the United States, United Kingdom, and Germany, but effects were nonsignificant (though trending in a consistent direction) in China and France. Yet, results also revealed that men were more likely than women to engage in "brow furrows," a core component of the expression of anger. This effect was significant in Germany and China but did not reach significance in the other countries (McDuff et al., 2017). This study indicated that claims of universal differences in men's and women's emotional expressiveness may fail to capture the nuances of specific emotions. Further, the effects of socialization present themselves in a particularly interesting way in this study. The differing effects for these findings across cultures provide just one example of the potential external influences, as opposed to innate differences, that may affect expressions of emotion.

With regard to expressing emotions, findings indicated than women are stereotyped as more emotionally expressive than men (Fischer, 1993; Simon & Nath, 2004). Adolescent and adult women are rated as more likely to express an array of emotions than adolescent and adult

men (Fabes & Martin, 1991), including smiling and laughing more frequently (Briton & Hall, 1995). In relation to the workplace, women managers are seen as less emotionally stable than male managers (Heilman et al., 1995) and are perceived to lack the emotional toughness (Heilman, 2001, p. 659) required by high-level (i.e., male-typed) jobs in the workplace. Further, given the inverse relationship between emotionality and rationality, Heilman and colleagues (1995) found that women managers are rated as less rational than male managers, and even when managers were described as successful, women managers were still seen as less rational than their male counterparts. Some researchers have suggested that professional women may benefit from avoiding emotional displays altogether, in service of appearing rational and attaining status (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). These findings converged to suggest that stereotypes dictate that women are more emotionally expressive than men and, by extension, are less rational.

There also appear to be stereotyped beliefs about which emotions are associated with each gender (Brescoll, 2016; Lewis, 2000; Safdar et al., 2009). Fabes and Martin (1991) revealed that men are rated as significantly more likely to express anger than women, whereas women are rated as significantly more likely to express sadness and fear than men. Similarly, women are rated as significantly more likely to express fear, sadness, surprise, and happiness than men, whereas men are rated as significantly more likely to express anger, contempt, and disgust (Hess, Adams, & Kleck, 2005). Further, Hess and colleagues (2005) explored the overlay of social status on the emotional displays expected for each gender. They found that even when presented with the same stimulus, men described as low in dominance were given more leeway to express anger than women low in dominance, whereas women low in dominance were expected to express embarrassment or sadness. Research findings also suggested that male and female participants differ in their assessments of how appropriate it would be for themselves to exhibit

various emotional reactions in a range of situations. Their self-ratings reflect that male participants rate the appropriateness of expressing anger, contempt, and disgust significantly higher than female participants, and rate the appropriateness of expressing fear, sadness, and happiness significantly lower than female participants (Safdar et al., 2009).

There are also data to suggest that perceivers have different reactions to men and women expressing the same emotions. For example, angry women are seen as significantly more out of control than angry/neutral men and women (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). Further, women expressing anger are accorded lower status than women displaying neutral emotions (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). Even within infants, perceptions of crying vary by infant gender. When a crying baby is described as a boy, perceivers attribute anger as the associated emotion, whereas when it is described as a girl, perceivers attribute fear (Condry & Condry, 1976). Thus, the content of expressed emotions may be seen to differ by gender, and perceivers' reactions to expressed emotions are also likely to differ pending the gender of the person who expresses such emotions.

In summary, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that there are actual gender differences in displays of emotion overall, as well as with regard to specific emotions. Yet, the findings also indicated that some of these differences, when observed, may stem from socialization. Importantly, gender stereotypes are socialized for the duration of women leaders' lives. Further, as Healey, Hodgkinson, and Massaro (2017) noted, emotion regulation in an organizational context is multi-determined and subject to forces at a variety of levels. Therefore, if it is the case that women actually express specific emotions more frequently than men due to gendered socialization, this will not detract from the central thesis of the study, which posited that gender stereotypes, socialized at the societal level, drive warmth displays. Further, as is the

case with gender stereotype research, the most pertinent question may not be whether men and women innately differ in their biological experience of emotion or tendency to express emotions; rather, the pressing concern is if stereotypes about emotionality affect women's behavior as well as perceptions of their behavior. Moreover, it may also be the case that both arguments are true: women may be more emotional and more emotionally expressive than men *and* they may have a need to manipulate their emotional displays in the workplace to "get by." Whether they are naturally more emotional (or not) is not directly related to their need to manage warmth as a tacit requirement of their job.

## The Current Study

In summary, this study sought to understand further how women leaders navigate gender stereotypes in the workplace. More specifically, the societal expectation that women are warm at the expense of competence, coupled with the requirement for competent women to display warmth to avoid backlash, creates a paradox for women, called the double bind. EL, the act of managing emotional displays at work, provides a key framework through which we may understand women leaders' experiences. Because warmth is a collection of positive emotions, women leaders may use EL to either suppress their warmth (thereby amplifying their competence) or amplify their warmth (thereby softening their competence). This study initially sought to investigate the following questions: *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace? If so, how do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace? If so, why do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace?* Based upon data collection and analysis, to be discussed more fully in Chapters Three and Four, the research questions were ultimately revised to the two questions written below:

1. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*
2. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate warmth displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*

# CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

## Qualitative Approach

A qualitative research approach was used for this study. In reporting the methodological design, I followed the suggestions offered by Creswell (2013) and Maxwell (2013) for how best to explicate one's approach to research. First, I review the philosophical assumptions underlying this research study and how they are related to the interpretative framework that I have chosen. Second, I explain the particular qualitative approach that was used in this study. Then, I summarize the specific and granular procedures that were undertaken. Next, I review my own positionality in relation to the phenomena identified here. Following this, I provide a summary of the data analysis process. Finally, I review concerns related to the validity of my findings.

### Philosophical Assumptions and Interpretative Framework

In this study, I sought to thoroughly *explore* and *describe* women leaders' experiences of gender stereotypes, emotional labor, and their intersection, as opposed to numerically quantifying discreet aspects of these phenomena (Creswell, 2013). Essentially, I was searching for the meaning that participants make as they navigate their workplaces and manage their emotional and warmth displays. As an approach, qualitative methodology was appropriate because it allows for an investigation into the complexity and nuance inherent in emotional and warmth modulation experiences in women leaders (Berg & Lune, 2012; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). In this vein, it makes space for "flexibility and diversity" (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 36) in participants' experiences and accommodates the idea that there are multiple realities (Creswell, 2013) and knowledge is known "through the subjective experiences of people" (p. 20). The experiences of the women leaders who were interviewed provided unique, rich, and powerful data that could not be known otherwise (e.g., through a quantitative approach).

Put differently, a qualitative approach permits a greater understanding of when, why, and how each individual woman leader manages her emotions and her warmth, such that themes within and across participants were able to be examined for similarities and differences. For example, there was evidence that two different participants both suppressed negative emotions, but the reasoning for doing so, or the strategies used to do so, differed. A quantitative study might show similar suppression scores for these women but would be unlikely to pick up these differences in the *why* and *how* inherent in this process. Alternatively, there were other examples where individual participants described the reasons for suppressing negative emotions and/or the strategies for doing so, and common threads surfaced across these participants. In either case, discovering the convergences and divergences among different participants deepened my understanding of what these women leaders experience at work.

After highlighting philosophical assumptions, researchers should next clarify their proposed interpretative lens (Creswell, 2013). Within the context of this study, a social constructivism framework was used as an interpretative lens. This theoretical perspective propones that as people move in the world, they seek to make sense of their experiences and interactions with others, which results in subjective meanings being construed by each individual (Creswell, 2013). Though an objective truth does exist (Rubin & Rubin, 2012), it cannot be known because of the filter of each person. This aligns with the philosophical assumption that multiple realities can exist simultaneously, and this study sought to report those disparate experiences as well as those common interpretations across the population of interest. Related to this idea, constructivism also relies on the ontological belief that these various realities become known through an interaction between the researcher and the researched, as was the case with this study.

Further, this study aimed to document complex viewpoints from the women leaders who experience this phenomenon in a specific context (Creswell, 2013): those roles, workplaces, fields, or industries that are *male-typed*. I utilized broad questions that encouraged participants to explain how they construct their understanding of the situation, allowing for learning about the potential influence that this male-typed context has on women leaders (Maxwell, 2013). This focus on a specific situation, and the way a certain group of participants navigate the situation, is in line with a constructivism frame.

Finally, taking a constructivism stance also suggests that the meaning that is made by individuals is influenced by history and social context. Within this particular study, the importance of paying mind to, and accounting for, historical and social factors cannot be underestimated. Stereotypes stem from deeply-ingrained gender roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002) that have persisted for thousands of years. Further, though women have increasingly gained greater access to the workplace, stereotypes about their traits and abilities have yet to keep up, resulting in a social context that is often benevolent in its sexism, but sexist nonetheless (Hebl et al., 2007). For example, the recent #metoo movement has revealed troubling and poignant examples of the sexism that still runs rampant across myriad industries in the present day and recent past, despite the desire to believe that great strides in gender equality have been made. Allusions to, or overt mentions of, this phenomenon occurred in several participant interviews, lending credence to the idea that societal forces likely affected participants' self-reported work experiences. Thus, a qualitative approach allowed me to account for the current social factors at play, as well as the weight of women's historical experiences at work. As such, the data that were collected, and my interpretations of these data, reflect the nuance, complexity, and detail of

participants' experiences in this specific moment in time and as shaped by the historical implications of holding a female gender identity.

A qualitative exploratory approach was used for this study. This is appropriate when there is minimal prior work exploring the area of interest (Given, 2008)—in this case, the ways in which participants may, or may not, manage their emotional and warmth displays in response to gender stereotypes. Further, the relatedness of warmth-related gender stereotypes and emotional labor has not been deeply explored in prior work, yet there is a theoretical argument that these two constructs may relate to one another; thus, this is worth exploring (Given, 2008). Qualitative exploratory research is also appropriate when the aim of researchers is to deeply immerse themselves in the lived experiences of participants under study, in service of describing a phenomenon of interest as well as identifying new insights (Stebbins, 2001). This aligned with my goals for the study, as I wanted to become deeply familiar with what it means to be a woman leader in a male-typed context in relation to experiencing and expressing emotions and warmth. In service of identifying broader conclusions about this experience that would allow me to describe the phenomenon to others, I sought to thoroughly understand each participant (Seidman, 2013), but then to work across these experiences to derive overall themes through inductive reasoning (Creswell, 2013).

## Design

### Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews were the key source of data. I was the only person who conducted the interviews. Interviews were an appropriate choice because my aim was to explore the meaning that others attach to their lived experiences (Berg & Lune, 2012). To this end, interviews allowed each participant to explain the ways in which she understood expectations for

her emotional expression at work, her warmth expression at work, how she approached the management of emotions and warmth, and the meaning she attached to this process (Berg & Lune, 2012), as well as the effects of her specific male-typed context (Seidman, 2013). Further, I wanted to empower individuals to tell their stories, which was one likely outcome of the interview process. The empowerment piece is particularly interesting, given the historical and social role of women, and particularly women in male-typed jobs. In fact, after the debrief portion of the study, numerous participants spoke to finding the interview process interesting, cathartic, or valuable for their own self-reflection. Finally, when exploring new arenas that have not yet been fully described and documented by prior research, interviews allow for the collection of rich, nuanced, and detailed data that expand the depth of our understanding of a given phenomenon (Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

Interviews were conducted in person and virtually, per the preference of participants as well as according to geographical constraints. Three participants completed the study in person and 23 completed the study virtually (of these, two people completed via FaceTime or Zoom with video/audio on, whereas the other 21 completed via phone or video conferencing software, with solely audio and no video).

Demographic and occupational data were also collected from participants. Participants were asked to report their age, gender identity, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, marital status, number of children, nationality, political affiliation (note, this question was added after the first five participants had already completed the study), educational attainment, undergraduate major, tenure at organization, gender breakdown of organization, gender breakdown of immediate peer group, gender of supervisor(s), three words to describe their organizational culture, and any relevant prior work experience. All questions were open-ended to

allow each participant to report these characteristics in her own words. This additional information allowed for a deeper understanding of the professional and personal experiences that potentially affected the worldviews of each participant, as well as situated them in their specific workplaces.

**Participants**

The entire participant pool comprised 26 women leaders in male-typed roles, functions, or industries. Leadership was defined as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (Northouse, 2016, p. 6). As such, participants were considered leaders if they were responsible for leading or managing a group of two or more individuals toward a shared outcome. A male-typed role was defined in terms of the gender-congeniality of the job, function, organization, field, and industry. More specifically, the following inclusion criteria were employed:

- Those holding a job currently held by majority men (e.g., CEO);
- Those holding a job perceived as typically held by a man (e.g., CFO, Marine Corps Officer);
- Those holding a job that requires the display of traits typically associated with men or the completion of tasks typically associated with men (e.g., demonstrating competence and agency; working in engineering, technology, hard sciences);
- Those working in functions or industries that are currently dominated by men (e.g., senior leadership teams at Fortune 500 companies; facilities management);
- Those working in functions or industries that are perceived to be dominated by men (e.g., the finance function, the natural resources industry);

- Those working in functions or industries that require the display of traits typically associated with men or the completion of tasks typically associated with men (e.g., Infantry in the U.S. Army); and
- Those working in organizations dominated by men, in a role typically dominated by men.

Recent U.S. Department of Labor Statistics (U.S. Department of Labor, 2019) as well as International Labour Organization (ILO, n.d.) classifications were leveraged when making inclusion/exclusion decisions based on these criteria. Occupations where women comprise less than 50% of role occupants were included. Similarly, industries where women comprise less than 50% of employees were included. Further, for individual cases, I sought statistics specific to a given role, field, or industry, i.e., Finance (Catalyst, 2018b), Law (Catalyst, 2018c), Physical Sciences (Catalyst, 2018d), Medicine (AMA Physician Masterfile, 2015; Vassar, 2015), Pharmaceuticals (Jarvis, 2018), Technology (Lazzaro, 2017), and Offshore Drilling (Oil & Gas UK, 2018). Where relevant, statistics for specific individuals' employers were used to determine the gender ratio of the given organization. Those are not cited here for confidentiality reasons. Finally, my screening questions asked potential participants to provide a rough estimate of the gender ratios within their given organization and field/industry; thus, those responses were also used when making inclusion/exclusion decisions.

Ultimately, four of the 26 participants were excluded from the sample after data collection was completed. Two were excluded because they worked outside of the United States and I made the decision to restrict my sample to those working in the United States. Because stereotypes are based upon overarching societal beliefs, it was most appropriate to utilize a sample of women who all worked in the same country (in this case, the United States). Two

additional participants were excluded because they did not work with subordinates on a shared goal, which surfaced during the interview itself. Therefore, they did not meet the definition of leader, as defined previously. Thus, the final sample comprised 22 participants. Table 1 describes their demographic characteristics.

In terms of the occupational backgrounds of the participants, five worked in finance (one of whom was a senior HR leader); five came from the field of medicine (four orthopedic surgeons, one general surgeon); four conducted research in a scientific field; two worked in male-dominated sports (one as a coach, one as a lawyer); one worked in the field of law; one worked in offshore drilling; one worked in pharmaceuticals (as a senior HR leader); one worked in risk (a field that involves working with organizations to assess potential areas of liability and vulnerability or to calculate the costs and benefits of potential opportunities); one worked in technology; and one worked in the video game industry. It is important to note that the majority of participants were currently occupying the job of interest for this study (n = 16), but six participants were asked to recount prior workplace experiences that met the criteria (as current workplace experiences did not meet criteria or the participant was not currently working). Each participant was asked to report her tenure at the organization that was the focus of the interview conversation, though, unfortunately, this item was interpreted differently by the participants. Some reported the duration of their time in their field, whereas others reported the duration of their time in a given role. Reports ranged from 1 month to 35 years. Participants were also asked to estimate the gender breakdown of their overall organization (ranged from 2%-50% female) and their immediate peer group (ranged from 2%-55% female). Next, they reported the gender of their supervisor, with 15 people reporting a male supervisor, three reporting more than one supervisor (majority male), two reporting a female supervisor, and two reporting “not

applicable." Finally, participants were asked to provide three words to describe the culture of their organization. Figure 1 depicts these responses in a visual graphic and Table 2 depicts them in a list, parsed out by participant.

**Procedure**

Upon receiving approval from the Teachers College Institutional Review Board (IRB), participants were approached for participation in the study. All recruitment materials are included in Appendix A. Recruitment included posting an advertisement to the study on the Teachers College portal, posting an advertisement to my personal Facebook page, as well as asking members of my professional and personal networks to forward my recruitment request to eligible members of their networks. Members of my professional network included full-time faculty in the Social-Organizational Psychology Program at Teachers College, adjunct faculty in the Social-Organizational Psychology Program at Teachers College, alumni of and current students in the Executive Masters Program in Social-Organizational Psychology, alumni of and current students in the Masters Program in Social-Organizational Psychology, alumni of the Principles and Practices of Organization Development Certificate Program, and alumni of and current students in the Doctoral Program in Social-Organizational Psychology. Notably, due to the authority dynamics inherent in the relationship between faculty members and current students of any of the aforementioned programs, I directed all faculty to avoid forwarding my email to any current students. Instead, I asked the Assistant Director for Operations in the Executive Masters Program to forward my advertisement to current students, and asked the student-run group in Social-Organizational Psychology (OHDCC) to forward my advertisement to any current students in the Masters Program. Further, I did not reach out to the alumni of the Principles and Practices of Organization Development Certificate Program directly; instead, the

Coordinator of this program forwarded my announcement. Similarly, I did not reach out to the adjunct faculty in the Social-Organizational Psychology Program directly; the Social-Organizational Psychology Program Manager forwarded my announcement. Finally, the Assistant Director for Operations in the Executive Masters Program also forwarded my announcement to alumni of this program. I did directly contact full-time faculty in the Social-Organizational Psychology Program, as well as current students and alumni of the Doctoral Program in Social-Organizational Psychology, requesting that they forward my announcement to their networks. My personal network included friends, family members, prior work colleagues, and various long-time acquaintances. I asked each of these constituencies to forward my announcement to their networks.

I also utilized a snowball sample methodology to leverage the contacts of initial participants by asking them to refer additional participants. Upon completion of the study, participants were asked to refer other prospective participants to me directly (see Appendix A). Of note, as the study progressed, there was a great deal of interest stemming from these various recruitment methods, and the snowball sampling was eliminated as I neared my maximum number of participants.

Upon expressing interest in the study, participants were sent high-level information about the study and asked to respond to the following four screening questions (see Appendix B for the full email text):

- Do you work in a job that requires you to lead/manage/oversee two or more people towards a common goal?
- What is your formal job title?
- Are the majority of others with your same job title male? Female?

- What is the gender makeup of your organization? Of your field? (An approximate percentage of women vs. men is great.)

If they were eligible, they were sent the consent form (see Appendix C) in two formats. One allowed them to print, sign, and scan the form. The other format included virtual fields that could be completed in Adobe Acrobat and authorized with a time-stamped signature. They were also given additional details about the study (see Appendix D for the full email text) and were offered the opportunity to participate in-person (in a private area on the Teachers College campus or at a mutually-agreed upon private space), via phone, or via videoconferencing software (e.g., FaceTime, Skype, Zoom).

All participants signed the consent form before the interview commenced. For those participants who were interviewed in-person, two of the three sent the completed consent form before I met with them; one signed the consent form in-person. For virtual participants, all returned the completed consent form to me in advance of the interview. The consent form included a check-box asking participants to agree to be recorded during the interview; all 26 checked this box. Of note, all participants were also asked at the start of the interview to reaffirm their permission to audiotape (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The consent form also included a check-box asking participants to agree to quotes taken from their interviews to be included in the dissertation; 25 of 26 participants agreed to this. Lastly, the consent form included a check-box asking participants if they would be willing to be contacted for future research; 26 of 26 participants agreed to this.

Before the interview began, I read participants an introductory script and answered any questions they might have about the process or study (see Appendix E). After orienting them, the interview was then conducted. All interviews were recorded on a handheld digital voice recorder.

Interviews ranged in length from 60 minutes to 83.68 minutes, with a mean length of 73.06 minutes (s.d. = 7.97 minutes). The varied length is reflective of participants' time constraints, as well as their communication style and the level of depth they chose to go into in response to each question. Further, some participants seemed to resonate deeply with the questions, providing multiple detailed responses. Others did not seem to resonate with the questions (that is, the questions did not probe phenomena they experienced at work) and/or had fewer experiences to report. Two interviews were conducted over the course of two days, whereas 24 were conducted in one sitting. Additional information relating to the interview protocol and process is summarized in the next section.

After each interview was completed, demographic and occupational background information was obtained via an online questionnaire (see Appendix F). For virtual participants, the questionnaire was sent via email immediately following the interview, and participants electronically completed the information. For in-person participants, I either emailed the link to the questionnaire and the participant completed it in real time on her own device or I loaded the questionnaire on my personal computer and allowed participants to use it to complete the questionnaire.

For in-person participants, upon submission of the questionnaire, I provided a high-level debrief of the study (Appendix G contains the debriefing script) and created space for participants to ask any questions. Similarly, for those who completed the study by phone, participants were asked to alert me via email or text message upon completion of the questionnaire so that I could call them back to provide a debrief of the study. For those who completed the study by conferencing software, I muted myself and waited for participants to complete the questionnaire, then provided a debrief after they alerted me that they had submitted

their data. I followed this exact procedure for 21 of the participants; for two, time constraints forced me to provide a debrief of the study before they completed the electronic questionnaire. For the remaining three, they completed the questionnaire soon after the interview, but I provided a debrief of the study several days to several weeks later to accommodate their schedules.

After each interview was transcribed, I contacted each of the 26 participants to ask if she would like to read the transcript and offer any corrections, additional reflections, or differing recollections of what was discussed. This was optional and many participants did not respond (n = 17). Of the nine who did respond, all confirmed the accuracy of the transcription and did not offer any changes. Next, after deriving the codes used to analyze the data, I contacted all 26 participants to offer their feedback, which was optional. Five participants replied; two voiced their identification with and interest in the codes; and three offered positive and constructive feedback, which was ultimately integrated into the discussion in Chapter Five. Finally, after the key themes were identified, I emailed all participants to share these themes and to solicit feedback. Again, this was optional. Zero participants responded with constructive feedback.

**Data Management**

Expectations around confidentiality were communicated to participants throughout all email communications in advance of the interview, as well as via verbal commitment to participants at the start of the interview. Confidentiality was also ensured through the ways in which participants' data were transcribed and stored. Participants' names were linked to a unique, randomly-generated, four-digit numerical identifier. There was one document linking participant names to participant ID numbers, which was password-protected and only accessible to me. Recordings were stored on one device that was kept in a locked box at all times, except

when it was being used to record interviews. Recordings were uploaded to a password-protected computer and back-up copies were stored on a flash drive, also contained in the locked box. Interviews were transcribed by a well-reputed, human-based transcription service, Rev. A signed confidentiality agreement was obtained before transcriptions commenced. Each transcript was password-protected. Recordings and transcripts were solely identified by the participant ID number. I redacted any identifying information from transcripts (e.g., if the participant mentioned the name of her organization, I wrote "[Organization name]" in place of the text). Lastly, any paper copies of consent forms or transcripts were stored in the locked box. A research assistant was provided with the de-identified transcripts to complete coding but was never given access to any identifying information. In this way, I am the only person who knows the identities of those who participated.

**Interview Protocol and Process**

The interview protocol can be found in Appendix H. It was created in an iterative process with input from peers (my doctoral workgroup), a framework laid out by my advisor (Dr. Caryn Block) for another qualitative study on a similar topic (Block, Cruz, Bairley, Harel-Marian, & Roberson, In press), as well as my dissertation committee. Per Berg and Lune's suggestions (2012), I first broadly operationalized what constructs I was interested in (emotions, displays of warmth); what types of precipitating events I wanted to investigate (interactions with peers, superiors, and direct reports); what methods for modulation I wanted to explore (suppression, amplification, others not formally documented by the literature); as well as why individuals might be doing this (differing expectations by gender).

In terms of the sequencing of the interview, I approximated Berg and Lune's (2012) suggested sequencing by opening with a nonthreatening question, which can also be

characterized as a "tour" question (Rubin & Rubin, 2012), asking participants to briefly describe their work responsibilities. From there, I moved to an important question, meaning the data were in line with my research purpose, and then finally, moved into sensitive questions that more specifically and directly probed the phenomenon of interest. At the end (and throughout), I ensured that I returned to areas that were not covered and, if time allowed, ended by asking participants what their advice would be for another woman in their position. I also encouraged participants to contact me if anything else occurred to them or if they wanted to follow up. This can be characterized as a "cooling" question (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 121) or, as Rubin and Rubin (2012) stated, it allowed us to close the interview while maintaining contact.

Within the protocol, the majority of questions were "essential questions" (directly related to the research question; Berg & Lune, 2012) and varying types of probes (attention, steering, confirmation, clarification, sequence, continuation, and elaboration; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). These probes served to convey my interest in the interviewee's story, keep the interview focused, confirm or clarify my own understanding of what had been said so far, determine the sequence of events in a story, communicate my desire to hear the entirety of my interviewee's story, and encourage the interviewee to delve deeply into specific aspects of her experience. Notably, I did not use credibility probes, which gently challenge the interviewee's self-report (Rubin & Rubin, 2012), as the focus of the study was on the subjective meaning constructed by participants, not the objective events that may or may not have transpired. The other main question type that comprised my interview protocol was follow-up questions (Rubin & Rubin), which asked participants to elaborate on key concepts by asking questions such as "how" and "what does it mean?" Regardless of question type, all questions were open-ended to allow for a range of responses. The interview flow most closely resembled a "main branches of a tree" approach, per

Rubin and Rubin (2012, p. 124), in that questions assessing the various aspects of the phenomena under study were afforded roughly equal time.

When interview questions were being constructed, I aimed to avoid affectively-worded, double-barreled, and/or complex questions (Berg & Lune, 2012), as well as leading questions (Seidman, 2013). Related, when probes and follow-up questions were spontaneously offered within the actual interview, I made every effort to ask clear, concise, and simple questions. Further, the questions were constructed to be free of jargon (Rubin & Rubin, 2012) and feedback on the phrasing of the questions was solicited from my research group and advisor (Berg & Lune, 2012).

Within the actual interview, rapport was established with participants by making each person feel comfortable at the beginning and throughout by focusing intently on her responses, silencing all distractions, and adopting a friendly and supportive tone (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I aimed to attend to both the content and the process of the interview, embodying the idea that an interviewer serves as an actor, a director, and a choreographer (Berg & Lune, 2012). Further, I aimed to engage in the three levels of listening via paying mind to the content of what participants were sharing, the inner voice of the participant that can often be overshadowed by the outer voice, and the process of the interview (timing, nonverbal cues, etc.; Seidman, 2013). Related, I exhibited flexibility, responsivity, and adaptability in the questions asked and the ordering of the questions (Creswell, 2013; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Though the interview protocol outlined a clear sequence of questions, I did not rigidly follow my predetermined structure at the expense of following the interviewee where she led and diving deeply into unanticipated, but relevant, areas of discussion. I often re-ordered the questions in the moment, in response to the unique stories of each participant.

The role of the interviewer also necessitates a patient, curious, reflective and self-aware stance (Berg & Lune, 2012). Throughout the interview, I allowed interviewees to answer in their own way and did not insert my own interpretations or stories into the interview (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Within these interviews, I tolerated silence, per Seidman's (2013) and others' suggestions, and also attempted to ensure that I did not interrupt interviewees if they were simply pausing to gather their thoughts (Berg & Lune, 2012). At times, this was challenging, given the virtual nature of many of these interviews. With that said, I pushed myself to allow pauses when I was unsure if the participant had completed their response. Rubin and Rubin (2012) noted that most people have become accustomed to excluding details when they converse; thus, interviewing should attempt to re-integrate these details. Therefore, I used many "how," "why," and "what" questions to deepen the conversation and draw out details, avoiding the urge to move through my protocol quickly. Moreover, I attempted to elicit vividness through asking participants to cite examples and specific stories (Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

In summary, many considerations were made with regard to appropriate data collection procedures in the planning and execution of this study. These aforementioned methodological considerations also relate to my role as a researcher, which presents its own challenges and advantages.

## Role of the Researcher

A key axiom underlying qualitative research is that the researcher has his or her own positionality with respect to the topic (Creswell, 2013). Researchers are compelled to examine, highlight, discuss, and claim their own biases and assumptions via bracketing or other methods, which contrasts with the assumption of objectivity in quantitative research. As social constructivism states, each person constructs his or her own meaning from a given situation.

Thus, actively and continuously highlighting my own perspective, my framework for understanding the world, and my ingrained assumptions served to strengthen my ability to interpret participant data without clouding my thinking with unidentified personal beliefs. To this end, I engaged in a variety of self-reflective activities to manage my own subjectivity.

It was first necessary for me to understand the relatedness of these topics (gender stereotypes and EL) to my own professional experience. When initially conceiving of this study, the topics at hand felt removed from me personally until a dear friend heard me describing EL to someone and said to me, "Wow, you must do that on a daily basis. It sounds exhausting." It then occurred to me that I do engage in EL frequently in order to get my work done across the various contexts in which I operate. "Turning on the charm" (e.g., amplifying my warmth) has been one strategy that I have used to handle many responsibilities of my various jobs. I see this as acting in a stereotype-consistent way by managing my emotions. Further, after my dissertation proposal hearing, one committee member remarked that she viewed me as expressing both warmth and competence in equal measure as a student and during the various part-time roles I have held at Teachers College. This remark surprised me as it did not necessarily match with my own experience of myself, wherein I tend to view myself as more warm than competent. Perhaps, my own view of self has been negatively affected by ingrained descriptive gender stereotypes, e.g., if I am warm, I must not be competent. In summary, I placed importance on maintaining ongoing awareness of how my own experiences may affect my judgment.

At the start of the study, I engaged in a researcher memo exercise to identify my own personal assumptions about the phenomena under study:

1. All women believe that stereotypes exist and are detrimental.

2. The process of combatting stereotypes and changing society is something that should be rallied behind and supported.
3. Every woman leader experiences emotions in the way that I do—deeply, fully, viscerally, across all contexts, and so on.
4. Every woman leader believes that emotional displays should be explored and understood rather than ignored or let go. Thus, they will be willing to get in touch with, and discuss, their own emotions.
5. Every woman leader utilizes emotional labor to get work done in her organization (as opposed to other methods). Emotional labor processes will be easy for all women leaders to identify and openly describe.
6. Emotional labor is exhausting and leads to other poor outcomes for everyone.
7. In comparison to quantitative research, qualitative research is a more authentic or "real" way to acknowledge my own experiences and biases.

Highlighting my own preconceptions shed light on what was likely motivating me to pursue this particular question in this specific way. Given these assumptions and experiences, I was vigilant in attempting to avoid projecting my own experiences onto interviewees, so that I did not lead them down a certain path or alienate them by being rigid in my approach to the subject matter. I also aimed to manage my own emotional reactions and refrained from sharing my own personal experiences to ensure that I maintained my role as interviewer. Lastly, I continuously reminded myself that my positionality is unique to me and I am seeking a diversity of experiences.

Additional informal researcher memos were completed during and after each interview. I noted my in-the-moment reflections as well as reflections immediately after the interview (and

hours or days later, if applicable). These memos captured a range of reactions, including the extent to which I felt comfortable, anxious, or intimidated in each interview; my level of engagement during the interview; ideas for key follow-up questions to be incorporated in future interviews; potential themes emerging from the entirety of the interviews; participant reactions to the ways in which specific questions were phrased; and my musings about managing interview dynamics (e.g., someone who is reticent to expand, someone who talks at length about an experience that is not directly related to the topic). Further, these memos captured my fears about negatively affecting my participants through asking them to recount difficult situations or through ordering the questions in such a way that I accidentally may have implied participants were deficient in a given area (e.g., after a participant reported something she struggled with, I asked about what made her a good fit for her role and the unintentional implication was that she had to defend her competence). Memos were also completed throughout the duration of the data analysis. These served to identify potential themes, perplexing or confusing findings, or open questions about the meaning of the data. Finally, memos were completed during the revision of my results after my Data Hearing and when writing the discussion portion of the dissertation.

## Data Analysis Strategy

Transcriptions ranged in length from 18 pages to 62 pages, with a mean length of 32.91 pages (s.d. = 9.86). I checked each transcription for accuracy by listening to the recorded interview and making corrections to the transcript before analysis. Once content was finalized, I content-coded the transcriptions, as did one research assistant (RA). This RA was a Masters student in the Social-Organizational Psychology Program at Teachers College who had completed the majority of her credits towards the Masters degree. She had prior quantitative research experience and was highly interested in both the topic at hand as well as engaging in

qualitative methodology. A rigorous coding process was followed, in consultation with dissertation committee members with qualitative methodology expertise. In making meaning of the data in general, I relied more heavily on inductive than deductive reasoning (Berg & Lune, 2012), though I also leveraged my knowledge of extant theory and research when sensemaking. The four phases involved in deriving the coding scheme and applying this scheme are described below.

**Phase One**

First, my RA and I read five to eight transcripts in full to familiarize ourselves with the interview content. Next, I selected five of these transcripts (three of the earliest transcripts and two from the middle of data collection) and we each attempted to separately induce codes for these five transcripts. At this stage, we were going line-by-line within each transcript to identify meaning units, then attempting to apply a descriptive code in our own words to capture the meaning (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017). I leveraged my existing knowledge in the domains of gender stereotypes and EL to derive my codes. My RA was prepared through reading my dissertation proposal as well as key articles relating to qualitative coding.

We met after this initial coding process to discuss our codes as well as the experience of attempting to derive codes. This meeting revealed a sense of overwhelm, given the length of each transcript and the variety of topics covered in each interview. It became clear that the operationalization of the initial research questions (*Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace? If so, how do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace? If so, why do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays of warmth in the workplace?)* had produced a wealth of data and over 100 potential codes. Many pieces of data were in line with

these initial research questions, in that participants reported numerous instances of managing their warmth. Yet, participants also spoke quite profoundly to their emotional modulation experiences, particularly with regard to negative emotions. The range of their emotional experiences fell outside of what I had been expecting to find, in terms of initially viewing warmth as a cluster of positive emotions. Participants sharing a broad range of emotions were a consistent occurrence across all interviews. This was likely due to the construction and sequencing of the interview protocol as well as, perhaps, how participants view and navigate organizational life. After soliciting input from my advisor, she and I revised the research questions to better reflect the breadth and depth of experiences reported by participants. These revised research questions guided data analysis and interpretation. They are:

1. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*
2. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate warmth displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*

In communicating these revised questions to my RA, we discussed the meaning of emotions and warmth to better align our understanding. Ultimately, the construct of emotions referred to participant reports of any of the following:

- anything that the participant shared as a response to "What emotions do you experience?" in the interview;

- any mention of "basic" emotions (anger, fear, disgust, sadness, happiness, surprise; Ekman, 1992);
- any mention of widely-acknowledged additional emotions (excited, interested, enthusiastic, relaxed, quiet, bored, guilty, lonely, frustrated, anxious, afraid; Zelenski & Larsen, 2000); and
- any sentiments using felt/feeling language, e.g., "I felt disrespected," "I feel grateful," "I felt fulfilled."

Warmth was more challenging to define, as it became clear that participants reported both behavioral manifestations of warmth as well as trait manifestations of warmth. Further, participants often used femininity as a proxy for warmth within the interviews. This aligned with prior research in that warmth is stereotypically considered a female trait (Fiske et al., 1999). Given all of this, the construct of warmth ultimately referred to participant reports of any of the following:

- traits or behaviors that convey concern for/sensitivity to others and/or convey positive intent;
- service-oriented behaviors;
- specific mentions of kindness, friendliness, compassion; being "nice," nurturing, sensitive, or caring; and
- traits or behaviors that are described as characteristically feminine or womanly by participants.

The concept of modulation referred to first capturing whether or not a participant adapted displays of either emotions or warmth in any way, and second, why and how she did or did not adapt these displays.

The main outcome of this phase of coding was the decision that all participant reports of emotional modulation and warmth modulation would be included in data analysis, even if emotional modulation was divorced from any warmth-related concerns, motivations, or expectations.

**Phase Two**

After these discussions with my RA and sponsor, I reviewed all of the codes that my RA and I had both identified in the initial coding effort to look for patterns, similarities, and differences in an attempt to narrow down the coding scheme. I also reflected on what would be most meaningful and parsimonious, from my perspective, in reporting out these data. Because of the exploratory nature of the study, I decided that utilizing two different units of analysis would be helpful in summarizing these data. First, at the level of participant (i.e., transcript), I wanted to capture common experiences around high-level emotion-related or warmth-related codes (e.g., reporting gendered expectations for emotional displays or reporting gendered expectations for warmth). The presence or absence of these global phenomena seemed more meaningful than numerical counts of the prevalence of specific themes throughout each individual transcript.

The majority of these codes were emergent, meaning that they arose from the data (Creswell, 2013), but per the advice of my second reader, I also derived several codes from the existing literature where the inductive codes appeared to miss a key concept. The finalized global emotion and warmth-related codes are described in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

The global emotion codes (Table 3) assessed emotion from individual, contextual, and gendered perspectives. For example, there were codes that addressed individual-level experiences of emotion (e.g., “Not experiencing emotions at work” and “Has adapted emotional modulation based on past experiences”). There were also codes that examined the context of the

workplace or field/industry (e.g., "Her specific workplace not accepting certain emotions" and "Her field or industry not accepting certain emotions"). Finally, there was a code addressing the role of gender in emotions (e.g., "Gendered expectations and/or consequences for emotional expression").

Similarly, for the global warmth codes (Table 4), there were codes assessing individual-level beliefs about warmth (e.g., "Displays of warmth important to leadership"), contextual variables (e.g., "Gender identity as advantage in field/role" and "Being a woman in a male-typed job, field, or industry feeling salient in the workplace"), and the relationship between gender and warmth (e.g., "Different standards/expectations for warmth by gender").

For each code in Tables 3 and 4, my RA and I decided whether or not it was present or marked our uncertainty. If any of the codes in the global emotion or warmth tables were answered with a "yes" or "unsure" response, my RA and I each provided a direct quote and transcript line numbers as supporting evidence.

Yet, I did not want to lose the capacity to look *within* each participant to understand the breadth, depth, and uniqueness of her experiences with emotional or warmth modulation. Thus, the second unit of analysis was looking within participants. In order to do this, every time an instance of emotion or warmth-related behaviors or traits was reported, it was coded separately.

We classified the emotions according to a list (Table 5) that we generated from reviewing the initial transcripts and reviewing the literature. Also, the emotions that were included complied with the agreed-upon definition of emotions presented earlier in this chapter. We were able to identify 19 specific emotional experiences that had been mentioned by more than one interviewee or that the literature indicated we should capture (e.g., "Frustration," "Accomplishment/Pride"). In order to capture specific emotions not contained in the 19-item list,

we added an "Other" code. Further, at times, participants did not identify a specific emotion but alluded to a general positive or negative emotional experience; thus, two additional codes were created: "General Positive Emotions" or "General Negative Emotions." Finally, at times, participants spoke broadly about emotions in general (e.g., "My colleagues say I never express emotion"); thus, "Emotions Writ Large" was an additional option. Ultimately, there were 13 negatively-valenced specific emotions and six positively-valenced specific emotions. Table 5 contains the finalized complete list of emotions.

We also classified warmth-related behaviors or traits according to a list (Table 6) that we generated from reviewing the initial transcripts and reviewing the literature. Also, the warmth-related behaviors or traits were aligned with the agreed-upon definition of warmth presented earlier in this chapter. We ultimately identified 22 specific behaviors, e.g., "Behavior: Being warm/friendly/approachable" or "Behavior: Avoiding doing traditionally feminine things *(e.g., baking)*" or 10 specific traits, e.g., "Trait: Warmth" or "Trait: Not empathic." These were gleaned from commonalities across participant interviews as well as the literature describing warmth-related traits or behaviors. There was one additional option, "Other," for those who reported a specific behavior or trait absent from the 32-item list. Table 6 contains the finalized complete list of behaviors and traits.

To capture both units of analysis (global codes across participants and specific instances of emotions or warmth within participants), at this stage, I created the first version of a "coding worksheet" that would be administered to each transcript by myself and my research assistant. The worksheet was composed of five sections. The first two contained the global codes relating to emotions and warmth, respectively, coded at the transcript level. Then, the next two sections allowed space to engage in line-by-line coding for specific reports of either emotions or warmth.

As described, this meant that we looked within each participant to identify every instance of a given participant mentioning emotions or warmth.

Finally, the worksheet comprised one additional section, which asked us for our overall assessment of whether or not the participant modulated emotions and warmth (response options: yes, no, unsure), and prompted us to provide reasoning in our own words for our answer. Further, it left space for any additional striking or important information that had not been captured elsewhere. Table 7 depicts this portion of the worksheet.

This worksheet was shared with my RA, advisor, and committee member with qualitative expertise. Feedback was solicited and incorporated, resulting in numerous changes. The main outcome of this phase was to create a framework for capturing the diverse and complex experiences of individual participants while also maintaining the capacity to draw conclusions across the entire sample.

**Phase Three**

Next, my RA and I jointly administered the worksheet on one transcript, then discussed potential areas for revision. After revisions were made, we administered the worksheet to two additional transcripts. Again, we discussed and implemented several revisions. Finally, we administered the worksheet to two additional transcripts, jointly identifying additional revisions. Revisions included adding, removing, or clarifying the original codes as well as fine-tuning a set of "coding instructions" that my RA and I would follow:

1. read the entire transcript once;
2. answer the global emotion and warmth codes;
3. read the transcript again, going line-by-line to identify specific mentions of emotions or warmth; after identifying these instances, provide descriptive information

including what prompted the participant to have this emotional experience or warmth-related experience and how the participant managed it in her example; and

4. provide a global assessment of whether or not the participant managed emotions and warmth.

We also co-constructed guidelines to follow throughout coding, based on the initial coding of these five transcripts and common issues that arose. Notably, it became clear that participants reported emotions or warmth-related behaviors or traits *in response to* some kind of stimuli. At times, the stimulus was general (e.g., leadership) and, at other times, the stimulus was specific (e.g., a rude direct report). Because stimuli could sometimes provoke a range of reactions, we attempted to capture the diverse and multifaceted ways that participants responded to a given stimulus, as reflected in the guidelines below. Further, we clarified other areas of confusion, including what types of interpersonal interactions to capture, how to capture the opposite of a given quality (versus its absence), and how to use an "other" designation. The guidelines were as follows:

- Identify a stimulus or situation; code emotions or markers of warmth in response to that; multiple codes can arise from one situation (but not the same sentence).
    a. If someone reported that she sometimes displayed an emotion and sometimes did not, code these as two separate instances; if someone reported that she sometimes modulated an emotion and sometimes did not, code these as two separate instances (note: in response to same stimuli).
    b. If someone reported that she sometimes modulated a warmth behavior and sometimes did not, code these as two separate instances (note: in response to same stimuli).

- If a person experienced the same emotion in response to multiple stimuli, enter these separately in the coding worksheet, e.g., frustration in response to (a) equipment failure, (b) boss de-authorizing her, (c) peers not listening to her input.
- Focus on what the person reported feeling/expressing/doing/not doing, as opposed to what others told her, e.g., do *not* code "my boss told me not to have kids," but instead "I don't talk about my kids at work."
- Focus on internal interactions (boss, peer, direct report, indirect report, etc.), not client-facing, patient-facing, or customer-facing interactions.
- Differentiate between a lack of something versus purposefully not showing something, e.g., "I am not a warm person" versus "I hide my compassion at work."
- Use "other" code to capture the opposite of a given code in our list; do not select the code indicating it is present.

The main outcome of this stage was to clearly define the content of the worksheet and put guidelines in place that supported reliably administering the worksheet to subsequent transcripts.

**Phase Four**

In the next phase, my RA and I each independently coded the remaining transcripts, applying the worksheet to each individual transcript. We met once per week for roughly 6 weeks to discuss every two to three transcripts and resolve discrepancies. Notably, the worksheet was iterated one final time after coding two additional transcripts in Phase Four; thus, the finalized worksheet was based upon seven transcripts. After revisions were made, the transcripts that had been previously coded were re-coded to align with the newest version of the worksheet. The main outcome of this stage was to crystallize the content of the worksheet and remain in open dialogue with my RA to ensure the reliability and validity of coding.

**Applying the worksheet to each transcript.** This section describes, briefly, the process for applying the worksheet to each transcript. First, as previously mentioned, we read the entirety of the transcript and provided yes, no, or unsure responses for the emotion-related and warmth-related global codes, along with supporting quotes. Essentially, at the level of each participant, we captured the presence or absence of the codes depicted in Tables 3 and 4.

Next, we went back to the beginning of the transcript and captured every emotional experience named by each individual participant, using the emotions listed in Table 5. In other words, we looked within each participant at her specific emotional experiences. In addition to identifying the emotion, we identified the stimulus for the particular emotion as well as whether or not the emotion was openly displayed (potential answers: yes, no, unsure). Next, we indicated whether the emotion was modulated (potential answers: yes, no, unsure). This allowed us to distinguish between those who openly displayed an emotion without modulation or those who displayed an emotion *despite* modulation. Next, we supplied participants' reasoning for why it was displayed or modulated by extracting direct quotes that explicated their reasoning, if they offered it. In addition to the direct quotes, we would often assign our own shorthand phrase to describe why it was displayed or modulated. Separately, we described how it was displayed or modulated. This means that we either described how the emotion was expressed (e.g., openly yelling at someone) or how it was modulated (e.g., took five deep breaths). Similarly, we used direct quotes as well as assigned our own shorthand phrasing. Finally, we were prompted to report the impact on the participant. Once again, we used direct quotes as well as our own shorthand phrasing. Please see Table 8 for a visual depiction of this portion of the worksheet.

Simultaneously, we captured every warmth-related instance named by each individual participant, using the behaviors and traits listed in Table 6. In other words, we looked within

each participant at her specific warmth-related experiences. After identifying a marker of warmth, we provided a more detailed description of the specific behavior or trait. Then, we indicated whether or not the behavior or trait was modulated with "yes," "no," or "unsure" as answers. We included a separate field to note relevant personality variables, as participants often offered comments about their innate personalities that were related to the behaviors they displayed. (Of note, if participants offered comments about their personalities that aligned with the traits listed in Table 6, those were reported separately, in addition to being associated with a given behavior.) Next, we supplied participants' reasoning for why a behavior or trait was displayed or modulated. Similar to the emotion coding method, we leveraged direct quotes as well as our own shorthand. Finally, we reported the impact on the participant, using direct quotes and our own shorthand. See Table 9 for a visual depiction of this portion of the worksheet.

Notably, there were not always complete data for each emotion or warmth behavior or trait; thus, we were able to describe some emotions or warmth behaviors or traits in more detail than others.

Finally, we provided our responses to the broad summary questions. Upon advice from my dissertation sponsor, the final step also included drafting a one- or two-sentence statement describing the specific strategy (if any) used by the participant to modulate emotions and the specific strategy (if any) used to modulate warmth. Though this step was added midway through coding, my RA and I both went back to earlier transcripts and re-read our coding, then derived these summary sentences. This summary allowed us to draw high-level conclusions about each participant, but also allowed us to compare across participants. Table 10 depicts the fifth portion of the worksheet.

## Inter-coder Agreement

As previously mentioned, my RA and I reviewed our parallel coding continuously. I decided to utilize the process of negotiated inter-coder agreement as we reviewed our independent codes and addressed discrepancies between our independent coding. This is a process by which multiple coders can resolve discrepancies in coding through discussion. It is "advantageous in exploratory research…where generating new insights is the primary concern (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013, p. 306). Upon engaging in negotiated inter-coder agreement across all portions of the worksheet, we were reliable in 99.33% of cases. There were only two discrepancies (0.67%) left unresolved across the 15 transcripts coded with this method. I revised my answer in accordance with my research assistant's opinion 48.67% of the time, and she revised her answer in accordance with my opinion 50.67% of the time. This suggested that the authority dynamics in our relationship did not seem to affect our negotiations significantly (Campbell et al., 2013).

Of note, negotiated inter-coder agreement was not calculated for the first five transcripts, as these were used to derive and apply the coding scheme at the outset of the coding process. When reviewing these first five participants together, we often had left items un-coded or used one another as a sounding board to decide ambiguous items. Further, one participant was jointly coded due to the complexity of her particular situation, and one participant was jointly coded due to unanticipated technical complications. As such, seven participants in total were not included in any negotiated inter-coder agreement calculations.

## Identifying Themes

As is common in qualitative research, after completing the coding, I began identifying core themes present in the data. In order to do so, I examined the overall percentages of

participants that fell into the "yes," "no," or "unsure" categories for the global emotion and warmth-related questions, as well as the summary questions. I read the 1-2-sentence summary statements provided by myself and my RA in the final portion of the coding worksheet. I also examined the pattern of emotion-related experiences reported by each participant as well as the pattern of warmth-related experiences report by each participant. In effect, for each participant, I read across each row in Figures 2 and 3 to "tell myself a story" about a given participant's experiences with emotions and warmth. For example, I might glean the following, based on my reading:

> Participant Z reported feeling like certain emotions were unacceptable in her workplace and that women were held to a different standard for emotionality. She reported four instances of frustration and one instance of anger, yet only openly displayed one instance of frustration because she felt comfortable showing her peer, whom she trusted. She felt like she could not reveal any negative emotions to her team members. In all five cases, she modulated her emotions to some extent, just far less with her peer. She openly displayed the two instances of positive emotions (excitement/passion and happiness) to her team when she experienced them, without modulating them, sharing that she thought it was motivational. She reported believe that warmth was an aspect of good leadership and also felt as if there were gendered expectations for her warmth. She tended to amplify behavioral manifestations of being warm (reported two instances of this), particularly when dealing with her direct reports or supervisors. She reasoned that this was part of her leadership role. She also tamped down her assertiveness because she had received negative reviews in the past when she was too firm or direct. She shared that this led to her feeling inauthentic at times.

My conclusions were not written anywhere; rather, I kept them in mind as I read through each coding worksheet to get a sense of potential patterns across participants. Using this method of continuously reading and re-reading the coding worksheets, the themes started to take shape. Ultimately, 11 themes were extracted from the coding, which are reported in the next chapter.

## Validity Issues

Validity is a concern in any research study, regardless of method (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Qualitative research in particular may be the target of criticisms related to the validity of

findings, due to the active involvement of the researcher and the types of data that are collected. With regard to qualitative research, Maxwell (2013) defined validity as "the correctness of credibility of a description, conclusion, explanation, interpretation, or any other sort of account" (p. 122). Notably, there has been some criticism of attempting to impose the traditional positivist framework of validity on qualitative research, as the goal is often to understand unique perspectives, as opposed to documenting one objective truth (Creswell, 2012; Maxwell, 2013). With that said, qualitative researchers have been responsive to validity concerns and there are numerous strategies these researchers employ to manage threats to validity (Creswell, 2012). In the context of this study, potential validity threats were acknowledged and mitigated wherever possible, in service of bolstering the accuracy of my interpretations. Importantly, it is not possible to manage all validity concerns; thus, threats to validity are honestly and openly reported below. My goal is to ensure that data collection and analysis are as transparent as possible.

One important strategy to increase the credibility and accuracy of qualitative research findings is reporting "thick" descriptions of the phenomenon under study (Creswell, 2012). This involves providing detailed and rich examples of the content of participants' reports. This allows the reader to decide how to interpret and apply the information uncovered in the study, particularly when seeking to apply it to other settings. In this dissertation, I made every effort to provide verbatim thick descriptions when conveying key themes or ideas.

Creswell (2012) also suggested engaging in member-checking, the act of seeking input from participants on the conclusions drawn from the study. This process ensures that findings are accurately interpreted and represented as well as honors the participants' impression of the phenomenon under study (Maxwell, 2013). To this end, while I did not ask participants to

engage in a second interview or a focus group to discuss my interpretations, after identifying my coding scheme, I reached out to each participant with my coding scheme to solicit feedback, if she was willing to provide it. Participant feedback consisted of highlighting additional codes that might be added to the coding scheme as well as noting the potential for my coding scheme to be too narrow. Participants did not disagree with any of the codes I did include in the scheme, lending support to the idea that the extant codes were a valid representation of some portion of their experience. I also shared the final themes derived from the data analysis with each participant to explore her reactions and feedback. Again, this was not required, but was an option offered to participants. No participants offered constructive feedback on the themes.

Another strategy for ensuring validity is utilizing triangulation, which is defined as leveraging multiple methods, sources, and researchers to amass data (Creswell, 2012). In this study, one key limitation involved the use of one primary data collection technique (interviews), as well as my decision to interview all participants myself. Seeking a more varied range of data through additional sources or involving additional researchers in data collection would increase the depth, nuance, and validity of my findings. This was not possible in this study and, as such, the conclusions drawn are subject to these limitations.

Related to this, researcher bias is another potential validity concern, defined as a researcher letting his/her own preconceptions cloud the interpretation of the data and/or attending to specific pieces of data that have personal salience (Maxwell, 2013). As previously described, I endeavored to maintain my reflexivity; that is, I aimed to be vigilant about the effects of my own positionality, background, experiences, and biases on the data collection and analysis process. I often revisited my own experiences with the phenomena of interest and reminded myself of my initial assumptions, attempting to rigorously hold myself accountable for the ways in which I

influenced my own results. However, I cannot fully account for how I may have unconsciously infused data collection and analysis with aspects of my own personhood. With this said, involving an RA in the coding of the interview data helped to ameliorate this concern. I actively encouraged my RA to continue challenging my ideas to invite alternate viewpoints. Further, I provided the themes and model to my RA and my sponsor for feedback. In particular, my RA's deep immersion in the data was used to ensure I had not overemphasized a particular idea or neglected to include a major thread in the data.

As such, my own subjective impressions and interpretations as the researcher were tested, challenged, and revised in collaboration with my RA (and at times, my sponsor). This cross-checking of my ideas with someone else was one attempt to appropriately highlight and manage my biases. In general, as both Maxwell (2013) and Creswell (2012) advised, my goal was not to act as if I could leave my personhood behind in the midst of data collection and analysis; rather, it was to enact reflexivity wherever possible, ensuring that I was aware of, and honest about, my own influence on the research process.

# CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This chapter first clarifies how emotions and warmth were conceptually defined during data analysis. Next, the data are described according to the coding scheme outlined in the prior chapter. Finally, the themes derived from the data are described.

## Working Definitions of Emotions and Warmth

The previous chapter described how my RA and I conceptualized both emotions and warmth throughout the coding process. In the process of analyzing the data, deriving themes, and looking *across* emotions and warmth, further clarifying my working definition of these constructs was necessary. In particular, finding nuances that allowed me to understand how these constructs differed was essential to me reporting the data accurately in this chapter.

In terms of emotions, in addition to the previously-reported definition of emotion (responses to "what emotions do you experience?" as asked in the interview; mentions of basic [Ekman, 1992] or additional emotions [Zelenski & Larsen, 2000]; sentiments expressed with "felt" or "feeling" language), I began to view emotions as relatively discrete, transient experiences which were internal to the participant. While some participants did ultimately display emotions externally (either by choice or in moments where they reacted so quickly their emotionality was apparent), the primary way that participants seemed to experience emotions was in the form of internal states.

In contrast, warmth, as reported by participants and as coded by me and my RA, seemed to exist in the space *between* people—as in warmth was conveyed (or not conveyed) by a participant to another person, or another person experienced (or did not experience) a participant's warmth. While emotions might arguably exist in a vacuum, warmth seemed to relate to the ways in which participants interacted with others. Thus, in addition to the previously

described definition of warmth (traits or behaviors that convey concern for others, sensitivity to others, or positive intent; service-oriented behaviors; specific mentions of kindness, friendliness, compassion; being "nice," nurturing, sensitive, or caring; traits or behaviors that are described as characteristically feminine or womanly), I began to conceptualize warmth as being related to the tenor of interpersonal interactions between participants and others in their workplaces. These two working definitions frame the descriptive information and themes presented in the following sections.

## Descriptive Information

As mentioned in the methods section, each transcript was coded according to the coding worksheet. I use the revised research questions to guide how I describe the data:

1. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*
2. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate warmth displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*

### Modulation of Emotional Displays

In service of addressing research question 1, *"Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace?"* Table 11 reflects the global assessment of whether or not a given participant modulates emotions at work, revealing that 95% of participants were coded as modulating emotions at work.

To further understand the potential drivers behind *why* participants might modulate their emotions (research question 1a), Table 12 reflects the percentage of participants who were coded in the yes, no, or unsure categories across the global emotion codes. To summarize, the most frequently reported item was "Emotion management/modulation important to the actual work at hand" (82% of participants), followed by "Gendered expectations and/or consequences for emotional expression" (73% of participants). These codes helped to provide an answer to research question 1a, which asked why participants might modulate emotions. The data suggested that the majority of participants did report situational factors (i.e., task) and gender as potentially influencing their emotional modulation, in response to research question 1a.

Table 13 displays the percentage of participants who reported each emotional experience, arranged in order of frequency. This table does not directly answer a research question, but it provides greater depth in addressing question 1, as well as 1a, 1b, and 1c. It depicts the specific emotions that participants were experiencing, which furthers our understanding of what specific emotions were being modulated in this sample. In determining why and how emotions were modulated (questions 1a and 1b) as well as the outcomes that may be experienced (question 1c), it is helpful to know which emotions were being experienced in the first place. Of note, participants sometimes reported emotions from earlier in their career (contrasting these experiences with the position they were focusing on during the interview); though these were coded, they were excluded from the percentages in the table.

The most frequently reported emotional experience overall was "General Negative Emotions" (77% of participants). The most frequently reported specific emotion was frustration (73% of participants). Adrenaline, boredom, grateful/lucky, and humiliation/shame were the least frequently reported emotions (5% of participants reported each of these). Of note, the General

Negative Emotions and General Positive Emotions categories captured those instances in which a participant spoke to simultaneously experiencing more than one negative emotion or more than one positive emotion, respectively. For example, a participant might have reported both frustration *and* anger in response to a stimulus, or both accomplishment/pride *and* happiness in response to another stimulus. Thus, the percentages associated with specific emotions did not account for those participants who reported experiencing multiple specific emotions at once. Overall, the results in Table 13 indicated that participants experienced an array of emotions in the workplace.

Thus, examining Tables 11-13 suggested that the majority of participants did modulate a range of emotions (research question 1), with a variety of factors impinging on modulation (research question 1a). Research question 1a is further expanded on in the themes, where research questions 1b and 1c are also addressed.

**Modulation of Warmth Displays**

To address research question 2, "*Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate displays of warmth in the workplace?"* Table 14 reflects the global assessment of whether or not a given participant modulated warmth at work, revealing that 86% of participants were coded as modulating warmth at work.

Table 15 displays the percentages of participants who were coded in the yes, no, or unsure categories across the global warmth-related codes. These codes partially addressed research question 2a, which asked *why* women leaders might modulate their warmth displays. The codes offered a variety of potential influences on warmth modulation. Here, the most frequently reported item was "Being a woman in a male-typed job, field, or industry feeling salient in the workplace" (91% of participants). This was followed by "Different

standards/expectations for warmth by gender" (73% of participants). These codes reflected the possible influence of context and gender on modulating warmth (research question 2a), though this is explored more fully in the themes later in this chapter.

Table 16 addressed research question 2b by displaying *how* participants conveyed warmth, failed to convey warmth, or suppressed warmth. This table shows the percentage of participants who reported each warmth-related behavior or trait, in order of frequency. Of note, participants sometimes reported warmth-related behaviors or traits from earlier in their career (contrasting these experiences with the position they were focusing on during the interview); though these were coded, they were excluded from the percentages below. The most frequently reported warmth-related behavior or trait was actually "Other" (95% of participants). This was likely reflective of the breadth of behaviors or traits that were related to warmth as well as our coding guidelines, which directed us to code the opposite of any item in the behavior or trait list as "other," if another code could not be applied. Within the "other" category, the most commonly reported experience was a constellation of assertiveness-related traits, e.g., assertiveness, directness, advocating for one's perspective, standing up for oneself, and the like. Fourteen participants (64%) reported behavior consistent with this idea. The next most common warmth-related behavior or trait was "Behavior: Being warm/friendly/approachable (91% of participants). These codes provide depth and nuance in considering *how* warmth was communicated, which is further elaborated on in the themes.

In summary, examining the frequencies associated with each global emotion code and each specific emotion allowed me to answer whether or not participants modulated emotions (research question 1), which emotions they modulated, and potential reasons why they might have modulated (research question 1a). Examining the frequencies associated with each warmth

code allowed me to address whether or not participants modulated warmth (research question 2), why they might have modulated warmth (research question 2a), and how they might have modulated warmth (research question 2b). To further address questions 1a, 2a, and 2b as well as to answer questions 1b, 1c, and 2c, themes were derived from the data.

## Themes

Ultimately, 11 high-level themes were derived from the data. Five themes related to emotions, five related to warmth, and one related to the intersection of these two constructs. The five emotion themes addressed the research questions 1a, 1b, and 1c, whereas the five warmth themes addressed the research questions 2a, 2b, and 2c. The final theme summarized the connection between emotion and warmth modulation that emerged from the data. Table 17 depicts these themes.

Before delving into the themes, it is important to note that the initial data collection was focused on the "why" and "how" of warmth modulation. As previously mentioned, the research questions then evolved into capturing the "why," "how," and outcomes of both emotion and warmth modulation. If I were to conceptualize this study through the lens of a classic input-throughput-output model, both the initial and the revised research questions address the throughput portion of this type of model. However, participants shared the antecedents, or the inputs, that led to emotions or warmth-related behaviors or traits. They also described the organizational (e.g., impact on the task at hand, the group, interpersonal relations with colleagues) and personal consequences (e.g., emotional or psychological impact on self) that resulted *from* emotional or warmth modulation. Sample antecedents to emotional and warmth modulation were captured in our coding and are reflected in Table 18. Antecedents included general stimuli, such as being in a leadership role, working with peers, or working with

superiors. Conversely, antecedents might be specific, such as a direct report with a bad attitude, working in a beautiful physical space, or succeeding in winning a piece of business. As reflected in these examples, specific stimuli also ranged in how positive or negative they were, e.g., a participant experiencing a patient having a good outcome versus a participant experiencing a dangerous situation at work.

I also felt compelled to summarize the *outcomes* of these processes. The final theme in the emotion section refers to the impacts of modulating emotions, or failing to modulate emotions, on participants. Two themes in the warmth section refer to the effects of modulating warmth, or failing to modulate warmth, on participants and their workplaces.

**Emotion Themes**

Five themes relating to emotions and emotionality were distilled from the data. They address the first research question and sub-questions: *1. Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate displays of emotion in the workplace? 1a. If so, why? 1b. If so, how? 1c. If so, what are the outcomes?* The themes include: **Theme 1: Emotional Modulation as a Component of Competence**, **Theme 2: Emotionality as a Tool**, **Theme 3: Unacceptable Emotions, Theme 4: Techniques for Processing Emotions**, and **Theme 5: Personal Outcomes of Modulating Emotions**. Several subthemes were also derived, which are reported below. The themes below are ordered to first address *why* emotions were modulated in response to research question 1a (Themes 1, 2, and 3), then *how* they were modulated in response to research question 1b (Theme 4), and finally, what *impacts* arose from modulation in response to research question 1c (Theme 5).

**Theme 1: Emotional modulation as a component of competence.** The first theme offers one potential reason why participants might modulate emotions, addressing research

question 1a. It captures the idea that emotional management helped participants to succeed in their jobs. Two subthemes are also explained below, relating to gender (*Subtheme 1a*) and leadership/managerial roles (*Subtheme 1b*). In looking across all participants, 91% reported statements consistent with this overall theme. Various idiosyncratic rationales were offered to explain how emotional modulation related to competence, such as some participants believing that the work at hand required them to be non-emotional: "While you are being emotional, you are not being productive" (Participant K, Legal Field, Baby Boomer). Another example is included below:

> I do think that in general, a surgeon is going to be more effective and better at their job if they're not emotional, which doesn't mean to not connect with patients…. But I also think, particularly in the operating room, if you're getting anxious or very frustrated or emotional, you're going to have difficulty doing your job effectively. (Participant J, Surgeon, Generation X)

Others believed that modulating their emotions helped them to work effectively with others at work. Participants spoke to modulating emotional displays because openly showing their emotions was unprofessional, immature, inappropriate, or unproductive (e.g., "but I've kind of tried to stop being in people's faces about it [frustration], because it just, I think it spirals things more out of control" [Participant F, Surgeon, Generation X]). Additional descriptive statements include:

> *Interviewer: So, in these situations when you're feeling a range of emotions…how do you cope with these emotions?*
> I think I mostly just always strive to remain professional. I mean I would say above and beyond, that would be my goal at work is to always have that sort of professional outlook…and, um, if situations do get stressful, I think it's even more important to remain professional. (Participant Q, Surgeon, Millennial)

> *In relation to an angry colleague:*
> He got very, very, very worked up and started, you know, really not speaking appropriately to me and I was like, I'm not gonna have this conversation if we can't have mutual respect for each other. You know, once you cool down come into my office and- and we can figure it out." And I walked away. And, um, somebody had heard that

> conversation, 'cause- outside of his office and came over and said, "I can't believe you- that's how you managed that conversation. That was awesome."… And I said, "Well what else am I gonna do?" I'm not gonna get worked up with him and then we both can't focus and have that clear mind to actually resolve the issue, you know. (Participant V, Finance, Millennial)

There were also concerns about the impact their emotionality might have on how others perceived their competence. Displays of negative emotions (e.g., anger, frustration) were seen as particularly detrimental to conveying a professional demeanor or to moving work forward. The following statement explicates this idea:

> [Reacting with frustration will] build barriers that you have to deal with in the future. It's going to damage working relationships, I mean no one likes to be yelled at. No one likes to be called out. And so, it's just more effective…. Me exposing my frustration, and what I'm really feeling at that second, isn't going to further my goal of what I'm trying to get done. (Participant M, Technology, Generation X)

Notably, in service of modulating emotions to convey competence, some participants also spoke to engaging in EL-like behaviors when they experienced emotions. For example, the first of the following quotes provides a textbook example of surface acting (i.e., changing observable expressions, but not internal feelings; Grandey, 2000), whereas the second relates to deep acting (i.e., changing internal feelings to match external expressions; Grandey, 2000):

> I just try and keep a smile on my face even if I'm like super pissed. You grit your teeth and smile and say, "Thank you. Yep, that works." And you do not feel that way at all. (Participant E, Surgeon, Millennial)

> Because you have to understand where they're coming from or else, you won't be able to draw the bridge and get on the same page. (Participant V, Finance, Millennial)

***Subtheme 1a: Emotional modulation is particularly important for women.*** A subtheme emerged from this overall theme, wherein 68% of participants indicated that displaying emotions as a *woman* has a particularly negative effect on others' perceptions of competence. Many participants were aware of the stereotype that women are more emotional than men (Fischer, 1993) and sought to dampen their own emotional displays in the face of this stereotype. Others

reported the sense that there were different standards for women's emotional displays, as men were given more leeway for displaying emotionality, particularly negative emotions. Participants often reported detrimental outcomes when they did express emotions openly. Descriptive statements include:

> But I know he doesn't- he's not like said this to me, but I've just kind of like, felt the vibes that when I get...emotional, and not in the sense of crying, but when I get very passionate, or angry, or like, disagreeing with him on something...and maybe my voice raises a few notches, he doesn't respond well. He's not hearing me anymore, he's just...he just feels like, the hysterics. And I've told myself that, I'm like, "okay, you cannot show your emotion to him because he's not gonna hear what you're saying"...and I feel like that's the case with a lot of men. At least in my experiences in the workplace. (Participant P, Law [Sports], Millennial)

> I'm a woman, I'm not supposed to be loud…. Lots of us were getting, um, emotional, and I stood up and said something about the president…and one of my colleagues stood up and said "Well, let's not get hysterical." He called me hysterical in that meeting, and I (laughs), I kinda went 'ugh'.... And then I thought, 'Am I hysterical? No, I'm, I'm excited, and I'm upset.... But I'm not hysterical.' And he didn't call that male colleague of mine on the right who just said other things in an, in a very excited way, he didn't call him hysterical. (Participant U, Scientific Research, Baby Boomer)

***Subtheme 1b: Emotional modulation is particularly important for leaders/managers.***

Another subtheme surfaced within this overall theme. Fourteen of 22 participants (64%) reported that emotional modulation is key to taking up a leadership or management role. Some participants described the feeling that their emotional displays were highly visible to their direct reports, and as such, they felt a responsibility to limit emotional displays, such as:

> Part of the definition [of leadership], like I think I said earlier, like I really think the surgeon sets the tone, and I think that, um, that is a responsibility of the leader is to be cognizant of that…to at least some extent and try to- to the best of their.... We all have bad days where we feel cranky or whatever but try to the best of your ability to like set that tone...'cause I do think that that is an important part being the leader of that situation. (Participant Q, Surgeon, Millennial)

Others reported that successfully modulating emotions was important when ascending the career ladder to leadership positions or when holding a role that is high in the hierarchy. For

example, participants reported, “You know, at my level you can’t really...you have to stay cool” (Participant V, Finance, Millennial) and “In a very professional place, you don’t really get to the high levels of achievement if emotions get into the equation at all, at that point” (Participant K, Legal Field, Baby Boomer).

Overall, Theme 1 and Subthemes 1a and 1b addressed research question 1a, providing three potential reasons why participants might have modulated their emotions. First, they connected emotional modulation to competence. Second, they did not want to fulfill the stereotype of an overly emotional, incompetent woman. Third, they viewed emotional modulation as an important leadership competency.

**Theme 2: Emotionality as a tool**. The next theme summarizes a second reason why participants might modulate emotions, again addressing research question 1a. It captures the idea that emotions can be used strategically in service of achieving a specific outcome, conveying information, or creating a certain impression, which was reported by 68% of participants. Some participants showed their emotion to communicate the seriousness of a situation, particularly if a direct report had made an error. Others held back their emotions the majority of the time, so that when they did display emotions, others took the matter at hand seriously. Further statements that describe this theme include:

> I needed my boss’s help to break down a couple barriers…. And, I was pretty open with my frustration with him…. And I think that it’s rare for people to see that. And so when he does, it gets his attention. (Participant M, Technology, Generation X)

> So I think that’s probably another reason why I remain a little bit more stronger, because then if I do have an emotional reaction to something, it’s like, “Oh, [Participant name] is reacting to this, that means it’s a bit more serious. (Participant O, Scientific Research, Millennial)

On the positive side, some spoke to leveraging emotion to motivate and engage others, such as:

> If things are going well, I'll actually just comment, "Hey, things are going well here. Let's keep up the pace" [positive tone]." You know?… I will convey, "Hey, things are moving smoothly. Good. Let's keep this up, everybody." You know, because there's usually a team of people around me. Let's all keep moving in the right direction. So, that's probably how I convey that, just to let people know that hey, this is, this is where we should be, let's keep move...let's keep.... This is a good place to be. (Participant B, Surgeon, Generation X)

In sum, this theme provides another reason underlying potential emotional modulation (research question 1a), wherein participants modulate emotions to achieve a goal.

**Theme 3: Unacceptable emotions.** The next theme also relates to why participants might modulate emotions, providing another response to research question 1a. This theme addresses the specific emotions that 68% of participants reported were not acceptable to show at work, most commonly crying, anger, or displays of "extreme" emotions. One subtheme described the rates of displaying versus suppressing particular emotions as well as the rates of modulating these emotions.

In terms of the overall theme, participants were explicit in stating that it felt as if specific emotions could not be expressed, e.g., multiple people stated, "There's no crying/tears in [field or industry name]" and/or used the statement from the movie *A League of Their Own,* "there's no crying in baseball" (Marshall, 1992) as a metaphor for their industry. Other participants reported receiving feedback or advice from colleagues or superiors that particular emotions should not be displayed, e.g., "One of my female bosses told me I shouldn't cry at work in front of men" (Participant N, Finance, Millennial). Finally, some spoke to instances where specific emotions were displayed and resulted in negative reactions from others. One participant shared experiences relating to two different emotions:

> *In relation to putting pet to sleep:* And he looks at me and he goes, "Are you crying at work?" And I said, "I was but I'm done now." And he goes, "Why...You don't cry at work. What's- what's going on with you?" So I told him and I knew he had [pets], right…. So I told him what was going on and what had made me cry and he went,

> "Doesn't matter. You don't cry. I don't want to see you crying in here again. I didn't realize you were that weak." (Participant L, Finance, Generation X)

> There were other ones that happened where things would happen and I had an absolute sense of outrage or just like who- who does that? And was- was, you know, reprimanded for that, told, "No, listen, that- that is not your place to- to question that or to- to pass a judgment on whether something is appropriate or not appropriate. It just is and all you get to do is deal with it. (Participant L, Finance, Generation X)

Some participants supplied additional reasoning for why these emotions were unacceptable. In relation to crying, participants hypothesized that crying is typically associated with women and may be seen as a sign of weakness:

> There's no tears in [field]…. There's just not. And maybe that will change at some point but if you're a woman in [field], you can never be seen crying…. Like it's just not acceptable. Like you cannot do it. If you do, people around you will never look at you the same. It just, you can't do it.... Which is not right or fair, but it just is what it is right now. (Participant Q, Surgeon, Millennial)

> You know there've definitely been a couple of times in my career when I've cried in front of people.… And honestly, that's one of the things that I've hated, it's like, there are times when women just cry. And maybe that's what we do instead of throwing a chair out the window…and, especially in a professional setting, that's not effective. And I didn't do it, to try to influence anybody, it was just the emotion was there.
> *Interviewer: Of course. Sure. And why, I guess do you think, it, it is ineffective, or the others react in a way that's not helpful?*
> So I also worked at [different organization] for six years, which was about eighty-five percent female. So it's been interesting I guess that, my, my career has been very male-focused, and then I've had one situation that's very female-focused…. I was just thinking, I could've been in a meeting with women, and showed that emotion, and it would've been fine…. And I would've gotten nurturing, and sort of coaching, and support. That's not going to happen in a, a room full of men. You're, you're going to be perceived as weak. (Participant M, Technology, Generation X)

In relation to anger, participants often alluded to different standards for expression of anger in men versus women, wherein anger is particularly detrimental to women:

> *In relation to an irate man:* I won't say a woman would never do with that, but that would be so far outside. That would be almost inconceivable for a woman to be able to show that much anger and frustration, and act upon it.
> *Interviewer*: *Can you say more about that? Sort of why that would be inconceivable?*
> It's just, women don't interact like that in [industry]. You would lose, you would lose your credibility and your effectiveness, almost immediately. And whereas there was a

> path back for him, for credibility. There'd be no path back for you would, you would effectively be done in your ability...to accomplish something. (Participant M, Technology, Generation X)

> What is jumping to my mind is that what I was mainly experiencing was fury…and anger, and frustration, and wanting to kill people…and what was coming across was that I felt very weak, and upset, and tearful, and a victim…. So I think there was something about my anger getting reframed as a much more sort of feminine um, an acceptable sort of...so I think I, and I think I actually, I actually think I've got work to do this on a personal level as well. But, so, I think that, that the emotions I was really feeling, which were primarily anger, and frustration, and humiliation when I could not express...I either couldn't express, or was not permitted to express, and what I think it came off as was a much more um, ah, sort of more clichéd, female, weaker emotional reaction. (Participant H, Risk, Generation X)

For frustration, one participant hypothesized that negative reactions to her expressing this emotion were related to her gender identity:

> I also feel like as a woman, people.... People, like, always just think that, like, you're, like, their mother…. And, like, there's always this, like, nagging thing…. Whereas, if one of, like, my male colleagues would go and tell you, like, "You're taking too long for this x-ray." It would be different. (Participant F, Surgeon, Generation X)

Several participants commented that strong displays of emotions in general (whether positive or negative) were unacceptable in their workplace or field/industry, noting that it would be highly unusual and not well-received.

In summary, there is evidence to support the idea that emotions such as sadness (conveyed through tears), frustration, or anger are not acceptable to display at work.

**Subtheme 3a: Implicit rates of expression and modulation.** One related finding emerged in relation to this overall theme, based on quantitative analyses. While Theme 3 captures explicit tenets of emotional expression, Subtheme 3a attempts to elucidate more implicit beliefs around the acceptability of various emotions.

For example, as reflected in Table 13, frustration was reported most frequently out of all *specific* emotions (named in 16 participants; frustration and annoyance were used

interchangeably for one additional participant not included in the 16 who reported solely frustration; thus, in total, 77% of participants reported frustration). Yet, in looking across all instances of reported frustration, it was openly expressed only 34% of the time. Further, 77% of the time, participants reported attempting to modulate frustration in some way. Related, anger, while less frequently reported by participants (36% of sample), was openly expressed only 18% of the time when it was experienced. Participants also attempted to modulate anger 73% of the time. Finally, "General Negative Emotions" were reported in 77% of participants. This category captured those who spoke to experiencing more than one negative emotion simultaneously, e.g., frustration *and* anger, or who reported negative emotions in general. General negative emotions were openly displayed only 41% of the time and participants attempted to modulate them 76% of the time. Therefore, for these negative emotions, participants reported hiding their emotions the majority of the time as well as reported attempting to modulate these particular emotions the majority of the time.

In comparison, "Enjoyment/satisfaction/contentment/fulfillment," the most frequently reported specific positive emotion (reported by 45% of the sample), was openly displayed 69% of the time and modulated only 38% of the time. Further, "General Positive Emotions," the next most commonly reported positive emotional experience (reported by 41% of the sample), was openly displayed 67% of the time and modulated only 40% of the time. Thus, there is additional evidence suggesting that frustration, anger, or general negative emotions might be unacceptable to display, meaning that myriad participants seemed to hold tacit beliefs that they should *not* be displayed and *should* be modulated, which contrasted with tacit beliefs about positive emotions.

Overall, this theme suggests that another set of reasons undergirding emotional modulation (research question 1a) relates to the emotions that are acceptable or unacceptable in a

given organizational context. Further, participants also seemed to harbor innate "rules" regarding which emotions were appropriate to display and which should be modulated and/or hidden.

**Theme 4: Techniques for processing emotions.** The next theme relating to emotions addresses research question 1b, which inquired about *how* participants modulate their emotions. This theme involves the 91% of participants who spoke to the myriad ways in which they process, manage, or release their emotions. Two subthemes are also contained under this overarching theme, reflecting consistent reports of managing emotions within the confines of the workplace (Subtheme 4a) or outside the workplace (Subtheme 4b).

In general, participants reported a diverse array of methods to handle emotions, including removing themselves from a situation, taking deep breaths, counting to 10, and others. The following quotes provide additional depth:

> I guess just like taking a deep breath, slowing down, like really trying to, really trying to focus on what's...you know, a lot of times there's a lot of stuff going on, people asking you questions left and right so really in those stressful moments, trying to really just focus on, you know, the most important thing at that moment and sort of try to cut out those distractions and just.... Yeah I guess just try to take a deep breath and sort of slowing down and- and just kinda focusing. (Participant Q, Surgeon, Millennial)

> Like I've definitely had situations that have been emotionally trying, and certainly, in that case, I go and take a shower, (laughs), I cry a little, then I come back, and I'm ready to work. I kind of give myself a timeout, as it were, like, you know, be by myself, not feel like I have other people's pressure on my shoulders. Deal with my emotions and then kind of come back to the problem fresh, um, with like having spent that emotional energy, um, like respecting my psyche, so to speak, and kind of coming back to the problem. (Participant O, Scientific Research, Millennial)

In general, this theme reflects the idea that participants reported deploying a diverse array of intrapersonal strategies to manage their emotions.

***Subtheme 4a: Intra-workplace management.*** This subtheme refers to those participants who reported managing their emotions within the workplace, most frequently by sharing emotional experiences with specific colleagues (reported by 68% of participants). As mentioned

in the first emotion theme, direct reports were rarely leveraged as an outlet for emotions. On the whole, displaying emotions to peers felt most appropriate to participants. With that said, several participants reported that they were unable to openly display their emotions to their peers, often due to a lack of trust or because of the political undercurrents of the organization. The following quotes represent this range in comfort with peer-related disclosure of emotion:

> So the other female in my group that I said is like, basically my peer, I'm comfortable like showing- not showing my frustration like, at her…. But if- if I'm frustrated at a situation, like I can go vent to her. Because usually we're on the same page about things and we have the same boss, so um...and we just deal with a lot of the same situations. And when I'm frustrated at an outcome, um, she usually is too because we just kind of have the same mindset on these things. And...so she's kind of like the one I'll just go and just get all my frustrations out to. (Participant P, Law [Sports], Millennial)

> If I were to have a very open conversation with some of my peers, I would fully expect that to be used against me at some point in the future…. And it would be used as a vulnerability. (Participant G, Finance, Baby Boomer)

In terms of superior-facing interactions, participants were typically more reticent to openly share emotions, though some reported that they did feel comfortable voicing their reactions to their bosses (or to those higher in the hierarchy who were not directly overseeing them). Descriptive statements included:

> *For a participant working at two different organizations:* I've had disagreements or I've had, um, kind of, I've been in, you know, been expressing anger to my, um, my chair at [Organization 1], and the response back from him is very different than the response at [Organization 2], uh, where he's more like, empowers me. (Participant F, Surgeon, Generation X)

> There's another woman in my department, um...that she's my superior, but she's been like uh, really great to work with…I feel, I feel like we're, her and I are on the same page a lot of times, so to an extent I feel comfortable going to her, but she is well above me, so I don't want to get too, I don't know, not comfortable but…I just still wanna keep that like, professional- that level of professionalism with her. (Participant P, Law [Sports], Millennial)

This subtheme depicts examples of managing emotions *within* the workplace through interpersonal interactions with colleagues.

***Subtheme 4b: Extra-workplace management.*** There was an additional subtheme reported by 59% of participants, related to venting to individuals outside of the workplace, including friends, former colleagues, significant others, or online groups. Participants used interpersonal interactions outside of the workplace to help modulate emotions. Descriptive statements included:

> I think I take out my frustration out not on people that I'm working with. I bitch a lot on my group texts with my friends about like "this … Fucking idiot just like is such a … what the fuck does this girl think she was doing?" (laughs) And I get that out and all my friends do the same thing about people they're working with. (Participant N, Finance, Millennial)

> Sometimes when I get home from work, I'll mention it to my husband. I also, [am in an online group] with other female surgeons…and so occasionally if, if one of us or myself has [something] that is very frustrating, sometimes I will, um, post something about it on the group, which I think is helpful, getting a lot of feedback or just being able to vent somewhere with people who understand that frustration, have experienced it themselves. And able to do so, not fully anonymously, but you're just, you're a lot more anonymous obviously, behind a keyboard and computer screen than you are face to face with somebody. (Participant J, Surgeon, Generation X)

Further, numerous participants reported either proactively or reactively using self-care techniques, e.g., exercise, sleep, as a method for managing or releasing emotions. These were intrapersonal strategies, wherein participants did not leverage external relationships to manage emotions; instead they took action on their own. For example, participants shared:

> I am very focused on getting enough sleep both because, not even dealing emotionally, but just being effective at work is difficult (laughs) if you're not well-rested. When I was at [former job], I started doing a lot of yoga and I realized that I'm much better at managing my emotions. I'm in a much better head space when I do yoga pretty regularly…. I work out a lot and that that helps me for whatever reason. I don't totally understand why. Yoga is like Zen and stuff so that makes more sense to me. But I go in a spin class when I'm pissed off, or upset or something and it's a really effective way of making me calm down. (Participant N, Finance, Millennial)

> So a lot of times it kinda came down to just almost like a physical, let off of steam. Like, you know, getting on the elliptical bike for a little while, going for a little bit of a hike, and just kinda clearing your mind that way. (Participant D, Scientific Research, Millennial)

In sum, participants spoke to multiple strategies that allowed them to manage their emotions, in response to research question 1b. These strategies were located within the workplace itself or involved relationships or outlets outside of the workplace. Further, they reported both intrapersonal and interpersonal methods for managing their emotions.

**Theme 5: Personal outcomes of modulating emotions.** This final emotion theme relates to research question 1c, which addresses potential outcomes of emotional modulation. It refers to the various personal consequences—psychological, emotional, physical—of modulating emotions reported by participants. Notably, the 64% of participants who commented on this theme shared a diverse array of feelings, reactions, and outcomes, which are described below.

Several participants reflected that their management of emotions had an impact on their relationship with their spouses. For example, one participant noted that her spouse did not believe she managed her stress effectively. Another shared that she would bring home her frustration. Yet another, in relation to staying calm when being yelled at, shared:

> You know, there- it takes a lot of energy out…. Even though I was cool and, um, sometimes my husband's saying that I'm like somehow now emotionless. (laughs) That's his thing these past couple years. (Participant V, Finance, Millennial)

Emotional modulation was described by multiple participants as leading to fatigue; for example:

> I was like, you know, I just, I stayed cool but it definitely- it definitely takes a lot more energy to continue to try to understand where other people are coming from when they're acting irrationally. (Participant V, Finance, Millennial)

As an additional way to conceptualize the energy used by modulating emotions, another participant shared that suppressing her emotions created "turmoil" inside of her. A second shared that in suppressing her emotions, she felt "like that duck that's paddling underneath but gliding on the top" (Participant W, Pharmaceuticals, Generation X).

Suppressing emotions was also described as leading to feelings of inauthenticity, as reported by a participant who noted that her organizational context required her to suppress her anger. Another person shared that the process of suppressing frustration created more frustration in the near-term, but ultimately, she felt "great" if the issue was resolved (if it was not resolved, she felt even more frustrated than she did in the first place). A third shared that after suppressing negative emotions in response to an inappropriate comment, she was in tears and very upset. A fourth noted that suppressing her anger may actually lead to clouding in her functioning, affecting her capacity to complete her overarching task. A fifth noted that suppressing emotions led her to feel "awful" and ultimately negatively affected her sleep. Finally, two others noted that they had received feedback from colleagues about their emotional modulation. These colleagues noted that their emotional modulation made these participants hard to read, and they were probed further about why they did not display more emotionality. These remarks suggest the potential negative outcomes related to suppressing emotions.

In terms *not* modulating emotions, participants reported numerous reactions after they had displayed what they were feeling: one participant shared that she openly expressed frustration, then felt guilty for embarrassing someone else (she had responded assertively to being spoken over publicly). After her frustration had been apparent to a direct report, another participant stated: "She could tell that I was not very happy. And I felt bad that she could tell that I wasn't very happy" (Participant N, Millennial, Finance). A third reported regret that she had openly expressed anger after colleagues made a sexist comment about her:

> And I got really frustrated…. I vented about it later to colleagues, and they took it over the line and called me a sex-ertary, and at that point I was just like, "You have no right to say that to me." And I, I got very angry…. But I wasn't proud of the anger I displayed. (Participant R, Offshore Drilling, Millennial)

Fourth, a surgeon who expressed frustration at the lack of proper operating room supplies felt as if she was overreacting (i.e., "I probably overreact to it and I don't know that that does any good"). Next, a participant who openly showed anger stated that it led to her being unsuccessful at her job. Another participant shared that anonymous complaints were filed about her after she had openly expressed frustration, describing this period as "devastating." Finally, one reported that when she expressed her emotions (through venting to others outside of her organization), she felt as if she was being unprofessional by talking about others "behind their backs." Thus, the intrapersonal reactions to expressing emotions were often negative.

Finally, there was also a subset of participants who spoke to emotionally trying experiences in the past ultimately decreasing their emotionality in the present. Several reported that they no longer felt as if they might cry at work. Others shared that they developed a type of immunity to the stimuli that had previously evoked a reaction in them. Notably, participants tended to view this as protective and helpful to their continued career growth.

In summary, in response to research question 1c, it is clear that myriad outcomes arose from modulating emotions as well as from failing to modulate emotions. The majority were negative outcomes, with a select few exceptions. Interestingly, there were some commonalities in outcomes, but there was also a great deal of idiosyncrasy in what participants reported.

Overall, this section indicates that participants modulated emotions because of wanting to appear competent, because it is important for leaders to do so, because of their gender, because some emotions are unacceptable in an organizational context, or because they wanted to leverage emotions as a tool to convey information. They used various techniques to manage emotions, including intrapersonal and interpersonal tactics, both within and outside of the workplace. Lastly, the effects of modulating, or failing to modulate, emotions ranged from feelings of

exhaustion or inauthenticity, to feeling additional emotion, to experiencing a clouding in functioning.

**Warmth-Related Themes**

Five themes relating to warmth and femininity were extracted from the data. These themes address the second research question and sub-questions: *2. Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate displays of warmth in the workplace? 2a. If so, why? 2b. If so, how? 2c. If so, what are the outcomes?* They include: **Theme 6: Warmth as a Component of Good Leadership**, **Theme 7: Others' Gendered Expectations About Warmth**, **Theme 8: Predicted or Actual Workplace Consequences of Warmth Displays**, **Theme 9: Warmth Communications to Others**, and **Theme 10: Personal Consequences of Modulating Warmth Displays**. Several subthemes were also derived, which are reported below. The themes below are ordered to first address why warmth was modulated, per research question 2a (Themes 6, 7, and 8), then how it was modulated, per research question 2b (Theme 9), and finally, what impacts arose from modulation, per research question 2c (Themes 9 and 10). (Theme 9 addresses two questions simultaneously.)

When reviewing these themes, it is important to note that participants had varied reactions to the word "warmth," despite warmth being defined within the interview as a cluster of positive emotions that convey kindness, approachability, sensitivity, and other similar impressions. Some participants seemed to conceptualize warmth as being stereotypically "girly," others as displaying physical affection, and still others as making space for personal or familial issues to be brought into the workplace. For example, multiple participants made comments about being conscious of hugging others at work in relation to the warmth questions I posed, or explicitly referenced #metoo. Others made comments like "I am not warm and fuzzy" or "I am

not warm and cuddly," seeming to differentiate themselves from their associations to the word "warmth." While this was not formally coded, it is notable that the meaning of warmth constructed by individual participants varied in relation to this construct.

**Theme 6: Warmth as a component of good leadership**. Theme 6 offers one potential reason why participants might modulate warmth, thereby addressing research question 2a. This theme reflects the idea that warmth is a component of good leadership or good management. Nearly three quarters of participants (73%) spoke to this idea. For example:

> That [warmth] is certainly something that I'm trying to, to deliver, at least to tell people I care…. I mean, to be a leader, a good mentor, leader, people have to…feel that leader is genuine and sincere…that's sort of an analogy of warmth…. So, if, if I feel like, you know, my mentor is truly sincere, cares for me and, and my well-being, that's the warmth I feel.... And so, I think that that's the equivalent of a capable leader. (Participant T, Scientific Research, Generation X)

Conveying warmth was seen as a way to understand and solve problems effectively or to resolve disagreements or conflicts; as a way to align employees around common goals; as a way to create an impression of approachability, which allowed direct reports to feel comfortable openly sharing problems with leaders/managers; and as beneficial to team dynamics and the pursuit of the task at hand. Descriptive statements included:

> For instance, like I had a patient that we did a surgery on and then I had left the room and as they were like taking the drapes off, they noticed something wasn't quite right. They came and got me and were like "Hey, this doesn't look right. Could you come back and look at it?" And I did and we fixed it and it was fine. But I think if I was an asshole they wouldn't necessarily have come and told me. You know, like...they woulda been like "Yeah, well, we don't wanna bother her." So, I think- I mean I think for good patient care, I mean it's important for people to be like, "Wait, hang on a second. Like this might not be right. Can you just double check this?" or whatever, you know, and I want my staff...to feel like they could say that to me, um, and not think that I'm gonna like lose my cool or, you know. (Participant Q, Surgeon, Millennial)

> I feel like a lot of my job ends up guiding groups of people to making decisions and coming up with plans together. So I think I find myself a lot of times, trying to gather information from a lot of people, get everybody in the same room and talk about possible approaches to a problem and get everybody's opinions and try to delve [into] all the pros

> and cons...it's my job to get the group to come to a consensus together by…I don't know, there's no exact formula for that, but a lot of it is just trying to make sure everybody feels like they're being heard and that their perspectives are being considered and to get everybody to understand the goals of what we're trying to do as a group.... That everybody's expertise is being valued and hopefully as a group, we can all decide on a direction that everybody wants to go and get everybody excited about doing something and working towards that goal together. (Participant I, Video Games, Millennial)

Some participants did link interacting in a warm way explicitly to their identity as a woman, highlighting that a feminine (i.e., warm) approach is effective; for example:

> I'm very good at diplomatically moving conversations to the desired outcome…. And I think that it's a very female way of interacting in that you're asking, "So has anybody thought about this?"… They're all non-action phrases…. "Well, what if we approached it this way?" And it's all sort of nudging without making explicit demands. And that's not to say that there aren't times when it's like, "It has to be this way." But I find that I do that much more in meetings than anybody else does. But I also do think that in addition to that probably being somewhat of a female approach, it's also much more effective than what I would describe as some male approaches. (Participant M, Technology, Generation X)

> I think that, as leaders in history were predominately male and were outliers if they were female, and given that the predominantly male view of men is to not be empathetic or inclusive, I believe that engaging with teams and engaging with people is not part of what men have typically thought leadership is. I think it's changing because there's a lot more research on empathy and leadership, suggesting that the effective leader is an empathetic leader. For me, it's all about how I engage with people and I bring that part of myself into my leadership role, whereas I think a lot of male peers don't understand that that is actually part of the role. Now they're beginning to understand it because the world is changing, and now they're actually having to learn it.
> *Interviewer: Yeah. So it feels like it comes naturally to you?*
> Yes. (Participant G, Finance, Baby Boomer)

In summary, this theme reflected the idea that warmth displays aligned with many participants' perspectives on how to be a successful and effective manager or leader. Thus, one potential reason why participants modulate their warmth, in line with research question 2a, related to their internal conceptions of leadership.

**Theme 7: Others' expectations about warmth.** This theme is also related to addressing "why" warmth might be modulated (research question 2a). It captures the 77% of participants

who highlighted that others had expectations about women's warmth displays at work. A few participants identified expectations for other women (not for themselves), but the vast majority of participants spoke to others' expectations for their own warmth displays, due to their gender identity, e.g., "They used to jokingly call me the mother of the shift" (Participant D, Scientific Research, Millennial) and "I was viewed in the mother role, whether I should've been or not…. People look at me and see grandma" (Participant U, Scientific Research, Baby Boomer). Other quotes included:

> So, definitely I do think that gender- I think there is a perception, both again from the general public but also, much like many stereotypes and much like many perceptions, within my practice, my partners as well, that women in general are going to be more warm than men are. I think that is perceived, and then of course acted out. Because we kind of tend to fit into our, what, you know, what our perceptions of us are. I don't know, for a variety of reasons probably…. Um, and if I was not warm, it would be seen as unusual. (Participant B, Surgeon, Generation X)

> So my boss will laughingly tell me that it's my job to have all the difficult conversations with people…. He's like, "That's why I hired you. So you're the one who gets to talk to all the people who don't know how to talk to each other and you're the one who gets to show them how to talk to each other." And- and I'm like, "Is that just because I'm the [title]?" And he's like, "Part of it, but mostly it's because you're a woman, you know how to do it." (Participant L, Finance, Generation X)

For a minority of participants, the combination of their gender identity and occupational identity had a particular interactive effect on others' expectations about warmth; for example:

> I think it's very stereotypical [of a] female surgeon is that you have to be a man to be a good female surgeon. And you have to like, be a general, be militaristic, do those kind of things. You can't be girly, you can't be feminine, you can't be compassionate. Which I disagree with, but I think that's definitely pervasive in our field. (Participant E, Surgeon, Millennial)

Of note, nearly a quarter of participants (23%) disagreed with the idea that they as women are expected to show more warmth than a male colleague, or the idea that women in general are expected to show more warmth as compared to male colleagues. For example, one

participant shared, “If a man is not approachable, they won’t be successful either,” in relation to a question probing gendered expectations for warmth.

In summary, while the majority of participants did report gendered expectations of warmth, some disagreed with this idea, instead sharing that warmth was required of both men and women in leadership positions. Therefore, for the majority of participants, gender played a role in explaining why they might modulate displays of warmth, per research question 2a.

**Theme 8: Predicted or actual workplace consequences of warmth displays.** Theme 8 provides another set of reasons related to why participants may have managed their warmth displays, thereby addressing research question 2a. Myriad participants reported a broad array of workplace-related outcomes associated with differing levels of warmth, including not displaying any warmth, to openly displaying warmth, to displaying a *moderated* amount of warmth. Further, participants often spoke to *predictions* about potential outcomes, depending on the extent to which they or other women displayed warmth, such as “I think there’s the perception that someone who’s warm can’t make a hard decision” (Participant P, Law [Sports], Millennial). These predictions or perceptions were reflective of participants’ own beliefs, what they had been told by others, or what they had heard in their organizational context or in the broader societal setting about what might happen in situations where women displayed varying levels of warmth. These experiences or predictions also frequently factored into how participants viewed subsequent situations and what behaviors they exhibited. This theme applies to both research question 2a (why warmth is modulated) and research question 2c (the outcomes of warmth modulation). The reason the theme applies to both questions is because participants used information about prior outcomes or predicted outcomes to make decisions about modulating

warmth in the moment (research question 2a), but also clearly spoke to workplace-related outcomes associated with warmth (research question 2c).

In total, 100% of participants shared some form of opinion on the implications or consequences of displaying no warmth (***Subtheme 8a***), openly displaying warmth (***Subtheme 8b***), or displaying a moderated amount of warmth (***Subtheme 8c***), as described below in the subthemes. Notably, there was a great deal of variation in what was reported by participants, but this overarching theme reflects the idea that warmth displays were something that women leaders were somewhat cognizant of at work. Further, as has been mentioned previously, participants sometimes used warmth and femininity somewhat interchangeably, speaking to consequences relating to how warm *or* how feminine they (or others) appeared in given situations. Thus, the quotes below reflect participants mentioning warmth and/or femininity displays.

***Subtheme 8a: Predicted or actual outcomes of not expressing warmth.*** Notably, demonstrating assertiveness, aggressiveness, or competitiveness was coded as a lack of warmth, per Rudman and Glick's (2001) finding that the display of these traits violates the prescriptive stereotype for feminine communality. Further, in analyzing these interviews, speaking forcefully and firmly without softening one's tone or attempting to adopt more typically feminine ways of speaking (Carli, 1990) was coded as a lack of warmth. In total, 73% of participants offered reflections on the actual or predicted outcomes of not expressing warmth.

Participants reported that failing to display warmth had resulted in an inability to gain political influence, had elicited sexist behavior from male colleagues (i.e., being told to "smile"), and had resulted in being publicly chastised by peers or superiors after speaking assertively. Participants predicted that being seen as lacking warmth could result in others viewing them as being non-collaborative, difficult to work with, a "bitch," or subject to organizational penalties.

One person was highly anxious that a failure to display warmth would have cost her the opportunity to stay in her career long-term. The following quotes exemplify these ideas:

> I think if you're a woman, even if you're market-facing and making a lot of money, if you don't do that more kind of emotional nurturing stuff as a manager, you really get penalized. (Participant H, Risk, Generation X)

> To be honest, I don't really have that much of a basis for comparison, but just my sense from hearing what other women have gone through. They can look at somebody the wrong way or have a certain tone in their voice and get written up for it, while, as far as I know, the men are not, not under that same level of scrutiny. (Participant J, Surgeon, Generation X)

> And, I guess I get a little bit, yeah, like snippy or short with them to try and maybe show that I am strong and confident and know what I am talking about. Like, if I speak more quickly and, like, talk down to them a little bit (laughs), which is very hard for me. I don't like doing that. But, if I do that, then maybe they will stop grilling me.... One of my qualities that I think makes me good for a job like this, is that I am strong, and I am confident. So, it's not like these are completely out of character, comments, but I think, again, maybe it is a gender thing, where like oh, they're not used to being talked down to by a woman…. And I will also just say that, like, I am aware that when I speak like this, it doesn't gain me popularity (laughs)…I don't...I hate this word, but I get called a bitch a lot, or bossy. Things like that. Um, not to my face, per se, but, I know that that's what people say, and it's more that, like, I am the boss, I am forceful and knowledgeable, and when a woman does that, those are the words that get used. (Participant C, Sports Coach, Generation X)

One participant spoke to limiting her warmth when she first started in a male-dominated field as a way to bond with male colleagues, by engaging in a fantasy sports league, drinking beverages favored by male peers, and avoiding being seen as overly feminine. Another participant spoke to limiting her warmth as a way to communicate a clear message to a male colleague who was openly sexist towards another female colleague. A third reported limiting her warmth as a tactic to defend against potential sexism, relating it to the idea that she was the sole woman in multiple settings; for example:

> *In relation to a sexist comment:* I have to have that very tough exterior. Otherwise, things like that would get to me a whole lot more…. It's almost like, if I am not extremely authoritative and…not aggressive...but, like, clear, then, then I sort of leave

> myself open for comments like that to hurt more. (Participant C, Sports Coach, Generation X)

Interestingly, another participant reflected on how her innate personality (not highly expressive of warmth) might have contributed to her success in a male-dominated industry:

> You know, as we've had this conversation, one of the things that's sort of come to me, is I, I wonder if some of my success or my effectiveness in a male dominated industry actually comes from the fact that my natural way of interacting, might be, in the overall social theme, described as more male than more female. So if I look at [former coworkers], they, they exude warmth you know? It's like, you're, you're walking through the office, and I might get a hug…. And I think that may be perceived as more, a more female way of interacting. Having that warmth, having that emotional expression. That isn't my natural way of interacting with people….
> *Interviewer: …So the natural, your sort of more natural approach is more aligned with, or less aligned with, I guess we should say, stereotypically female ways of interacting?*
> Yes…I think that, I think that's fair. And probably more aligned with the more male stereotypical ways of interacting. You know factual, direct. (Participant M, Technology, Generation X)

A connected idea was expressed by a participant who related expected displays of warmth to the concrete responsibilities of her job. She elaborated that displaying warmth would be counter to role-related expectations and that the absence of warmth contributed to her being effective:

> I don't think anyone would expect someone in this position to be someone who would be described as warm…and I'm...I don't think I fit that description really, either. I actually have been described as...not that I've been described as cold, but sometimes I can come across as too cold. And...you know, you never wanna be on- a super extreme. But I think it requires, my role requires someone to be more on the colder side of things. (Participant P, Law [Sports], Millennial)

In summary, there are numerous outcomes, both experienced and predicted, in relation to not displaying warmth. Beyond simply experiencing or predicting outcomes, participants used this information to determine their warmth displays in future settings. Thus, this subtheme relates to research questions 2a and 2c.

***Subtheme 8b: Predicted or actual outcomes of expressing warmth.*** The next subtheme refers to outcomes of openly expressing warmth at work, which comprised a varied array of potential or actual consequences and was mentioned by 100% of participants. Several participants noted that openly expressing warmth led others lower in the hierarchy to seek them out for additional mentoring or advice, thus creating additional work in them having to field these requests. Others spoke to taking on extra work due to their desire to be a collaborative team player with peers (e.g., warmth-related behaviors). One other participant shared that her warmth had resulted in taking on extra-role responsibilities, finding that many colleagues sought her out for advice on a variety of issues, falling outside of her formalized role. Yet, it is important to note that another participant highlighted this same outcome but enjoyed being sought out for advice.

One participant reported that displaying warmth was devalued within her specific organizational context. Another participant spoke to others' unconscious perceptions of her gender identity reducing her credibility, noting that colleagues may have viewed her as "an old doddering woman" (Participant U, Scientific Research, Baby Boomer). A third noted that warmth has led to flirtation from male colleagues:

> Like there are certain men [in workplace] that are just, you know, like they're very, very polite, but the second they think you're friendly, they take friendly to mean something else. And it's good. It's good to have these conversations with other women to kind of know what to expect, like how, who to not be friendly to, which is crazy. (Participant O, Scientific Research, Millennial)

Potential outcomes of displaying warmth include concerns about being seen as "coming onto" men in the workplace, concerns about career growth being limited or not being taken seriously in one's field; for example:

> You know, the times that I will tamper it [warmth] down, are often if I'm meeting with a group of colleagues, and often times I'm the only female in the room, or one of

> two females in the room, depending on the size of the group. And I'll be discussing a um, you know an issue…I sometimes have to put the warm side of me away, and focus on being the more, um, scientific side. You know, to say "Here are the issues, here is what's going on," and kind of put the warm and fuzzy off to the side.… Because, again, in those certain moments you know that you're- know that people don't want the warm and fuzzy at that moment. Um, and so, and you don't want to be too, at that point, you want to be seen as a scientist. And a, not as a warm and fuzzy mother. (Participant B, Surgeon, Generation X)

Interestingly, in line with Hebl and colleagues' (2007) work on sexism directed towards pregnant women, two participants spoke to enduring negative reactions from others when they worked during their pregnancies. Pregnancy is a strong visual marker of femininity and likely has particular resonance in male-typed settings, cuing a violation of gender norms (Hebl et al., 2007). Related, both of these women spoke to occasional negative reactions from colleagues when their parental status was made salient, as did a third participant.

With all of this said, several positive outcomes were reported in relation to warmth displays. Participants shared that displaying warmth is important for professional growth (through networking and meeting new people), when holding a contractor role and seeking to be hired for additional work, and for cultivating a positive team environment or benefitting the organization as a whole. For example:

> I think it's part of sort of maintaining that good environment at work too. It's like when people find you warm and approachable, everything's just more upbeat and things run smoother. (Participant Q, Surgeon, Millennial)

> I do think this more diplomatic, building consensus approach is really effective…and to the extent that can be adopted.... I think women adopt it because we have to. Some men adopt it, because they realize it works…. But I think from a business perspective, the more that it's adopted, the more effective organizations will be overall. (Participant M, Technology, Generation X)

In summary, this subtheme also reflects the idea that participants spoke to outcomes that they experienced or *might* experience due to displaying warmth. Not only are these outcomes

relevant to research question 2c, they also influenced subsequent warmth behavior at work (research question 2a).

**Subtheme 8c: Predicted or actual outcomes of displaying moderate warmth.** The last subtheme captures the idea that some participants (64%) aimed to display a *moderated* amount of warmth but were cautious to display too much or too little. They reported that displaying too much warmth might lead to being "walked over" or others not taking them seriously. Suppressing warmth completely might detract from successfully achieving the task at hand. Further, participants spoke to the need to balance warmth in their role as leader or manager, as they aimed to appear approachable to direct reports while still maintaining high standards for work. Descriptive statements included:

> *Interviewer: So, would it be correct to say it's sort of this idea of being approachable, of getting to know your people sort of you see as a key part of being a leader?*
> Yeah. Absolutely…and I think you have to be- it has to be appropriate though…I'm also, I don't know how to say it but I'm also, people need to respect me as well…And it- and I have to have that balance. So I'm not just gonna sit there ...'cause I've seen leaders do this as well. Where you sit there and you joke around and that's fine and then when you go into a conference room or when you gotta get work done people then- people then don't- people don't take you seriously. So, um, I balance, you know, being approachable but also being a, you know, setting the expec- crystal clear on expectations of people and holding them accountable to it. And, you know, end of story. (Participant V, Finance, Millennial)

> I would say- if I had a young person…. "You've got to walk a fine line." Which is, the fine line is, make sure that you accomplish what you need to accomplish for your career goals and your desires for patients. Don't let people walk over you, because sometimes "warm" can get translated into "pushover." Um, and so you have to be conscientious of that, and not let people walk over you. Put your foot down and stand your ground when it comes to things that really matter. For instance, if it's your patient care, or a career position that's important to you. So it's usually the first advice I give, don't let people push you over because again they often, a pleasant, warm, friendly female might get perceived as somebody that can get walked over. Um, or taken advantage of by other colleagues. So be careful about that, drawing those lines…. But I also then, would also say to them, don't let the coldness of the [field] become you…. Don't lose your ability to be um, compassionate and warm. Just because you want to fit in with the field. (Participant B, Surgeon, Generation X)

Participants also spoke to adapting the level of warmth they displayed based on the individual preferences of their direct reports or based on the personalities of each of their team members or feedback provided by direct reports about preferred leadership or management style, such as:

> I think that's something that coaches, all coaches, have to think about, because individual players need more or less warmth to be their best. Um, and I think that's true for any coach, not just from a female coach. And so, there are times when like I'm really upset with a player but he's a little bit more fragile or he doesn't respond as well to an urgency in my voice and I have to be more warm than I'm feeling. Um, and there are also times, when like usually it comes from a player saying like, "[Participant name], I need you to be harder on me." And so, if I get that feedback then I will sometimes like be a little bit more harsh and demanding when I may internally be thinking, "Well, actually, what he's doing is totally great and awesome. And like, sure, he's making a mistake, but it's gonna get better on its own." But that he's told me, "No, I want you to be more aggressive with your feedback." [Participant C, Sports Coach, Generation X]

Finally, one participant identified the warmth-related implications of navigating descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes, in the context of taking on a leadership role in a male-typed organization. She noted the complexity of moderating the level of femininity or warmth in this setting:

> But I think for women, um, you had to display masculine traits, but to a point. So, the women that, that are still succeeding…are very often ex-military. They are very used to these sorts of um, organizations and kind of coping mechanisms. It's very, very important that you know, they will not speak up and defend other women. Um, they will not rock the boat. And it's all a kind of coping mechanism…. I feel that warmth is a bit of a poison chalice in that um, you are certainly expected to behave that way, and make use of it, and be able to kind of deploy that as a woman. But then I still feel it's also an excuse to devalue the female contributions. So, I think I've struggled, you know, I think what I used when I was younger was to try and copy the men. And not I've realized that that also kind of has negative unintended consequences. (Participant H, Risk, Generation X)

Once again, this subtheme pertains to both research question 2a (why warmth is modulated) and research question 2c (what outcomes arise). Participants leveraged data from their own experiences or their own predictions to alter their warmth displays in various situations.

Overall, Theme 8 and Subthemes 8a, 8b, and 8c reflect the idea that warmth displays are frequently deliberate, per the influence of reasoning based on prior experiences or predicted outcomes.

**Theme 9: Warmth communications to others.** This theme addresses *how* participants modulated their warmth, in response to research question 2b. Whereas Themes 6, 7, and 8 described the reasons participants offered for *why* they may display varying levels of warmth, Theme 9 describes the ways in which participants conveyed warmth or withheld warmth once they made the decision to do so. Coding revealed that 86% of the sample modulated their warmth in some way; therefore, this theme encompasses those participants.

Importantly, the instances of warmth modulation described below all involve interfacing with other individuals, reflecting the working definition that warmth is related to interpersonal interactions (as opposed to an internal experience). The specific warmth-related behaviors and traits that were endorsed by more than one-third of the sample included five different behaviors and one trait, as reported below. Of note, "Other" was reported by nearly the entirety of the sample, but that is addressed later in this theme. The specific behaviors and traits were:

- behavior: being warm/friendly/approachable;
- behavior: supporting team or individual team members/accessible to team/creating a positive team environment towards overall task or goal;
- behavior: adjusting verbal communication style (e.g., tone, humor, timing [e.g., waiting to speak]);
- behavior: managing others' problems/caring for others/nurturing (e.g., extra-role behavior);

- behavior: resolving conflict/building consensus/working across varied stakeholders; and
- trait: warmth.

The trait of warmth was reported in the context of interpersonal interactions, and all five of the specific behaviors captured instances of participants communicating the presence of warmth. Interestingly, these behaviors spanned across stakeholder groups. The behavior "being warm/friendly/approachable" was used to describe interactions across various audiences (i.e., superiors, peers, direct reports, or subordinates). In the quote below, one participant described the how she behaved in warm/friendly/approachable ways:

> And I also think warmth is a way to- and the way in which I use it, is a way to show, caring and approachability and kindness without- sometimes without even saying anything. Like you can- you can convey warmth with gestures and smiles and nonverbals and just asking people, "How are you?" So, they would make fun of me because I'll ask people, like, you know, people go, "How are you? How are you?" Duh-duh-duh…I go, "How ***are*** you?" And just the way in which I say it, with the emphasis on the "are," right? How ***are*** you? It's an inquiry into how are you the human, how are you holding up, how are you processing this, how are you doing, what's going on with you, do you have what you need?... That to me demonstrates- that's how I demonstrate warmth, is by inquiring into how the human who is experiencing whatever it is they're experiencing is doing with all that. (Participant L, Finance, Generation X)

Another spoke to how she purposefully amplified her warmth, wherein her work personality differed somewhat from her personality outside of work:

> At work, I try to, I try to create a more positive or friendly personality…where my default might just be, you know, I'm introverted, I don't feel like meeting new people, but at work it's like, no I, for my professional growth, I have to meet new people. And I have to pretend I'm interested in something that I don't care about. So I think I put more effort into being just a friendly, outgoing person. When that's not really my true self.… It's not like I'm being a completely different person, it's just I'm take- I feel like I'm taking aspects of my personality and just kind of emphasizing them a bit more. (Participant P, Law [Sports], Millennial)

Importantly, multiple participants also spoke to how they displayed *moderated* warmth. One participant spoke to wanting to be seen as pleasant, but not too friendly. She shared that she

attempted to fend off any potential advances from male colleagues by ensuring she limited physical contact in a pleasant way:

> And I think that there are other situations, um, with men that I've worked with that have been below me or in a different field where, you know, sometimes a guy will come in for a hug and, um, you know, you just kind of put your hand (laughs) like in front of them, you know, like, "Nah, I just...I prefer handshake." You know, it's a very pleasant easy way to kind of just be like, "Keep your hands to yourself, buddy." (Participant O, Scientific Research, Millennial)

The behavior of "adjusting verbal communication style" was also used to describe interactions across various audiences (i.e., superiors, peers, direct reports or subordinates). One participant shared how she adapted her communication style at work:

> I think especially when I meet with my superiors here at [Hospital Name], I do kind of try to put on a fake persona now because it's just not worth it. Because...I've learned that it doesn't really matter what I'm gonna say to them, they already have something.... You know, they've already had, like, the meeting in their head, it doesn't really matter, I'm just, like, kind of there to have, like, their ideas wash over me, they don't really care what I say, so I don't, I try not to even get involved most of the time.
> *Interviewer: How would you describe that "fake persona"?*
> I mean, I think it's somebody that's very kind of agreeable with kind of like a "yes, sir" persona. You know, where it doesn't even, it doesn't pay to disagree. (Participant F, Surgeon, Generation X)

These behaviors stand in contrast to "supporting team or individual team members/ accessible to team/creating a positive team environment towards overall task or goal," which was used to refer solely to downward-facing interactions. The following quotes exemplify behaviors that created a positive team environment or supported individual team members:

> If I have a patient and they're like "I'm doing great, I feel great, thanks so much, it's been awesome," I try to tell my staff that. Like "Hey, Mr. So and so's doing great. He's looking awesome, go check [it] out." So, I try to sort of give them that positive feedback. Similarly, in the OR, I'll be like "Hey, remember that hard case we did? I just followed back and they're doing really well." So that kinda thing I do think is helpful. (Participant Q, Surgeon, Millennial)

> If they said, you know, "I would like to go to a conference," I will find a way, saying that, "if you can submit an abstract and present at a conference, I'll find the means to

> support you." And so, I think, for me, it's to find the support and whatever they need, is something that, is my way of doing it. (Participant T, Scientific Research, Generation X)

Further, "managing others' problems/caring for others/nurturing" was also used almost exclusively to refer to interactions with direct reports, though a minority of participants shared peer-related interactions. This code was used to refer to extra-role behavior, meaning going "above and beyond" what might be expected of a leader in terms of task-related help. For example, one participant shared the following:

> *Interviewer: How do you convey warmth?*
> Provide support whenever necessary. I mean, when they face difficulties, say, for example, somebody is, a family member got sick and my staff was very, very worried. I will provide whatever necessary support, referring doctors. Or, you know, checking on that person, "how are you doing?" And, any resources I can find to reduce the anxiety and the worry of my people. (Participant T, Scientific Research, Generation X)

Interestingly, the code "Behavior: Resolving conflict/building consensus/working across varied stakeholders" was primarily used to refer to peer-facing interactions, though some participants reported this code in relation to downward-facing interactions. For example, the following participant noted:

> I've been very successful in being the mediator and the bridge and the liaison between them when they don't know how to talk to each other. And so they'll come in and they'll talk to me and then I'll be able to go, "Okay, so if you had to say that to so and so, how can you see yourself saying it?" And then they'll figure out how to say it or play it out and they'll go back and then- you know, and I'll talk to the other one, so they don't have to deal with the emotions in each other, they got that out in my office, and then they can deal rationally and logically with each other. (Participant L, Finance, Generation X)

Taken together, participants consciously deployed warmth across settings through a variety of behavioral expressions.

In terms of the "other" code, this was frequently utilized to capture those instances where participants were displaying a lack of warmth or suppressing their warmth in some way. A majority of participants (64%) were coded with an "other" code capturing instances such as

these. Descriptions associated with the "other" code included: being assertive, direct, firm, outspoken, bossy, or aggressive; advocating for one's point of view; engaging in conflict; and withholding information from colleagues. One such example comes from a participant who reflected that she did not convey enough warmth to her boss, leading to her facing challenges:

> I think probably because of my kind of earlier perceptions, [that] I'd somehow kind of won the gender game and managed to succeed in this organization where other women hadn't, I did not do enough to placate him. I did not do enough to say, "Yes" and kind of line up with him…. I query what I could have done differently, but I certainly think I challenged him and pushed him in a way that had significant negative consequences for me. (Participant H, Risk, Generation X)

In addition, it is notable that 32% of all participants were coded as exhibiting the behavior of "not being warm/friendly/ approachable." This code is represented by the following comment:

> *Interviewer: Are there times where you feel like you don't want to display warmth in situations at work?*
>
> Well, if I perceive somebody doesn't want it, then I would definitely sort of cut it off. Not everybody likes it. I mean, I have a staff member, he doesn't like it…. And I learned that. So, I tried to express caring and so on, but that was perceived as intrusive, almost, you know, too much. Some people just like to be left alone. Don't ask too much, don't get close too much, they're trying to say. And, therefore, I don't interact with him in a way I interact with [other staff] who are much more reciprocal of my sort of style…. Some people just don't like it…. When I interact with this [staff member], it's more business-like. (Participant T, Scientific Research, Generation X)

Taking these two codes together, "other" (lacking warmth or suppressing warmth) and "behavior: not being warm/friendly/approachable," 77% of the entire sample reported instances where they did not appear warm, friendly, or approachable, conveyed the impression they lacked warmth, or suppressed their warmth. With regard to active modulation of warmth, 64% of the sample actively modulated these behaviors. This indicated that nearly two-thirds of the sample modulated warmth by tamping it *down* in various situations.

Notably, the majority of warmth-related specific codes refer to behaviors (n = 22) and five of the six most-commonly reported markers of warmth were behavioral. Yet, warmth-related traits (n = 10) were also coded and the code of "Trait: warmth" was reported by 41% of the sample. While traits are traditionally defined as dispositional attributes of a given individual (Asendorpf, 2009), participants in this study most frequently referenced traits in the context of working with others. For example, one participant spoke to her natural warmth (trait) coming through in interactions with colleagues. Another spoke to her natural warmth allowing her to succeed in her field, as it required interaction with others. A third shared that she was *not* naturally empathetic (trait), but she has learned how to ameliorate this through actively employing empathetic behavior. Another participant shared that she was not naturally effusive or bubbly (trait) and this helped her in her role, as exhibiting effusiveness would perplex those with whom she worked. Thus, even when speaking to warmth-related traits, these were often construed in relation to interpersonal interactions.

In summary, in response to research question 2b, this theme suggests that participants were often actively increasing their warmth displays through a variety of behaviors that they believed conveyed a sense of warmth to others. They may also be communicating warmth by allowing their natural (trait) warmth to come through in interpersonal interactions. On the other hand, there were times when they either chose not to behave in a warm way *or* express assertiveness, which conveyed a lack of warmth.

**Theme 10: Personal consequences of modulating warmth displays.** The final warmth theme addresses research question 2c, which explored the impact that warmth modulation may have had on participants. This theme summarizes the personal impact of modulating warmth displays, which was reported by 64% of participants. In terms of expressing warmth, a

participant who outwardly expressed warmth in the face of sexist behavior reported being left with feelings of confusion after an interaction was over. Related, another participant shared that in the past, colleagues unexpectedly sought comfort from her, which she hypothesized was due to her appearing approachable. This led her to feel confused about why she was being seen in this way. A third shared that after displaying warmth, she worried about others' impressions of her and wondered if she was doing a disservice to her own reputation:

> I'll have a headset on at my desk and I'll be in a meeting with two to eight other people where I see everybody has a video camera so we can all see each other. And I have been self-conscious about seeing my little video window next to all the rows of men that I'm working with and seeing myself smiling and laughing and seeing, you know, a bit more cheerful and bubbly than my male colleagues and thinking to myself, I wonder if I'm coming across too cheerful and bubbly? Like if I'm not gonna be taken seriously…. I mean that's just my personality, especially in new situations…. And looking at myself in that video lineup, I was very self-conscious about how I was coming across and whether I might be doing a disservice to my reputation by being too warm and cheerful and not being, you know, as serious as my male colleagues (laughs) in the moment. (Participant I, Video Games, Millennial)

Additionally, participants shared outcomes relating to amplifying warmth. One participant shared putting on a persona at work that required her to amplify her warmth (i.e., appearing overly agreeable because the organizational context required it); then she reflected on the consequences:

> *Interviewer: And, how does that feel, to put on the persona?*
> I mean, it definitely doesn't feel like I'm being myself. That's the best way, I guess, to describe it, you know?… I'm an extrovert who speaks my mind…and to kind of sit there and instead, you know, not respond and collect your thoughts and maybe never ultimately respond, depending on the situation that you're in.… I think it's, it's incredibly frustrating and just, yeah, I just feel like I'm being somebody else. (Participant F, Surgeon, Generation X)

Related, another participant spoke to deliberately integrating more warmth into her leadership style in the past, based on feedback from her boss. She then shared that this felt "mechanical" and a "little manipulative" at the time (though it was now second-nature to her). A

third spoke to feeling tired because of amplifying her warmth at work. An additional participant, a surgeon, shared a striking metaphor: she started each day with a reserve of warmth and when she was forced to deploy it in staff interactions, her tank would be depleted. She noted:

> If you can't do patient care well because other things are, you know, impeding that process, then I think your warmth disappears.
> *Interviewer: Got it. So, it's like a reserve that you have within you?*
> Maybe you start with, like, a whole tank of warmth, and then you…as the day goes on, it's just, it's not there anymore. (Participant F, Surgeon, Generation X)

In terms of suppressing warmth, one participant noted that she suppressed her natural warmth because of the organizational context, leading her to feel frustrated and exhausted. Two others mentioned feeling uncomfortable when they suppressed their warmth, though they viewed it as required by their roles at specific times. A fourth shared that she felt compelled to limit her warmth and instead project an assertive demeanor, but internally, she felt "tumultuous."

Notably, participants were more likely to share personal outcomes relating to displaying a lack of warmth versus suppressing warmth. One participant, after assertively sharing her opinion (e.g., displaying a lack of warmth), was laughed at, then left feeling dismissed. Another, after demonstrating assertiveness in her general working style over a period of time, was subject to negative reactions from those around her and believed it was a significant factor in her departing her role for lack of fit. Another participant shared that she delivered constructive feedback to a direct report (e.g., violating the warmth prescription), which elicited a strong negative reaction and friction in the workplace. This led to her questioning her capacity to lead others, feelings that her reputation was ruined, and an inability to sleep:

> I just felt that, and it seemed from the conversations onboard, that I got blamed 'cause I was inexperienced as a manager. And to me the whole situation felt unsafe, that this person could not run our equipment…. And I felt that my reputation was ruined, and I wasn't sleeping at night, I was so upset and I didn't understand why my [superiors] didn't take it seriously…why they didn't tell him "Hey, learn the system."... And that they didn't see that this was sexism. (Participant R, Offshore Drilling, Millennial)

This participant's reaction also included amplifying her warmth in future interactions, as well as experiencing daily anxiety (mental and physical manifestations) and "overthinking" interpersonal interactions. The following quote further described this situation:

> *In relation to managing the impression of being agreeable:*
> *Interviewer: What was that like for you inwardly?*
> Just kind of scared on how to react 'cause I was overthinking a lot on well, how should I react to these situations? How can I be liked? And going along with conversations that I really wanted no part of.
> *Interviewer: Do you think it had an impact on you, like emotionally, physically, psychologically?*
> I was very anxious...and I did not realize. I knew I was anxious, but I didn't know what the cause was, I just thought I was an anxious person…. I used to shake, like my body, like my knees would shake, I just was so nervous all the time, 'cause I was really concerned about being liked so I could do this long term. (Participant R, Offshore Drilling, Millennial)

In general, several participants mentioned questioning when and how to voice their opinions, after experiencing a lack of receptiveness to openly and honestly voicing their perspective, such as:

> So we were just sitting around doing nothing, waiting for the weather to get better, and on days like that, you end up just talking about random things, right 'cause there's nothing to do…so [my boss shared something about his dating life] and I was just like, "No, that's horrible." And I spoke up, and I shared my opinion, and he's like...I don't remember the exact words, but something like "I didn't think you were that way," or yeah, "I didn't think you were like this.". And I was so surprised by how hard, like it, his response to me was, how quick he was to judge me.… He really went after my person [about the disagreement]…. I remember thinking in that moment, like I just shouldn't voice my opinion on things because of how harsh he came down on me over this. (Participant R, Offshore Drilling, Millennial)

While femininity was coupled with warmth previously in this chapter, several femininity findings emerged that are reported separately here, due to the specificity of these examples. First, one participant noted that she experienced anxiety in situations where her femininity was apparent (e.g., by inadvertently wearing tight clothes). She attempted to avoid this anxiety proactively by carefully selecting her clothing. Another shared that when she was pregnant, she

felt as if she was being weak by asking for a minor exception after she had successfully completed an hours-long surgery. Another participant reported going through a "challenging time" when she was pregnant, as coworkers actively criticized and resented her.

Finally, several participants explicitly mentioned reflecting on their gender identity in relation to modulating their warmth. They spoke to wondering whether or not male colleagues were undertaking the same labor on a day-to-day basis. At times, they mentioned emotional reactions (e.g., frustration, anger, annoyance) when they reflected on the potential additional thinking and behavior modification they were undertaking, in comparison to male colleagues. For example:

> At the end of the day, with my Medical Assistant, we had a really tough patient. I said to [the Medical Assistant], I was like, "We need to draw blood on this patient." And, she looked at me and she didn't say anything, and I just said to her, I was like, "I'll do it." I was like, "You have to come with me."… And, at the end of it, I said to her, "Listen, it was a tough end to the day, I understand. Thank you for helping out with that, but we have to try to be able to do this on our own next time." You know, kind of...to make her understand. But, at the same time, I was wondering if...it was, this was one of my male colleagues who said, "We need blood from this patient," would she have given them that look? Like, would they have felt the need to say, "I'll help you" or "I'll do this." It always is something that goes through my mind and, and I don't, I think the fact that it even goes through our minds is so different because I don't think that men ever think about what the situation would be like if they were a woman. (Participant F, Surgeon, Generation X)

In summary, myriad outcomes were associated with purposefully modulating warmth (through amplification or suppression) as well as with choosing not to modulate warmth (or failing to modulate warmth).

Overall, the five warmth-related themes addressed why participants might modulate their warmth (their conception of leadership, gendered expectations, past outcomes or predicted outcomes); how they modulated warmth (through displaying or not displaying interpersonally-oriented behaviors or traits; through displaying assertiveness, which implied a lack of warmth);

and potential personal outcomes to modulating warmth or failing to modulate warmth (fatigue, inauthenticity, confusion, questioning whether men ever considered their gender in relation to warmth at work).

**Theme 11: Intersection of warmth and emotion.** The final theme addresses both research questions. This theme reflects the instances where participants offered a response or example that bridged across both of the domains of warmth and emotions, as reported by 64% of participants. These participants did not solely mention emotional modulation *or* warmth modulation; instead, they either spoke to suppressing negative emotions (e.g., anger or frustration) *and then* amplifying warmth (***Subtheme 11a***) or displaying positive emotions *and then* amplifying warmth (***Subtheme 11b***). These subthemes were based on the working definitions of emotions being internal events that can be modulated (or not), whereas warmth refers to interpersonal interactions. Thus, these subthemes refer to first engaging in emotional modulation, then engaging in warmth modulation. The instances reported below stretch beyond simply suppressing negative emotions and putting a smile on one's face or choosing to smile when one is happy. Instead, for ***Subtheme 11a***, negative emotions were suppressed, then warmth behaviors were amplified. For ***Subtheme 11b***, participants did not solely report displaying positive emotions, but also channeled those positive emotions into behavioral displays of warmth.

This theme was an area where I leveraged self-as-instrument data (McCormick & White, 2000) noted throughout the interview and coding process. Self-as-instrument refers to researchers or practitioners attending to "emotional, perceptual, and cognitive aspects of their selves as diagnostic tools" (p. 49). To capture self-as-instrument data, I wrote memos throughout data collection and analysis. In several memos, I noted the correlation between suppressing anger

or frustration and amplifying warmth, as well as expressing anger or frustration and being penalized for violating prescriptive gender norms. When conceptualizing this study, I was focused on the overlap of positive emotions and warmth but neglected to account for the overlap between negative emotions and a lack of warmth. Previously, I had viewed the opposite of warmth as appearing cold or aloof, not as expressing negative emotions. However, through the coding process and reading additional literature, I began to conceptualize visible displays of frustration or anger as communicating a lack of warmth. When coding, I was also struck by the difficulty I sometimes encountered when attempting to categorize some instances as *either* relating to emotion *or* relating to warmth/lack of warmth, as opposed to bridging across these constructs. This challenge in coding was another source of self-as-instrument data that indicated this overall theme as well as ***Subtheme 11a***. Given my initial thinking about this study, ***Subtheme 11b*** (participants translating their positive emotions into warmth behavior) was less surprising.

***Subtheme 11a: Negative emotions and warmth.*** This theme refers to the 50% of participants who related negative emotions directly to warmth. One example of such a bridging response included when a participant reported suppressing feelings of anger and purposefully expressing warmth behaviors, because she viewed warmth behaviors as more effective in motivating her team than openly displaying negative emotions, and because she had previously mentioned that anger was not effective for women to express:

> And there are moments where you kind of want to get angry. You're like, you have a moment where you're like, "Ugh."... I find I usually swallow that and try the, the honey approach, which...what I call it...is just to say, to go to whoever's, go to whoever's frustration and say, "Hey, this patient was..." You know, maybe it's the nurse or somebody out at the front desk.... "Sat around for the last thirty minutes, should've gotten x-rayed." Like I try to pull that approach. "What can we do to make this not happen again?" I usually present it like that in the, kind of a nice tone and try not to be accusatory, I don't want to like jump down somebody's throat. Again, that just gets

> people angry and flustered. And then they get scared of you and, and, and don't want to work with you anymore or, or whatever the, the outcome might be. (Participant B, Surgeon, Generation X)

Thus, this participant reflected upon her gender identity as well as the most effective leadership style when modulating negative emotions and warmth.

As another example of the complex relationship between negative emotions and warmth, when someone is responding to a sexist instance, she may be suppressing her anger, yet outwardly smiling or laughing to the offender. Should this solely be coded as emotional labor, i.e., displaying emotions externally that do not match one's internal experience? Or, is there also a gendered aspect to this example, relating to the stereotype that women *should be* warm and violations (e.g., defending oneself against sexist behavior) and are frequently met with backlash? For example, one participant described the following interaction:

> I don't remember exactly what I said, but [senior scientist] was just like, "That's not what I'm talking about," and he patted me on the head (laughs). He's like, "Use that noggin." And like, I was so flabbergasted. I smiled and laughed, which is not like me, but I didn't know how to behave like, I don't know what to do. I was like "what the fuck is going on?"... You know, he was trying to give me this advice because…I think that I was challenging him a little bit…it's not that what he's saying isn't true, I'm saying it's more complicated. And that's when he like patted me on the head just like.... You know, it's another way to say like, "No, just listen to me, little girl."... I feel like having a supervisor that stands up for me has really reduced the number of interactions that I've had like that.... But it doesn't stop these interactions where these older, um, men think that they're helping you, but they're really just kind of eliminating.... Like, if you think about it, they're kind of discrediting what you're saying in the conversation by infantilizing you. *Interviewer: What do you think sort of was going through your head when [this happened]?*
>
> My immediate thought was, "Don't react negatively because you want this man to remember you, and you want him to remember you positively." And that...I don't...I'm not particularly...I think that I wish that I had handled it a little bit differently, but that's not what happened. What happened was is that I kind of had this very nervous, like, laughter and smile moment. (Participant O, Scientific Research, Millennial)

In this example, beyond simply suppressing negative emotions, this participant amplified her warmth through expressing smiling and laughing behavior, consistent with expectations of

women. The impetus for this behavior was related to her sheer surprise as well as concerns about negatively affecting a future work collaboration.

The additional descriptive statement below explicated this idea in the lived experiences of participants. This participant spoke to an awareness that gender affected not just the display of emotions, but also the warmth-related behaviors that women can exhibit when feeling specific emotions:

> So, I think, you know, to your original question, are there different expectations, emotionally? And it's- it's not just to me, showing my emotions, it's like, what I'm allowed to say and what.... Am I allowed to be honest and call people out and like show that I think this is unfair? Um, is there a difference? Yes, definitely. And yeah, it's not exactly emotions being unacceptable, but like my actions and like expressing how I feel in that situation, which is emotion. (Participant C, Sports Coach, Generation X)

Notably, an additional participant reported similar behaviors, yet was explicit in viewing this as *unrelated* to her gender, in contrast to the prior two quotes. This participant spoke to suppressing negative emotions and amplifying warmth as effective for problem-solving:

> I think I get, I'm thinking about like when I'm frustrated with someone for not producing something that I was expecting them to be able to produce. And my internal reaction is like, "What the hell?" My external reaction is much more understanding. And, um, supportive of why…it wasn't done. And I don't do that because I'm worried that I'm going to be perceived poorly. But I think that's a more effective way to figure out what's happening…. And it's a more effective way to solve the problem…. And it would make me better, feel better instantaneously to not be warm and to be like, "What the hell?" (laughs) But it's, I think it's very, I think it's not an effective way to solve the underlying issue. To, um, to behave like that. (Participant N, Finance, Millennial)

The following participant spoke to learning over the course of her career to balance her intensity with warmth. Earlier in her career, in environments that demanded urgency, she exhibited a strong-results focus but did not focus on warmth. Based on feedback and learning, she now coupled her drive with emphasizing approachability in service of motivating others:

> I don't know if it's necessarily emotions it's a- it's a sense of urgency. So just a push and a drive, which can come across as, you know, intense and an emotion, which it's not.… So that's why for me it's super important to get out and be face to face with

> people...and to explain the context and- and really help them through it and make- and kinda inspire them to get on board…. I think my intensity early on, um, I came across as a very intense, you know, young kid that was in a senior role early on...and, you know, just I would sometimes be a tornado that went through an office. (laughs)… I made some mistakes and I had good coaches along the way that helped me realize, um, my intent versus the perception people had…. So, I really had to be intentional about that. (Participant V, Finance, Millennial)

Finally, this subtheme included those participants who highlighted the moments where they did *not* suppress negative emotions and also failed to display warmth, noting that this was not effective. One such example is:

> I would be trying to negotiate and stand up for myself um, and those conversations would tend to go very, very badly…. It was increasingly clear that I was angry, and upset, and unhappy, and checking out…. I think it was obvious that I was not having a good time. So I don't think I, I don't think I did what I see that my female peers were doing, which was to internalize these issues and play the game and not, you know, I tried to speak up and change things and complain and it was not a good idea.
> *(Later in interview) Interviewer: Did you ever feel as if you were deliberately deploying warmth?*
> No, I think my life would have been much easier if I had. I think I failed to do that and I think that was one of my problems…. I think I could see that other women were better at navigating up and not making it clear that they thought, the people I knew they thought were total jerks, were total jerks. And knowing when to stop and knowing what to say to please people. And I could see that I needed to do that, I just wasn't able to do it because it stuck in my throat too much. (Participant H, Risk, Generation X)

In summary, this subtheme attempted to capture some of the complexity involved in how participants conceptualized negative emotions in relation to warmth displays.

***Subtheme 11b: Positive emotions and warmth.*** This subtheme reflects the finding that some participants (32%) channeled their positive emotions into explicit warmth-related behaviors. This means that beyond simply displaying positive emotions when they experienced them, they took action, so to speak. For example, when experiencing excitement/passion, the following participant openly expressed these emotions, then amplified her warmth:

> So for example, if they win a piece of business, I want to share the excitement…. I'll take the microphone, stand in the middle of the floor and say a few words about how this piece of business is a tremendous result, and hand the mic over to the people responsible

> so they can talk about it. I am sort of exaggerating the win for the benefit of the whole, to try and boost positivity and enthusiasm and motivation. (Participant G, Finance, Baby Boomer)

Similarly, other participants reported leveraging instances of experiencing positive emotions to drive warmth behaviors, including publicly acknowledging excellent work. This behavior was in service of bolstering team morale. In addition, one participant shared that she used occasions when she was experiencing positive emotions as a foundation to create stronger relationships with direct reports, as a mitigating factor for challenges that may arise in her future work with her team.

In summary, this overall theme aimed to document the connective tissue between emotional modulation and warmth modulation. Next, the final chapter of this dissertation builds on the results reported throughout Chapter Four.

# CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The original purpose of this study was to explore the possibility that women leaders in male-typed contexts utilize EL to manage gender-based stereotypes about their warmth. The data ultimately told a more complex story; in addition to modulating warmth displays, participants shared powerful reflections about modulating a broad range of emotions for various reasons. Further, participants spoke to stimuli evoking both emotional reactions or warmth-related behaviors or traits, as well as the outcomes of emotional and warmth-related displays. Thus, the findings ultimately reached beyond the initial research questions, and necessitated a revision to the questions posed and addressed by this study:

1. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*
2. *Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate displays of warmth in the workplace?*
    a. *If so, why?*
    b. *If so, how?*
    c. *If so, what are the outcomes?*

This chapter first summarizes the evidence gathered to answer both of these research questions, based upon the themes presented in the prior chapter and summarized in Table 17. Then, I provide a summary of the key findings that reach beyond these questions. Next, I review the limitations of this study as well as areas for future research. I then offer the potential ways in which this study may inform theory and practice. I conclude with a high-level summary of the work presented here.

## Interpretation of Results

### Emotional Modulation

Data analysis indicated that the majority of the participants in this sample did modulate emotional displays in the workplace. Overall, 95% of participants were coded as modulating emotions. In terms of "why" (research question 1a) and "how" (research question 1b) these women leaders modulated emotions as well as outcomes (research question 1c), multiple findings emerged.

**Why do women leaders modulate emotions?** Participants reported a diverse array of reasons for modulating their emotions, which I am framing as relating to role, gender, context, and instrumentality. One role-related reason involved a desire to convey competence through emotional modulation. Participants were concerned that a failure to modulate their emotions would be seen as immature, unprofessional, or inappropriate. This aligned with prior work exploring the relatedness between rationality (i.e., the opposite of emotionality) and competence (Heilman, 2012). A second role-related reason involved participants expressing a belief that emotional modulation is particularly important for leaders or managers. They noted that unfiltered emotions could have a detrimental effect on team members as well as the overall working environment. Prior work has explored this idea, documenting that emotional stability is a desired quality in leaders (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

Gender also played a role in the reasons why participants modulated emotions. Myriad participants spoke to emotional displays having a negative impact on perceptions of their competence. Given that emotionality was seen was detracting from one's competence, they were particularly concerned about enacting the stereotype that women are more emotional than men (Fischer, 1993; Simon & Nath, 2004). Fears of being seen as irrational or hysterical, or self-

reported experiences of being seen this way when emotions were displayed, affected participants' behaviors. This related to the question posed at the end of the second chapter on whether women leaders may be responding to gendered expectations about emotional expression within the context of their day-to-day work, as opposed to managing emotions solely to convey warmth. Some support was found for the proposition that women leaders manage emotional displays in response to the stereotype about women being more emotional than men, as opposed to managing emotions in service of communicating warmth.

Context played an important role in determining why some women leaders modulated their emotions. Some participants reported that within their specific organizational context, or within the overall context of their field or industry, certain emotions, or certain degrees of emotional expression, were taboo. Specifically, a number of participants reported that crying and anger were unacceptable. Also, some participants reported that there was an acceptable range of visible emotional activation but displaying more emotionality than the allowable range would be frowned upon.

They noted that these norms stemmed from their particular organizational or industry-wide contexts. At times, they compared and contrasted their current context with prior workplaces or the workplaces of friends holding similar roles at different organizations. These contextual norms were sometimes explicitly mentioned by colleagues, in the sense that participants were told they should avoid displaying specific emotions or extreme emotions; at other times, they gleaned this information from observation (e.g., viewing how others who *did* display these emotions were treated) or personal experiences of displaying these taboo emotions. The idea of contextual expectations for emotional displays was aligned with the overall definition of display rules, as reported in the literature (dictates for emotional displays shown to

external individuals being served by employees; Ekman & Friesen, 1971). Yet, it also suggested that there are tacit or implicit display rules within participants' organizations or fields, which diverges from the explicitly mentioned or enforced display rules common in prior studies. This supported the proposition that EL concepts can be used more broadly to capture interactions outside of clients, customers, and the like.

It is important to note that an exploration of the percentages of expression and modulation indicated that participants displayed positive emotions more frequently than negative ones, and they attempted to modulate negative emotions more than they modulated positive ones. This likely reflected additional norms (either at the organizational, industry/field, or societal levels) dictating the relative appropriateness of displaying negative versus positive emotions, wherein negative emotions were unacceptable to display. This finding aligned with Hülsheger and colleagues' (2010) finding that the most common display roles prescribe the suppression of negative emotions and the amplification of positive ones.

Gender also played an interesting role in the contextual determinants of emotions. Multiple participants related crying to their female gender identity. They noted that crying was typically associated with women, which aligned with literature documenting gendered expectations for emotions, such as crying (Ragins & Winkel, 2011). Crying was seen as acceptable for women to express, whereas it was seen as unacceptable for men to express. Related, crying was likely to be viewed as a sign of weakness, as it was a low-status emotion (Tiedens, 2001). Thus, within the context of male-typed fields and industries, crying in general was likely to be derided as failing to align with the context. The combination of crying *and* female gender identity might result in a type of multiplicative interaction in a male-typed

context. Crying may confirm that a woman does not "belong" in a hyper-rational, competitive, tough, male-typed workplace.

Contextual expectations around anger may also have been related to gender identity. While sadness is a low-status emotion, anger is a high-status emotion (Tiedens, 2001). Anger is seen as being more frequently expressed by men (Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000) and does not detract from perceptions of their competence or credibility when it is shown (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008; Schaubroeck & Shao, 2012). Indeed, participants in this sample made numerous mentions of a type of double standard related to male versus female expression of anger. As the literature predicted, participants reported that men were given far more room to express anger (with fewer or no negative repercussions) than women were. Very few participants reported feeling comfortable expressing anger at work. Further, those who did express anger reported negative outcomes.

When taken together, it is conceivable that sadness (e.g., crying) served to confirm descriptive stereotypes (e.g., women are weak and unable to "hack it" in a male-typed context), whereas anger violated prescriptive stereotypes (e.g., women *should be* warm and expressing anger conveys a lack of warmth).

The final reason for modulating emotions indicated by this study included instances where emotionality could be used as a tool. i.e., instrumentality. In these cases, emotions were deliberately modified to help a participant reach various ends. On the negative emotion side, displaying emotions such as frustration allowed a participant to underscore a verbal message of displeasure. On the positive side, displaying emotions such as passion allowed participants to motivate others. Thus, specific emotional displays were thoughtfully deployed to meet a desired result. Participants also spoke to modulating their emotions writ large, in service of various

outcomes. For example, by modulating their emotions the majority of the time, the impact was maximized when participants finally did choose to display specific emotions.

Figure 2 provides a sampling of the reasoning offered by participants for displaying or not displaying either positive or negative emotions. Each example was classified by role, gender, context, or instrumentality. Also, this table includes instances where participants may have expressed an emotion because they did not think about modulating it or reacted instantaneously, such that modulation was not an option. Further, it included instances where participants attempted to modulate but were unable to (thus displaying the emotion).

**How do women leaders modulate emotions?** In terms of the second portion of the emotion research question, participants reported modulating emotions through three primary techniques. First, there was a series of in-the-moment methods that they employed, such as taking deep breaths, counting to 10, engaging in internal monologues (e.g., telling oneself not to react to something), and/or removing oneself from the situation. The desired end result of modulating emotions in these ways was to avoid displaying the emotion to fellow employees.

The second method involved managing emotions through interfacing with others in the workplace. Participants most frequently reported confiding in peers, noting that being at the same level with someone or going through the same day-to-day experiences increased their comfort level. With that said, multiple participants were reticent to speak openly with peers due to the politics or culture of their organizations. Several participants also reported openly sharing emotions with select superiors. This included bosses with whom they felt comfortable or superiors higher up in the hierarchy whom they trusted.

The third method involved seeking resources outside of the organization. Participants reported sending text messages or emails to significant others, friends, family, or former

colleagues in the midst of the workday as well as venting in person to these constituencies after the workday ended. Participants also noted that engaging in exercise was an effective outlet for their emotions. In addition to these more reactive strategies, participants sometimes preemptively engaged in behaviors to stave off emotional experiences or decrease their reactivity to various stimuli in the workplace (e.g., getting sufficient sleep).

Notably, each of these three methods was employed to decrease or eliminate displays of emotion at work. These methods were used in relation to managing negative emotions for the vast majority of the time. In contrast, there were instances where participants experienced positive emotions and modulated them through *amplifying* these emotions in a visible or public way. Often, amplifying these positive emotions was viewed as a tactic to motivate team members or stimulate additional high-quality work. This idea most closely aligned with literature describing the relationship between leaders' visible positive emotions and ratings of charisma, as well as the relationship between leaders' visible positive emotions and followers' moods (Bono & Ilies, 2006).

Looking across both negative and positive emotions, it appears that participants tended to use response-focused strategies (Gross, 1998b), meaning that they adjusted how they displayed their immediate emotional responses to a given stimulus, as opposed to modifying which situations they entered or how they perceived various stimuli (e.g., antecedent-focused strategies; Gross, 1998a). It seemed as if participants often confronted familiar stimuli throughout their work days, which evoked somewhat consistent emotional reactions. From there, the majority of participants then focused on how they displayed, or did not display, those emotional reactions. This stands in contrast to potential antecedent-focused strategies, which would involve avoiding situations that evoke emotional reactions that a participant does not want to experience or

changing the perception of a familiar situation to decrease an emotional reaction. The distinction between response-focused and antecedent-focused strategies is important because response-focused strategies, which are posited to underlie surface acting (Grandey, 2000), tend to lead to negative outcomes (presented in the following section). Yet, the use of response-focused strategies is likely a product of organizational life today, in that participants may have limited agency to avoid specific evocative stimuli and/or may have limited unoccupied time that can be spent adjusting their perceptions of various stimuli.

The overall emotion findings aligned with prior research on EL, in which employees often suppress negative emotions and then amplify positive ones (Hülsheger et al., 2010). The additional contribution offered by this study is that these participants reported engaging in this common EL behavior when interacting with colleagues, as opposed to external constituents like clients, customers, or patients. Prior work has been fairly limited in exploring the extent to which emotions are modulated during internal-facing interactions (for exceptions, see Bulan et al., 1997; Pierce, 1995; Pugliesi, 1999).

**What are the outcomes of women leaders modulating emotions?** In relation to the third portion of the emotion research question, participants reported an array of outcomes associated with emotional modulation (Table 19). For those who actively modulated emotional displays, they reported experiencing fatigue, internal strife, feelings of inauthenticity, experiencing additional emotions, a potential clouding in their cognitive functioning, and outcomes in their personal lives such as lack of sleep. Many of these outcomes aligned with outcomes documented in the EL literature (e.g., Bono & Vey, 2005; Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). For participants who reported specific instances where they did *not* modulate their emotions, thereby sharing their emotional reactions in the moment, the outcomes did not appear

to be significantly better. They reported a range of reactions, including feeling badly, regretful, or guilty.

**Emotion summary.** In summary, in response to the research questions, "*1. Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate emotional displays in the workplace? 1a. If so, why? 1b. If so, how? 1c. If so, what are the outcomes?"* participants revealed that they did modulate their emotions. Further, they offered a range of reasons why they modulated emotions, as well as an array of methods that allowed them to modulate emotions. They also spoke compellingly to the myriad (mostly negative) outcomes associated with this phenomenon. This study revealed that participants almost universally viewed modulating negative emotions as necessary in the workplace. Conversely, positive emotions, while less frequently reported overall, were seen as more acceptable to display at work. The internal considerations undertaken by women leaders as they navigated emotionality at work constituted additional "labor" that was occurring in an invisible, covert way. Further, the outcomes that stemmed from engaging in emotional modulation may not be readily apparent to others in the workplace but represent additional penalties or psychosocial costs incurred by women leaders.

**Warmth Modulation**

In response to the second set of research questions (*2. Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate displays of warmth in the workplace? 2a. If so, why? 2b. If so, how? 2c. If so, what are the outcomes?*), the data suggested that the majority of the participants in this sample did modulate warmth displays in the workplace. Overall, 86% of participants were coded as modulating warmth. Various reasons were offered for why warmth was modulated, and multiple methods were shared in relation to how warmth was modulated. Further, participants shared numerous outcomes resulting from warmth modulation.

Before answering these questions, it is important to note that warmth was conceptualized in diverse ways by participants, including viewing warmth as physical affection, warmth as speaking about family issues within the workplace, or warmth as appearing "fuzzy" or "cuddly" (perhaps an extreme version of being kind or approachable). The way I understood these varied definitions was that these pieces of data reflected how the broader population of women leaders in male-typed contexts viewed warmth and/or reacted to that particular word choice. Whereas emotion may have evoked somewhat similar internally held definitions in participants (and perhaps in the broader population), warmth seems to be a more ambiguous construct. This, of course, presents implications for future research examining this phenomenon (to be discussed later in this chapter).

These internally held associations to warmth may have affected participants' responses to my questions, thus affecting the warmth-related themes that were derived from the data. For example, if a participant's internal conception of warmth focused on expressing physical affection, she may have disagreed with any questions probing gender differences in warmth expectations (e.g., believing that women were *not* expected to show more physical affection than men at work), or may have offered potential outcomes of displaying warmth based on this definition of physical affection (e.g., concern that displaying warmth would lead to being seen as flirting with male colleagues). In effect, the ways in which participants conceptualized warmth may have gone beyond the traditional definition of warmth, thereby affecting their answers to my questions.

**Why do women leaders modulate warmth?** Somewhat similar to emotion modulation, participants offered a range of reasons related to role, gender, and context when providing the reasoning behind modulating warmth displays. In addition, there appeared to be internal

calculations about the *potential* instrumentality of warmth displays that prompted some participants to manage their warmth in a particular way.

First, role-related reasons for displaying warmth aligned with internal conceptions of leadership or managerial style. Participants believed that appearing to be warm (i.e., friendly, approachable) allowed them to work more effectively with their teams, as well as to complete the overarching task more effectively. For example, appearing to be approachable allowed a surgeon's team to alert her when they noticed something concerning after a surgery was over. If the primary task (Roberts, 1994) of a surgeon is to treat patients, taking up her role in a warm way allowed this surgeon to excel.

Yet, also in relation to role, a subset of participants highlighted the importance of displaying a moderate amount of warmth. They modulated their warmth such that they were not viewed as completely lacking warmth nor being overly warm. They viewed this "middle ground" as being aligned with taking on a leadership or managerial role. Further, several participants viewed their role as requiring them to suppress warmth at various times. Thus, role-related prescriptions for warmth varied across participants, pending the responsibilities associated with a given position. It is also important to note that the ways in which individuals view, define, and take up a given role are influenced by both individual characteristics and the systemic expectations placed on a given role (Krantz & Maltz, 1997). This means that there may be unconscious or less salient messages from the broader organization influencing how individuals take up their leadership role and how others respond to someone's behavior in-role. Further, the individual perspective and belief system each participant brought to bear on how she defined her role may also help to explain some of this variation.

Gender also played a role in determining why warmth was displayed. Over three quarters of the sample spoke to an awareness of others' expectations for their own warmth displays and/or experiencing the impact of others' reactions to female colleagues failing to display warmth in the workplace. These expectations were implicitly or explicitly communicated to participants, resulting in alterations in their behaviors. Importantly, nearly one quarter of participants explicitly *disagreed* with the premise that they altered their warmth behaviors in response to their gender identity. This is an interesting finding and one that warrants additional exploration.

In examining the demographic and occupational variables associated with those who believed that their gender did not affect their displays of warmth, clear patterns did not emerge. Those who reported this idea ranged in age from 30 to 63 years. They cut across occupational areas (two in Finance, one in Law, one in Scientific Research, and one in Technology) and varied in their levels of educational attainment. They worked in organizations that varied in the extent to which they were male-dominated (from 18% to 50%). Yet, interestingly, when examining how they were coded in response to a separate global warmth-related code ("Different standards/expectations for warmth by gender"), four out of the five participants provided statements consistent with this code. This indicated that they did agree there were different warmth-related standards for women versus men. Examining these two codes, in addition to reviewing their transcripts, led me to conclude that first, these participants likely did not alter their *own* behavior due to their gender and/or they may have attributed warmth displays to their leadership role, as opposed to their gender identity. Second, they *did* recognize that women more broadly were subject to gendered expectations about warmth; they just did not alter their own behavior in response to these expectations.

Participants also reported contextual reasons that factored into their warmth displays. Within specific organizational or industry/field contexts, displays of warmth (whether openly displayed, not displayed at all, or displayed in a moderate amount) seemed to have specific meaning. In some contexts, warmth was devalued, undercut participants' authority, or evoked negative reactions in others. In other contexts, warmth may have signaled that a person could not make a challenging decision. Warmth in another context may have communicated an openness to being the recipient of flirtatious advances. When warmth was *not* displayed, in some contexts, participants experienced an inability to influence others or being publicly chastised. Yet, positive outcomes were also associated with displaying warmth, not displaying warmth, or displaying moderate warmth. Therefore, the lived experiences of women leaders in this study varied from setting to setting, just as the meaning of displays of warmth varied from organization to organization. This provided support for the presence of tacit display rules specific to individual organizations.

The last underlying reason affecting warmth modulation stemmed from the *perceived* instrumentality of specific warmth displays. Participants viewed displays of warmth as a way to communicate to others that they were collaborative, easy to work with, and good team players. Participants viewed displays that conveyed a lack of warmth as a way to communicate displeasure with specific events, situations, or people. Similar to the contextual reasons offered above, the reasons related to perceived instrumentality depended on participants' own experiences and the social information they digested while being embedded in their particular organization or their particular career trajectory. This means that, for example, individual participants might have two differing predictions about what outcomes might arise if warmth was displayed. Or, they might have differing ideas about how to achieve a desired outcome

through warmth modulation, e.g., two different participants spoke to bonding with male colleagues, but one related this capacity to suppressing warmth whereas the other related it to amplifying warmth. This lent credence to the idea that many participants were modulating their behaviors based on tacit or implicit display rules for success in the particular context they have internalized.

Figure 3 provides a sampling of the reasoning offered by participants for the three different displays of warmth: openly displaying warmth, not displaying warmth, or displaying a moderate amount of warmth. Each example is classified by role, gender, context, or perceived instrumentality. The information presented in the cell reflecting the cross between "shows moderate warmth" and "not modulated" refers to my hypothesized reasoning, as this was not referenced in the data.

**How do women leaders modulate warmth?** Participants moderated warmth through the presence or absence of warmth-related behaviors or traits. The most commonly reported behaviors that conveyed warmth included aiming to appear friendly and approachable to others, supporting one's team, providing support to one's team members outside the formal requirements of the leadership role, adapting one's verbal communications to appear more warm, and managing conflict in service of driving groups to consensus.

Yet, nearly an equivalent percentage of participants also reported behaviors that conveyed a lack of warmth. These included the explicit aim to not appear warm as well as interacting in an assertive, direct, firm, or aggressive way. Further, this included providing critical feedback or engaging in conflict with others.

These behaviors, whether conveying warmth or conveying a lack of warmth, involved interactions with stakeholders up, down, and across the hierarchy. Notably, participants also

were thoughtful about the impact their innate traits might have on perceptions of their warmth. At times, they would allow their natural personalities to emerge, and at other times, they would modulate their traits.

**What are the outcomes of women leaders modulating warmth?** Participants reported an array of outcomes associated with warmth modulation, which overlapped somewhat significantly with those related to emotional modulation. In terms of actively modulating warmth (through suppression or amplification), participants shared that they experienced fatigue, internal strife, feelings of inauthenticity, experiencing additional emotions, negative impact on the task at hand, and a concern they were being manipulative or deceptive. When participants reported specific instances when they did not modulate their warmth (either displaying innate warmth or an innate lack of warmth), outcomes included feeling confused, worried, dismissed, and anxious, as well as an overall sense that it was unclear when and how participants should voice their opinions such that they would be received in a positive way. These outcomes are summarized in Table 20.

**Warmth summary.** In summary, in response to the second set of research questions, *"2. Do women leaders in male-typed jobs modulate warmth displays in the workplace? 2a. If so, why? 2b. If so, how? 2c. If so, what are the outcomes?"* participants revealed that they did modulate warmth displays. Diverse reasons relating to role, gender, context, and perceived instrumentality drove their modulation and warmth was communicated in a variety of ways. Further, participants reported numerous negative outcomes associated with modulating warmth.

The findings revealed the complexity inherent in participants' internal conceptions of warmth, coupled with gendered expectations and variable contextual expectations for warmth displays. The findings also surfaced the personal and professional outcomes associated with a

mismatch between a participant's displays of warmth and the situation, interaction partner, or organizational culture at hand. In contrast to the emotion findings, which indicated the somewhat universal finding that negative emotions should be suppressed and positive emotions can be openly displayed, the warmth findings were more complicated to distill. In some situations, when holding certain roles in certain organizations, warmth is not only positively received but it is expected. Yet, in other situations, when holding different roles embedded in other organizations, warmth is negatively received. Navigating these expectations likely represents true hurdles to women's day-to-day workplace experiences.

Moreover, the tensions that presented themselves in my attempts to simplify the data likely reflected the divergence between descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes. Suppressing warmth may allow a woman leader to avoid being seen as solely warm and not competent, in line with descriptive stereotypes (Fiske et al., 1999). Put more simply, it may allow her to be "taken seriously." This was an experience that many in the sample noted. Yet, some of these same participants, as well as other participants, also attempted to couple their competence with warmth, fearing that an absence of warmth would negatively affect others' perceptions of them. The idea of softening one's competence with warmth fits squarely in the realm of prescriptive stereotypes (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Thus, my challenges in distilling these data may be a proxy for the conflicting and confusing influences on women leader's behavior at work.

Next, I offer a summary of additional key findings that emerged outside of the scope of the individual research questions and expand upon those summarized above.

## Other Key Findings

### Relationship Between Emotions and Warmth

The focus of this study progressed from an initial inquiry into the potential utilization of emotional displays to convey warmth impressions, to deeply examining the separate domains of emotions and warmth. Ultimately, only one of the 11 themes reflected the relationship *between* emotions and warmth (**Theme 11: Intersection of warmth and emotion**), while the other themes focused on either emotion or warmth. This was a necessary decision to convey the information offered by the participants most effectively and accurately. Yet, Theme 11 did offer some evidence in support of the original research question, potentially supporting the proposition that emotional displays are sometimes managed in service of conveying warmth.

With that said, participant interviews revealed additional nuances in how both emotions and warmth were implicitly or explicitly viewed by participants (and by me as the interviewer) as they reported their experiences. These nuances diverged from my initial conception of these two constructs. Further, the ways in which participants spoke about these constructs affected the conclusions that can be drawn from Theme 11 around the relatedness of these two areas. Whereas emotions seemed to be experienced as discrete internal events, warmth was spoken about in the context of interpersonal interactions (e.g., externally manifested). As such, participants might experience emotions (internally) and make decisions about whether or not to display them to others. At times, they *also* made decisions about external displays of warmth (whether through behaviors or revealing/hiding traits) after experiencing and managing emotions.

Put more concretely, a participant may have had success in attaining a client, felt excited (emotion), and displayed this excitement to engage others (**Theme 2: Emotionality as a tool**).

However, she may *then* have walked the floor outside her office to congratulate each of her team members and ensured her own superiors were aware of her team members' contributions (warmth behavior) in service of increasing team morale (**Theme 8b: Predicted or actual outcomes of expressing warmth**). Or, conversely, a participant may have been angry at a direct report's mistake (emotion) and suppressed the anger because it was not acceptable to display in her organization (**Theme 3: Unacceptable emotions**). *Then*, she may have amplified her warmth through altering her tone of voice, message, and body language while delivering feedback (warmth behavior; **Theme 9: Warmth communications to others**) in service of effectively landing her message (**Theme 8b: Predicted or actual outcomes of expressing warmth**) and because she was aware that as a woman leader, she must appear warm (**Theme 7: Others' gendered expectations about warmth**). These additional actions extend beyond merely displaying emotion and are reflective of amplifying one's warmth. Yet, these warmth behaviors do not exist in a vacuum; they are prompted by the initial emotional reaction to a given stimulus. Therefore, there was some relationship between emotional experiences and warmth-related behaviors or revealing warmth-related traits.

Additionally, the data revealed that one *outcome* of purposefully modulating warmth was an emotional reaction (**Theme 10: Personal consequences of modulating warmth displays**). In the prior example, where a participant was angry at a direct report's mistake, suppressed her anger because it was not acceptable to display in her organization (**Theme 3: Unacceptable emotions**), then amplified her warmth through altering her tone of voice, message, and body language while delivering feedback (**Theme 9: Warmth communications to others**) to land her message (**Subtheme 8b: Predicted or actual outcomes of expressing warmth**) and because of her gender identity (**Theme 7: Others' gendered expectations about warmth**), she might

ultimately experience an emotional reaction at the end of this process (e.g., frustration at having to mask her anger with warmth; **Theme 10: Personal consequences of modulating warmth displays**). Or, as another example, perhaps a participant modulated her warmth because she believed it was appropriate for a leader to do so (**Theme 6: Warmth as a component of good leadership**) and then ultimately felt satisfied because of adapting her warmth (**Theme 10: Personal consequences of modulating warmth displays**). This "reverse" connection (warmth modulation leading to an emotional reaction) was not proposed or predicted at the start of this study.

In summary, this study documented some overlap between the areas of warmth modulation and emotional modulation, though there is certainly more work to be done in further understanding how these constructs relate to one another.

**Leadership and Emotions**

The next finding that surpassed the initial research questions was the relationship between how participants viewed leadership and the importance of emotional modulation. Modulating emotions was seen as part of being competent in a leadership or management role **(Subtheme 1b: Emotional modulation is particularly important for leaders/managers)** and was reported by 64% of participants. Discovering that participants drew explicit connections between emotional modulation and leadership was somewhat unexpected.

As previously mentioned, research has found that rationality is seen as relating to leadership (Heilman et al., 1995), as is emotional stability (Judge et al., 2002). However, the relationship reported by participants between emotional modulation and leadership also related to the body of work exploring emotional intelligence (EI) and its relationship to leader

effectiveness. EI has been found to relate positively to ratings of leader effectiveness in numerous studies (Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, & Boyle, 2006; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005).

Importantly, EI can be defined in numerous ways, but for the purpose of this dissertation, it is defined as "the ability to engage in sophisticated information processing about one's own and others' emotions and the ability to use this information as a guide to thinking and behavior" (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008, p. 503). In this definition, part of EI involves being aware of one's own emotional state and then translating that information into useful data to guide behavior. Participants in this study were not specifically asked to identify emotions in others; thus, this portion of the definition will be ignored. EI comprises four specific competency areas: "[1] perceiving emotions accurately in oneself and others," "[2] using emotions to facilitate thinking," "[3] understanding emotions, emotional language, and the signals conveyed by emotions," and "[4] managing emotions so as to attain specific goals" (Mayer et al., 2008, p. 507).

The findings of this dissertation referred to all four branches of this definition. First, participants seemed to vary in their capacity to perceive emotions in themselves, with some clearly labeling their experience and others describing their emotionality in more opaque or general terms. Second, it appears that emotions were not perceived as facilitating thinking; rather, they tended to be viewed as impediments to thinking (to be further explored in the next section). With regard to the third component of EI, participants seemed to have brought their own perspectives on the signals conveyed by emotions, given their implicit beliefs and their overarching contexts (i.e., organization or field/industry). For many, there was a clear connection between their perspective on the signals that might be conveyed by expressions of specific emotions and an adaptation of behavior accordingly. The intersection of gender identity and

emotional displays was also explicitly referenced by many participants in terms of the signals that might be conveyed through emotionality. With regard to the fourth component of EI, the data seemed to indicate that participants were chiefly concerned with managing emotions in service of goals, wherein negative emotions most frequently detracted from one's capacity to achieve an objective. Yet, participants' reports of using negative emotions in instrumental ways (e.g., showing frustration to convey that a direct report needed to alter behavior) supported the idea that even negative emotions can be used to meet desired outcomes. On the whole, positive emotions seem to be viewed as supporting goal achievement.

When taken together, it appears that even without explicitly asking about EI, participants spontaneously offered multiple examples or reflections that aligned with the four components of this construct. Further, the ways in which participants spoke about managing their emotions indicated that they explicitly related modulated displays of emotionality to competence and accounted for the moderating effect of gender on this relationship. Without measuring individual EI in this sample, it is impossible to understand if some trends in different EI ability levels appeared across participants and themes. However, it is clear that consciously or not, participants reported lived experiences involving the facets of EI.

**Emotions as Problems to Be Managed**

Given that some EI theorists view emotions as functional, in terms of communicating information (Mayer et al., 2008), it was striking to find that most participants, if not all, seemed to view emotions as somewhat problematic in navigating organizational life. In conducting the interviews and analyzing the data, I was left with the sense that emotions were often unwelcome, caused distress, detracted from the task at hand, or were seen as potential roadblocks to taking up a leadership role effectively. This perception stood in contrast to viewing emotions as a source of

information or data that have the potential to reflect something not just about a given individual, but also about a group, an organization, or the broader sociopolitical context. Viewing emotions as data and as a way to better understand various levels of organizational processes (i.e., interpersonal, group, intergroup, and interorganizational; Wells, 1995) was aligned with taking a systems psychodynamic perspective on organizational life (Gould, Stapley, & Stein, 2006).

A systems psychodynamic perspective suggests that organizations are open systems, embedded in broader contexts and subject to forces from the external environment reverberating throughout the organization itself (Alderfer & Smith, 1982). Further, this perspective acknowledges the unconscious aspects of organizational life, including the covert forces affecting individuals, groups, and the organization as a whole. In this perspective, when an individual experiences and/or expresses an emotion, it is possible that the individual is containing the emotion on behalf of a larger group or system, essentially representing one aspect of the group life (Wells, 1995). Put more concretely, when a participant in this study reported feeling angry or expressing anger, it was plausible that she was angry not just on behalf of herself, but also on behalf of others in her immediate group or the broader organization. Because this was an unconscious process, those around her in her context were unlikely to own or acknowledge their own contribution to her feeling angry. Instead, they unconsciously preferred for her to carry this emotion, as they benefited from being able to disown it in themselves (Wells, 1995).

Further, it is possible that the structure of an organization implicitly tasks specific *groups* (whether organizational or identity; Alderfer & Smith, 1982) as holding aspects of the emotional life of the organization writ large (Noumair, Pfaff, St. John, Gipson, & Brazaitis, 2017). The women leaders in this study, representing the identity group of "women," as well as the

organizational group of "leader," may carry, hold, or contain certain emotions due to their group identities. As a discrete example, it may be that the *women* in a given organization were implicitly tasked with holding sadness, crying, tearfulness, and the like. The broader organization might have colluded in this unconscious division of labor because it benefited those outside of this identity group, i.e., men. If crying was seen as a sign of weakness or lack of professionalism, there may have been an unconscious investment in letting the *women* hold this emotion, which freed the men up to experience other emotions. Or, for example, there may have been a tacit agreement that the organizational group of "leader" contained frustration. By leaders holding this emotion, other groups were freed up to have different (and potentially less noxious) emotional experiences.

This perspective, which allows for more complexity in understanding why and how certain individuals or groups become "filled up" with emotions, was of particular relevance in this study. Given the overlying male-typed context, there was likely a strong unconscious (or perhaps conscious) pull for many participants to be seen as rational, logical, and objective. In fact, one participant reported that her colleagues viewed the organizational environment as hyper-masculine and rational, yet she was aware it was quite irrational. In an environment where rationality is prized, the outcasts were those who cannot abide by the implicit norm to be non-emotional. As such, extreme emotions were likely viewed as unacceptable (as reflected by **Theme 3: Unacceptable emotions**). Further, an emotion that conveyed weakness, such as crying, may also be unacceptable in a male-typed context that prized strength (also reflected in **Theme 3**). It is arguable that a female-typed context would exert different pressures on individuals, resulting in other emotions being seen as unacceptable, e.g., perhaps pride would be unacceptable in a female-typed context due to the influence of gender norms. Indeed, Rudman

and Glick (1999) noted that the feminine prescription for niceness might be more powerful in female-typed jobs.

The implications of this perspective are to locate the findings of this study not just in the individual participants who offered up their experiences, but also in the groups and organizations of which they are a part. They allow us to account for the covert dynamics that are so often ignored in favor of overt, observable, measurable phenomena (Noumair et al., 2017). By examining and understanding each woman leader's experience of emotion, we have also been given potential insight into the broader system in which she is embedded, and the ways in which others in that system might unconsciously collude in her experiencing or expressing specific emotions. Further, this perspective invites curiosity, as opposed to judgment or the enactment of rigid display rules for emotionality.

**Gender and Leadership Style**

If leadership style were to be plotted on two axes, a focus on the task at hand versus a focus on people (Gipson, Pfaff, Mendelsohn, Catenacci, & Burke, 2017), one might expect that women leaders are more likely to display a people-focused style, given the dictates of prescriptive stereotypes. In this vein, it is notable that 73% of the sample in this study reported that exhibiting warmth, i.e., a focus on people, was a component of being successful in a leadership or management role (**Theme 6: Warmth as a component of good leadership**). Interestingly, however, there was some variation in how participants spoke to the influence of *gendered* expectations for warmth on leadership style. Some participants explicitly identified the influence of gender on their warmth displays in a leadership role, whereas others did not explicitly highlight this or disagreed with the idea that gendered expectations of women affected their own warmth displays in role. Two areas of inquiry help to explain the extent to which

women leaders might be aware of, or enact, gendered expectations about their leadership style, further helping to unpack the range of experiences documented by this study. First, the effects of individual-level responses to stereotypic expectations are highlighted. Then, a summary of prior research examining leadership styles in women versus men leaders is provided.

**Individual goals.** One source of variation in participants' warmth displays and/or variation in their beliefs about gendered expectations for warmth in women leaders may be related to the implicit goals being pursued by each *individual* participant at work, based upon her reactions to gender stereotypes. In examining women scientists who operate in the stereotype-threatening system of academia, Block and colleagues (in press) found that these women demonstrated different response patterns to the stereotype that women lack the competence to succeed in science. Block et al.'s study was a parallel examination to this one, as it focused on the competence dimension of gender stereotypes. Yet, it has implications for understanding how women might navigate the warmth dimension of these same stereotypes.

In Block et al.'s (in press) study, participants were characterized as pursuing a range of implicit goals in their day-to-day work, which led to observable behavioral response patterns. The first response pattern, "fending off the threat," was driven by the goals of "[keeping] gender invisible to others and [keeping] systemic threat invisible to self" (p. 6). The second response pattern, "confronting the threat," was driven by "[making] systemic threat visible to others" (p. 6). The third response pattern, "sustaining self in the presence of threat," was driven by the goal of identifying the gender-related stereotype threat in their environment as a "dilemma to be navigated rather than [a] problem to be solved" (p. 6). Essentially, these different response options describe the discrete ways individual women scientists navigate a stereotype-threatening context, such as a male-typed role in a male-typed field.

The implications of Block et al.'s (in press) findings for the current study included that participants may have been pursuing various goals, whether consciously or unconsciously, related to managing their gender in a male-typed role (leadership) in a male-typed context. These various implicit goals might account for the range in reports about warmth displays and gendered expectations about warmth affecting leadership behavior. For example, perhaps those participants who disagreed with the idea that gender affected displays of warmth in a leadership role were implicitly focused on keeping the systemic threat (i.e., gendered expectation of women's warmth) invisible to themselves. One possibility suggested by Block et al.'s work is that that individuals displaying this response pattern may be reticent to identify the impact of the overarching context on their behaviors (in this case, warmth displays), instead denying that gender norms have an effect on them. Or, for those participants who spoke forcefully about the gendered expectations they have experienced in a leadership role, perhaps they were driven by making the systemic threat visible to others (in this case, me as the interviewer). Finally, some participants acknowledged the gendered expectations they faced in their leadership role and reported choosing which battles to engage in, versus which to sidestep for self-preservation reasons, which related to the goal associated with the third response pattern (Block et al., in press). Thus, the individual-level goals that participants were implicitly pursuing in their work contexts may ultimately affect their leadership behavior as well as self-reports about their leadership behavior in various ways, including fending off the proposition that gender identity directly affects leadership style.

**Meta-analytic findings regarding leadership style.** Another way to conceptualize the range in reports of warmth displays and how participants viewed gender affecting leadership style, if at all, is to compare the results of this study to other work in this domain. Prior meta-

analyses on leadership style revealed interesting findings about *how* woman leaders most frequently take up their leadership roles.

Despite the descriptive stereotype that women are warmer than men (Burgess & Borgida, 1999) and the prescriptive stereotype dictating that women *should be* warmer than men (Burgess & Borgida, 1999), understanding how these stereotypes translate to actual leadership styles has yielded mixed findings. On one hand, women leaders are more likely than men leaders to adopt a democratic or participative style but are not necessarily more interpersonally oriented in their style than men leaders (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004).

With regard to interpersonal orientation, the initial proposition in the current study was that women leaders' subjection to gender stereotypes from the broader context would affect their warmth behavior. However, the data revealed a more complex story, wherein some women leaders did display warmth in service of succeeding in their leadership roles, while others did not. Further, there was variation in the extent to which participants cited gender as a driver of their behavior. The prior work that demonstrates that women leaders' display of an interpersonally-oriented style depends on the context of the study (van Engen & Willemsen, 2004) suggested that drawing sweeping conclusions about the effects of gender stereotypes on *all* women leaders is misguided and inaccurate. Rather, locating women leaders in their specific contexts (job title, function, organization, and field/industry) and then understanding the unique display rules within those contexts is perhaps more predictive of an interpersonally oriented leadership style. This should be done in concert with understanding, at an individual level, how participants are responding to gender stereotypes, in line with Block et al.'s (in press) findings.

With that said, the prior finding that women leaders tend to be more democratic than men leaders (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004) is interesting in light of the

ways in which participants in this study most frequently displayed warmth. Some of the most frequently reported behaviors in this study, such as appearing approachable, creating a positive team environment, and resolving conflict, all reflected a desire to make space for others' contributions. In examining the leadership styles reported by participants within the interviews, none of the 22 participants revealed a core component of their leadership style to be autocratic. While they displayed directive behavior at times, there was no overriding leadership philosophy that emphasized taking up leadership roles in aggressive, non-collaborative ways, particularly in the context of managing direct reports. Thus, this component of their leadership style was consistent with the extant literature that documented women leaders' greater likelihood of displaying a democratic style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004). With that said, the intricacies of how a democratic style might be connected to gendered expectations for warmth behavior were not explored in this study. It is likely that participants would agree that the adoption of a democratic style, or characteristics of a democratic style, is due to contextual expectations, gendered expectations, and/or individual-level beliefs about what constitutes an appropriate leadership style, without solely identifying gender as the driver.

In summary, the ways in which participants described their own leadership styles were fairly aligned with the literature examining gender differences or similarities in styles (e.g., interpersonal, democratic). It is also notable that the data from this qualitative study demonstrated some convergence with the findings from prior quantitative studies on leadership, given the overarching goal to explore and document women leader's *lived experiences* of the phenomenon at hand, as opposed to numerically measuring their attributes or behaviors. Further, the ways in which participants spoke to the effects of their gender identity on their leadership

styles related to the results of another qualitative study exploring the lived experiences of women navigating stereotype-threatening environments (Block et al., in press).

## Limitations and Future Directions

This section covers a range of limitations that affected the findings reported here, ranging from the choice of methodology, the sampling strategy and sample itself, to the measures. Within each of these areas, the implications for future research are discussed.

### Methodology

First, while utilizing a qualitative approach was an appropriate choice for this research study, it presented a set of limitations that are important to highlight. Critiques of qualitative research, as summarized by Kvale (1994), included that such research is not objective, not reliable, not valid (because it rests on subjective impressions), and is biased. While I did account for many of these critiques in designing and conducting this study, as reflected in Chapter Three, the findings reported here should still be read with some degree of caution.

Yet, I am hesitant to conclude that it was inappropriate to take this approach or that these findings should be overlooked. Given the focus of this study, which involved understanding the lived experiences of participants as well as the dearth of prior research in this area, a qualitative exploratory approach was necessary. Further, the validity and reliability sought by traditional quantitative work rest on the assumptions of the positivist tradition—implying that one objective truth exists and can be documented (Creswell, 2012; Maxwell, 2013). Though this has been a dominant philosophical belief system underlying empirical work, it is not the only framing of the research process. Indeed, taking a social constructivism approach, which means that individuals form subjective meanings based on their own experiences, as well as social and historical factors (Creswell, 2013), implies that an approach such as this one produces valid data. Thus, the rich,

documented tradition of qualitative research suggests that this approach is one potential way to record these data.

Further, qualitative researchers have pointed out that applying traditional quantitative standards and concepts to qualitative work is actually inappropriate, given the differing philosophical assumptions and stated goals of the work (Krefting, 1991). Instead, examining the trustworthiness of a given study is indicated, which is defined as relating to the "quality, authenticity, and truthfulness of findings of qualitative research. It relates to the degree of trust, or confidence, readers have in results" (Cypress, 2017, p. 254). Lincoln and Guba (1986) noted that components of trustworthiness include credibility (akin to internal validity), transferability (akin to external validity), dependability (akin to reliability), and confirmability (akin to objectivity) are more appropriate. Confirmability, credibility, and dependability are addressed below, whereas transferability is addressed in the next section. Other potential limitations that fall outside these four areas are also woven throughout the following sections.

In reflecting on potential threats to confirmability, it is true that I was the only interviewer, I was intimately involved in coding the data, and I derived the themes by myself. It is impossible that this study did not have some degree of my own subjectivity embedded in the findings. The implication of my own subjectivity factoring into the findings presented here means that other researchers may not collect or interpret the data in the same way and that it could be challenging to replicate this study. Yet, I made every effort to ameliorate potential threats to confirmability throughout the research process, ensuring that I accounted for my biases and subjectivity at each stage of this study. I engaged in critical self-reflection, memo writing, formal conversations with my RA and advisor, and informal conversations with peers and

colleagues during the generation of the idea, data collection, data analysis, and finally, the drafting of conclusions.

In service of addressing credibility, I engaged in member checks after deriving codes and themes, which is one suggested strategy to manage this dimension of trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). Further, in response to another suggested strategy, including negative cases (Lincoln & Guba, 1986), I did not discard those participants whose experiences differed from the majority of cases; instead, I integrated their experiences into the themes. To further address credibility, I worked closely with an RA who read every transcript and coded 15 of the 22 transcripts independently. She and I engaged in a rigorous discussion about each disagreement found between our independent coding. This allowed the final set of codes to reflect the thinking of two different researchers, strengthening credibility, as my thinking, assumptions, and biases were confronted in our work together. However, it is important to note that to further bolster credibility or validity, future research may consider engaging in a rigorous way with expert researchers in this field throughout the code and theme-derivation processes. Feedback could be solicited from independent experts to ensure codes and themes are not idiosyncratic to the primary investigator.

Notably, Alvesson (2003) suggested that there may be an overreliance on the accuracy of interview data in qualitative research, given how profoundly the interview situation can affect participants as well as participants' inaccuracy in validly reporting their own experience. If this is the case, soliciting input from expert researchers might help to ground potentially biased data collected from interviewees in the broader landscape of documented findings in these areas. Then, after receiving input from these researchers, the primary investigator could further probe

participants around their experiences to solicit more accurate data. This would serve to improve the credibility of the study.

Related to this, another potential limitation to credibility stemmed from my reliance on self-report data. Participants' responses may have been subject to social desirability effects (Hoyle, Harris, & Judd, 2002). This means that the data may have been affected by participants seeking to portray themselves and their experiences in a positive light (whether deliberately or not) to me as the interviewer. Moreover, it is important to note that participants may not have been aware of how others actually viewed them in the situations they reported. Given that emotions can involve physiological reactions (Gross & John, 2003), participants may have signaled their internal states to others without conscious awareness. It is possible, for example, that a participant shared an example during our interview wherein she thought she successfully suppressed her anger, *yet* her conversation partners were actually able to detect her true feelings because her tone of voice changed or her face became red. Further, because this study focused on chronic workplace interactions, it is likely that participants were interacting with colleagues who had known them for some time and may have been aware of when participants were actively modulating emotions or warmth. Adding an observational component to this study would have allowed me another perspective on when, how, and why emotions and warmth might be modulated, beyond relying solely on self-report. Further, both observation and potentially surveying the superiors, peers, and direct reports of participants might have helped to strengthen my capacity to understand how successfully participants were modulating their emotions and their warmth. These additional data collection techniques would ultimately improve the credibility of the findings.

Despite this, if we assume that participants were accurately reporting their own experiences, an additional threat to credibility relates to the use of only one primary data collection method (interviews). This eliminated the possibility of triangulating the interview data with other sources of information (another strategy suggested by Lincoln & Guba, 1986). Because of this, it is possible that the extant data did not validly reflect the true nature of participants' experiences. While all participants were contacted with the codes and themes, more steps could have been taken to ensure that the coding and themes accurately reflected the full range and depth of participant experiences, e.g., sharing the coding of a participant's transcript with her and asking for feedback on the characterizations of her statements. Thus, the sensemaking rested upon my and my RA's reading of the data, as opposed to strenuously confirming that participants' experiences were articulated clearly.

The limitations related to dependability (or reliability) were more challenging to address in this study. Because of the exploratory nature of this work, a complex, novel coding scheme was generated. Of note, when coding semi-structured interview data with this type of coding scheme, establishing strong inter-coder agreement is particularly challenging (Campbell et al., 2013). Further, Campbell et al. (2013) noted that the tendency for semi-structured interviews to generate wide-ranging, verbose answers that touch upon numerous themes presents obstacles to establishing strong reliability. My approach to coding was to code a set of transcripts with my RA, and then to use the negotiated inter-coder agreement process between myself and my RA for subsequent transcripts. Yet, I did not examine the reliability of these codes and themes in a population of coders, which prevented me from measuring and reporting reliability in multiple coders. Future work should adopt a process that includes numerous coders and examines the

extent to which these coders are reliable with one another in coding individual statements within transcripts, as well as categorizing quotes according to high-level themes.

The next limitation relates to both credibility and confirmability. It stems from my own subjective reactions to participants. While I made every attempt to be alert to my biases, emotions, reactions, and the like during interviews, I am sure I unwittingly influenced what was shared with me. Further, I had to make speedy decisions about which follow-up questions to use, generate novel follow-up questions in the moment, think "on my feet" when presented with verbose or reticent interviewees, and attempt to track and reflect on complex information while simultaneously remaining present and engaged. Due to these various tensions, there were moments where I missed the chance to ask specific follow-up questions, misunderstood participants' meanings, or was distracted by my own emotional reactions to participant reports. Leveraging a mixed-methods approach (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) in future research would help to control for concerns about subjectivity. The use of an interview as one data collection tool could be retained, but additional questionnaires assessing emotions and warmth in survey format could be added to the research design. Questionnaires assessing both EL (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Diefendorff et al., 2011) and warmth (Cuddy et al., 2004) have been documented in prior research. Including these would ensure that the variability introduced by the researcher to the interview process was balanced by administering the exact same survey to all participants in the exact same manner, ensuring accurate data were collected.

Related, the final design-related limitation refers to my failure to capture additional individual difference (IDV) data for each participant. As previously mentioned, incorporating quantitative questionnaires might have provided balance to the semi-structured interview data. Leveraging quantitative questionnaires to examine IDVs would have allowed me to better

understand the potential moderating effects of specific participant characteristics on these findings. I identified a variety of potential IDVs in my ongoing memos during data collection and analysis, including measuring participants' adjustment scores through the Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan, Hogan, & Warrenfeltz, 2007), resilience (Friborg, Hjemdal, Rosenvinge, & Martinussen, 2003), feminine gender identification (Kachel, Steffens, & Niedlich, 2016), and/or gender bifurcation (Pronin, Steele, & Ross, 2004), individual EI (e.g., assessed by using the MSCEIT; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003), and self-monitoring (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Also, at least two participants independently suggested that career stage might also affect my findings, thus explicitly accounting for this IDV would have strengthened this study. Further, assessing an array of other variables in a consistent, quantitative way, such as participants' characterizations of their organization's gender dynamics, awareness of broader societal gender issues, exposure to traditional gender roles or norms through upbringing, and childhood and teenage exposure to traditionally male-typed sports, activities, or tasks (e.g., woodworking), would have benefitted this study.

**Sampling Strategy and Sample**

Another set of limitations arises from the sampling strategy and the sample itself. This was a convenience sample and is subject to the criticisms of this type of sample, such as an inability to generalize to the target population (Bornstein, Jager, & Putnick, 2013). As such, when leveraging Lincoln and Guba's (1986) criteria, the transferability of the findings may be limited in the sense that other samples might have yielded different results.

With that said, it was striking to find common themes across an array of occupational backgrounds, as represented by the varied participants in this study. This implies that the findings are not isolated to any one "type" of women leader in this sample, but instead are

relevant to those in fields as diverse as surgery, to scientific research, to offshore drilling. The heterogeneity of the sample effectively increases the potential generalizability of the findings. However, future research should adopt a more stringent sampling strategy, such as population-based probability sampling (Bornstein et al., 2013), which would ensure a far greater degree of transferability or generalizability. Further, future research would benefit from isolating one population of interest (e.g., women lawyers or women surgeons or women scientists), then examining these constructs within a well-defined population. Discrete studies could be undertaken with regard to various populations of women leaders, ensuring the population is homogeneous in occupational identity within each study. This, too, would increase the capacity of researchers to generalize findings to their populations of interest.

Related to this, there was great variation in the specific characteristics of participants' work environments. For example, the extent to which participants' organizations and immediate peer groups were male-dominated ranged from 2% to 50% for the former and 2% to 55% for the latter. On one hand, this suggested some level of generalizability in findings, given that themes cut across these different settings. On the other hand, the capacity to uncover potential nuances related to these disparate settings was lost. For example, the experiences of women leaders in environments so dominated by men that the entire organization employs only 2% women are likely to be qualitatively different from those with a gender split that is more balanced. Yet, I was unable to probe how and why these experiences might be different, given the limited sample size. Future research would benefit from imposing boundary conditions for the extent to which a participant's environment is male-dominated, allowing for a more robust exploration of extremely, highly, or moderately male-dominated settings.

Similarly, while some participants mentioned the extent to which their work was primarily in person versus virtual, others did not explicitly mention this variable. Given the changing nature of work (Priest, Stagl, Klein, & Salas, 2006; World Bank, 2019), developing a deep understanding of the ways in which emotion modulation or warmth modulation relate to virtual work is essential. However, without explicitly measuring this *and* ensuring there was enough variability in the sample to explore trends in the findings, this occupational variable was not meaningfully included in analyses.

While the occupational backgrounds of participants varied, the sample was fairly homogeneous in demographic characteristics. It was majority White, straight, partnered, left-leaning, American, and highly-educated. This is notable as this collection of identities matches my own social identity group memberships in many ways. While I did not explicitly seek out participants who were similar to me, I did ultimately create a sample that mirrored my own characteristics. This may be due to my own personal and professional networks, and as such, is something on which I have continued to reflect.

Further, the limited range in various demographic variables reduced my capacity to explore how multiple social identity variables may have interacted to affect participants' experiences of emotion and warmth modulation. Explicitly investigating intersectionality, defined as "the notion that identity is formed by interlocking and mutually reinforcing vectors of race, gender, class, and sexuality" (Nash, 2008, p. 3), would have strengthened this study. The sample comprised little diversity in race and sexuality. Though class was not explicitly assessed, the highly-educated nature of the sample, coupled with the majority white-collar or professional job titles and industries, indicated that the majority of this sample was likely middle or upper

class in nature and working in environments surrounded by others of a similar class background. This does limit the transferability of these findings.

For example, prior work has suggested that Black and White women are subject to different societal expectations for emotional displays, in that Black women are expected to be angry whereas White women are expected to be tearful (Brazaitis, 2004). Further, researchers have suggested that White women may be less aware of systemic forces that value or devalue certain social identity groups, as compared to people of color (Block et al., in press). Next, with regard to sexual orientation, Fiske et al. (2002) noted that lesbians are viewed as competent but lacking warmth. As such, it may be the case that lesbians are particularly vulnerable to being viewed as violating prescriptive stereotypes for women, necessitating that they must prove their warmth more frequently, and perhaps in different or more overt ways, than straight women.

With regard to class, recruiting a sample with greater variability in the types of industries and organizational contexts represented, as well as the level of education required to hold a given occupation, would allow for a broader exploration of these phenomena. Out of the myriad industries represented, it was striking to realize that the two participants who worked alongside a greater proportion of blue-collar workers were also the two participants who faced the most overt sexism (in addition to less obvious, yet still striking, instances of benevolent sexism; Glick & Fiske, 1996). Interestingly, those participants who worked in white-collar or professional settings seemed to face more covert sexism (though some of these participants also faced upsetting and directly sexist comments). Perhaps there is a way in which white-collar workplaces have pushed hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) underground, abiding by another set of tacit display rules about what can be verbalized "in polite company," whereas blue-collar workplaces are not subject to the same interaction rules. Additional research is needed to bear this out.

It is also important to note that age was the only demographic variable that varied somewhat across participants, though there were few women in the later stages of their career. Ultimately, three participants were baby boomers, nine were in Generation X, and 10 were millennials. Recruiting a sample that was more evenly distributed across different generations might have allowed for an analysis of the effects of generational differences on these themes. Further, more actively exploring how career stage affected the findings would have strengthened this study. For example, perhaps baby boomers have seen positive changes over time in the workplace and feel less constrained by gender norms than earlier in their careers or view younger women as experiencing fewer gender-related challenges in present-day workplaces. Multiple participants actually explicitly referenced how generational differences in their coworkers affected their interpersonal interactions around gender. In the various debrief conversations, several participants also reported that their own and other participants' career stages might moderate my findings.

Finally, it is worth noting that in my recruitment materials, email communications, and interview protocol, I referenced gender identity on numerous occasions. In fact, during the interviews, I explicitly asked participants to reflect on how their identity as a woman affected their warmth displays at work. In employing this language, I explicitly narrowed which identity variables (in this case, solely gender) I was interested in exploring in relation to emotions and warmth. While focusing participants on gender likely yielded rich data about one particular social identity, doing so likely oversimplified participants' experiences, ignoring the complex forces exerted by multiple identity variables on emotion and warmth modulation. It is significant that at least three participants spontaneously reported the effects of other identity variables (e.g., race, country of origin, class background) on their experiences during the interview process. It

would have been beneficial to understand *how* and *why* Black women leaders or lesbian women leaders or first-generation college graduate women leaders differed in their emotion and warmth modulation, given these various identities.

Thus, it is suggested that future work ensure diversity across myriad demographic characteristics in the sample. It is also advisable for future research to account for the effects of intersectionality in participants, examining the impact of multiple social identity group memberships on the phenomenon of interest. Recruiting a sample that more accurately reflects the actual population of women leaders in this country and understanding the ways in which multiple identity variables impinge on women leaders' experiences are essential to generating generalizable *and* valid findings.

The last limitation relating to the sample refers to the choice to include only women leaders in this study. Without including men leaders, it is impossible to compare across these two groups. Therefore, I cannot claim that women leaders have additional or different work *as compared to* men leaders; I can solely claim that women leaders revealed a great deal of labor that falls outside of traditional job descriptions of leadership. It may be that men leaders also take on additional work or are subject to the dictates of gender stereotypes. Conversely, it may be the case that men leaders do not report an awareness of these stereotypic expectations for their own behavior, and as such, do not modulate either their emotions or their warmth. Finding that men leaders do *not* actively modulate emotions or warmth is a powerful finding in and of itself and may speak to a manifestation of privilege.

Thus, future work should include men leaders in similar or identical positions, organizations, and fields/industries. With that said, I am also hesitant to imply that men leaders are the "absent standard" (Sampson, 1993) against which women leaders should be judged. The

findings of this study can stand on their own without a parallel investigation into men leaders' experiences. It is just notable that the capacity to compare *between* groups was not a component of the current study.

**Measures**

The final set of limitations relates to the measures that I employed throughout data collection. I did not explicitly define emotion in my interview protocol; thus, it is likely that each individual participant brought her own understanding of the construct of emotion to bear on her answers to my questions. Further, as reviewed in Chapter Four, though I explicitly defined warmth in my interview protocol, it became clear that individual participants associated various meanings to the word warmth, despite my definition. Thus, identical questions may have elicited different information from each participant, given her unique, internally-held definitions of emotion and warmth. This exerts a negative impact on credibility, as it is not clear exactly what participants were holding in their mind when commenting on emotions or warmth. Future research should ensure that the constructs of emotion and warmth be explicitly and repeatedly defined and that alternate definitions held by participants are explored and recorded. While it is not possible to know exactly what participants are thinking, it is imperative to clearly define constructs of interest and to document any divergences verbalized by participants throughout the interview. Conversely, it may be of deep interest to researchers to explore these disparate meanings, as variation in perceptions of emotion or warmth is an interesting finding in and of itself. Yet, clarity around the purpose of the research study should guide the degree to which researchers are seeking divergent meanings or aiming to ensure consistency in meaning across participants.

Somewhat related, when recounting specific emotions, participants were asked an open-ended question to solicit responses. Retrospectively, it is clear that answering this question depended on participants' capacity to identify and name their emotional experiences. This ability varies in the human population (Barrett, 2006) and, as such, presents challenges to the extent that participants varied in their ability levels. Next, upon naming a given emotion, participants were not asked to define their perspective on what constitutes the emotion, e.g., how they defined "happiness." This suggests that each participant was leveraging her own definition for the emotions she presented during the interview, as opposed to me providing explicit guidelines on how common emotional experiences are defined. This also presents validity concerns in that one participant's definition of an emotion may not match another participant's definition of the same emotion, nor might it match my own definition of the emotion. Future research might consider incorporating an overarching list of emotional experiences as a prompt for participants and/or providing clear definitions for each emotional experience. Or, as previously mentioned, future research may consider exploring the diverse ways in which this population conceptualizes specific emotions as long as the overall research question explicitly aims to achieve this end.

This issue is particularly salient with regard to the emotion of frustration, which was the most frequently reported specific emotion. My RA reflected that frustration seemed to refer to a broad range of emotional experiences, such that it was sometimes challenging to understand exactly what participants meant when they used this term. Further, she posited that frustration might be a more acceptable emotion for women to report than anger, rage, or other more intense emotions. Given that frustration is defined as the inability "to change or achieve something" (Oxford Dictionaries, n.d.), ensuring that participants viewed frustration in this way would have bolstered my findings.

Finally, the interview protocol did not explicitly assess the stimuli evoking emotional or warmth-related reactions, nor did it provide a great deal of scaffolding around assessing outcomes of emotional or warmth modulation. Given that this study was not initially designed as documenting an input-throughput-output process, the lack of questions targeted at exploring the inputs or outputs is not surprising. Yet, future research may consider more fully documenting the stimuli (i.e., inputs) that participants relate to emotional or warmth-related reactions. Further, probing the personal and professional impacts of such modulation on participants (e.g., outputs) would paint a fuller and more robust picture of potential outcomes. Future research may also benefit from understanding the outcomes of choosing not to modulate emotions or warmth as well as failing to modulate emotions or warmth.

## Implications for Theory and Practice

### Theoretical Implications

This study revealed several implications for theory, including the overlap between emotional modulation and warmth modulation, the theoretical definitions of EL and warmth, and the relationship between gender stereotypes and emotionality stereotypes.

First, as exemplified by the last theme, **Intersection of warmth and emotion** (**Theme 11**), there was some relatedness between emotional modulation and warmth modulation. On one end of the continuum, participants reported suppressing negative emotions, then amplifying manifestations of warmth. On the other end, participants reported displaying or amplifying positive emotions, then also amplifying warmth displays. The traditional definition of EL refers solely to managing displayed *emotions* (Grandey, 2000), but does not include managing subsequent behaviors after the initial emotional event. Therefore, in this study, the idea that

participants first modulated emotions and then modulated behavioral warmth displays is a finding that goes beyond the traditional literature.

However, further theorizing is needed to explore whether EL should theoretically include warmth-related behaviors that occur after the initial emotion is experienced *or* if downstream warmth behavior modification actually represents a separate construct (consistent with how it was treated in this study). If downstream warmth behavior does represent a separate construct, understanding where EL ends and warmth modulation begins is imperative. At what point does someone move out of either surface acting (managing observable expressions; Grandey, 2000) or deep acting (adjusting internal emotional experience to match external displays; Grandey, 2000) and move into purposefully modulating warmth-related behaviors?

For example, I characterized one participant's account of suppressing her anger, then demonstrating warmth-related behaviors in conveying constructive feedback to her staff as an example of emotional modulation coupled with warmth modulation. Yet, perhaps another researcher would simply view this as *either* emotion *or* warmth modulation. The way I differentiated between these constructs, identifying emotions as discrete internal events that may or may not be displayed, and warmth as occurring in behavioral or trait form in the space between people, may not be the most accurate. Thus, theoretical guidance on the boundaries of EL can guide future work, addressing the extent to which EL includes or does not include manifestations of warmth behaviors, such as supporting team members, altering one's tone of voice, bringing a group to consensus, and others, after an emotion is experienced.

It is also interesting to note that one prior qualitative study investigating the lived experiences of EL seemed to uncover evidence of the link between emotional modulation and warmth modulation, though in this study, Pierce (1995) expanded the concept of EL to include

all interpersonally-oriented caretaking behaviors. She did not refer to these behaviors as related to warmth; instead, she viewed them as an extension of EL. This stands in contrast to the myriad quantitative studies that have viewed EL in a narrower and discrete way. Again, there is a need for more clarity in how to define and differentiate between emotional modulation (or EL) and warmth modulation, as well as theorizing about how they relate to one another.

Next, when analyzing the data, I was struck by the tension between the more traditional definition of EL (focusing on interactions with clients, patients, customers, and other external stakeholders) and the definition of EL utilized in this study (examining internally facing interactions with superiors, peers, and direct reports). I viewed some of what was shared by participants in this study as classic surface acting (managing observable expressions; Grandey, 2000) or deep acting (adjusting internal emotional experience to match external displays; Grandey, 2000). It is theoretically meaningful that participants shared these experiences in internally oriented interactions (i.e., superiors, peers, direct reports), as opposed to clients, patients, or customers, because this provided support for the idea that EL can be extended to more diverse interactions. While several recent studies have indicated that some researchers are eager to expand the definition of EL to a broader set of interactions (e.g., Simpson & Stroh, 2004), there seems to be hesitation in the field overall to examine more tacit and informal display rules for interfacing with internal groups.

Perhaps this is because EL is posited to depend on discrete display rules, which may be clearer when interacting with external constituencies, e.g., "service with a smile" (Barger & Grandey, 2006). Internal interactions may be more complex, harder to measure in an *in vivo* way (because they are chronic and lengthy), and subject to an array of other dynamics (e.g., the length of time colleagues have known each other, competition between groups for scarce resources,

etc.). However, there is a need for additional theory development that stipulates how the EL involved in internally facing interactions might converge with, or diverge from, the prior work involving external groups. Before continuing to conduct research on these various internal groups, there needs to be greater clarity around the theoretical propositions of EL in these diverse settings.

Next, greater theoretical clarity on what constitutes a lack of warmth is indicated by this study. The definition of warmth as positive intent (Fiske et al., 2002) is clear. Similarly, the definition of communality as attributes related to social interactions or service to others is also clear (Heilman, 2001). However, the specific types of behaviors or traits that convey a *lack* of warmth (or a lack of communality) are less apparent.

A lack of warmth can be conveyed simply by displaying competence (Cuddy et al., 2011). Low warmth has been described as a particular group appearing "too competent, too ambitious, too hardworking, and, simultaneously, not sociable" (Fiske et al., 2002, p. 880). Heilman (2012) noted that appearing "individualistic or competitive in…orientation" (p. 125) violates the prescription for communality. Further, competent women are viewed not only as lacking communality, but they are seen as "countercommunal" (Heilman, 2001, p. 668). This set of findings suggests that displaying male-typed behaviors, such as competence, assertiveness, and competitiveness, is akin to demonstrating a lack of warmth and/or actively violating the warmth prescription.

However, warmth can also be assessed via rating a group on a Likert scale on the following attributes: "tolerant, warm, good-natured, sincere" (Fiske et al., 2002, p. 884), "warm, kind, sensitive" (Rudman et al., 2012, p. 181), and "good listener, cheerful, enthusiastic, cooperative, friendly, helpful" (p. 183), as well as a bipolar scale assessing "supportive–not

supportive, understanding–not understanding, sensitive–insensitive, and caring–not caring" (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007, p. 83). These findings imply that viewing a person as low in these traits constitutes a lack of warmth. Similarly, Cuddy, Fiske, and Glick (2008) used the words "unsociable and aloof" to describe a social identity group low on warmth.

Yet, warmth can also be conveyed through an interest in children (Rudman et al., 2012) or through parental status (Cuddy et al., 2004). With regard to parental status, Cuddy et al. (2004) found that women without children are rated as significantly less warm than women with children. These descriptions suggested that not being a parent or not being interested in children implies a woman lacks warmth.

Finally, the role that anger plays in conveying a lack of warmth is somewhat ambiguous. Within the context of this study, anger was viewed as leading to impressions of a lack of warmth. Yet, the majority of prior work studying anger's relationship to gender stereotypes has actually focused on the competence dimension. For example, Brescoll and Uhlmann (2008) found that women's displays of anger resulted in a backlash effect due to lower *competence* ratings. Lewis (2000) found that an angry woman leader was rated lower in effectiveness than a neutral woman leader. Brescoll (2016) suggested that anger expressions in women convey dominance and high-status, which leads to negative outcomes because women are not stereotyped as dominant or high status. Thus, while it has been documented that women showing anger violates expectations about gender-appropriate *emotions* (Hess, Adams, Grammer, & Kleck, 2009), the extent to which anger may violate warmth norms has not been thoroughly described, to my knowledge.

Taken together, it appears that low warmth can be conveyed through demonstrating male-typed traits or behaviors, failing to demonstrate friendly, helpful, kind traits or behaviors, and failing to associate oneself with children. It was assumed in this study that conveying anger may

also lead to perceptions of a lack of warmth. These varied ways to conceptualize low warmth surfaced in the context of this study when trying to understand the data. It was challenging to account for the myriad ways a lack of warmth might present itself in these participants.

Further, these different behaviors or traits vary in the extent to which they are purposeful (e.g., choosing to express anger; purposefully withholding help from others) versus accidental (e.g., unwittingly decreasing perceptions of warmth simply by displaying competence; being a reserved or shy person by nature). They also vary in that one outcome seems to be conveying an absence of warmth, whereas another outcome is actively displaying the opposite of warmth. It is unclear in the literature, and unclear in this particular study, if purposefully withholding warmth, actively violating the warmth prescription, or accidentally communicating a lack of warmth are qualitatively different, or if they all fall under the umbrella of low warmth. Further, it is unclear if displaying anger solely leads to effects on competence ratings, or if it also affects perceptions of warmth. Perhaps it is accurate to group these diverse ways of conveying low warmth together, though that seems to create a noisy, heterogeneous construct. As such, greater theoretical understanding is needed to identify and describe more accurately what we mean when we examine a lack of warmth as well as how anger factors into warmth judgments, if at all.

Finally, while one body of work has examined gender stereotypes and another body of work has examined emotionality stereotypes, exploring the relatedness of these areas seems to be less common (Brescoll, 2016). It is interesting to note that gender stereotypes are based on the differing roles taken on by women and men in the past, wherein men typically had more power and status than women (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eckes, 2002; Rudman et al., 2012). Past work has also connected the emotions viewed as typical of each gender, as well as expressed by each gender, to their traditional gender roles and the status that accompanies those roles (Brescoll,

2016; Ragins & Winkel, 2011). Yet, the ways in which stereotypic expectations about emotionality—i.e., women are more emotional than men (Fischer, 1993; Simon & Nath, 2004); women are expected to cry, men are expected to be angry (Ragins & Winkel, 2011)—connect to the warmth and competence dimensions of gender stereotypes is less apparent.

Within this study, emotionality writ large (i.e., the volume and strength of emotional experiences) seemed to relate directly to the competence dimension of gender stereotypes. Participants reported that modulating emotions was a way to convey competence (**Theme 1: Emotional modulation as a component of competence**), was important to succeeding in a leadership role (**Subtheme 1b: Emotional modulation is particularly important for leaders/managers**), and was a way to get work done (**Theme 2: Emotionality as a tool**). These three themes speak to modulating emotions to achieve the task at hand, in service of appearing competent in the workplace. These findings also relate to the literature describing emotional stability as a desired quality in leaders (Judge et al., 2002), as well as noting that a lack of competence is inferred from women's emotional displays, resulting in impediments to advancement in the workplace (Brescoll, 2016).

On the other hand, there is a link between positive emotions and warmth (Smith et al., 2015). Indeed, the ways in which participants in this study conveyed warmth (**Theme 9: Warmth communications to others**) often involved exhibiting positive emotions, just as they suppressed positive emotions or allowed negative emotions to come through when conveying a lack of warmth. Further, as Brescoll (2016) noted, "women who are unemotional risk being seen as cold, unfeeling, and unfeminine as they are fundamentally failing to fulfill their warm, communal role as women" (p. 421). Importantly, she also suggested that displaying some degree

of positive emotions conveys warmth, but noted that excessive positive emotion is detrimental to women (Brescoll, 2016).

From these findings, it is possible to conclude that stereotypes about emotionality writ large may be related to competence, wherein women are stereotyped as more emotional than men (and, therefore, as less competent than men). This contrasts with emotionality stereotypes about specific emotions, which might communicate information about warmth, e.g., men are stereotyped as expressing anger more than women (Ragins & Winkel, 2011), which may communicate a lack of warmth. Or, women are stereotyped as expressing cheerfulness more than men (Ragins & Winkel, 2011), thus communicating an impression of warmth. However, greater theoretical clarity on the relatedness of emotionality stereotypes and gender stereotypes would be helpful in further elucidating how these areas map onto one another.

**Practical Implications**

This study revealed potential practical implications for organizations writ large, groups, and individuals. As is suggested by the systems psychodynamic perspective (Gould et al., 2006) presented earlier, as well as the concept of embeddedness (Alderfer & Smith, 1982), these implications are not independent of one another; rather, my expectation is that any application of these findings to the organizational level will impinge on the group and individual levels, just as an application of these findings at the individual level will reverberate up and out, through the group and organizational levels. Finally, applying these findings to the group level is expected to influence both the individual and the organizational levels (Wells, 1995).

**Organizational practical implications.** At the organizational level, it is clear that many participants, across a diverse range of roles, fields, and industries, perceived display rules for their emotional and/or warmth-related displays. The presence of these display rules is most

salient in the following themes and subthemes: **Emotional modulation is particularly important for women** (Subtheme 1a), **Unacceptable emotions** (Theme 3), **Implicit norms of expression and modulation** (Subtheme 3a), **Others' gendered expectations about warmth** (Theme 7), **Predicted or actual workplace consequences of warmth displays** (Theme 8), **Predicted or actual outcomes of not expressing warmth** (Subtheme 8a), **Predicted or actual outcomes of expressing warmth** (Subtheme 8b), and **Predicted or actual outcomes of displaying moderate warmth** (Subtheme 8c). Each of these themes touch on some aspect of the surrounding context (whether direct interactions with workplace colleagues or more distal, abstract belief systems at the organizational level) having an impact on women leaders' beliefs about emotionality or warmth.

These tacit display rules may be a product of the cultures of the various organizations represented within this sample. Schein (2010) defined organizational culture as comprising three components: artifacts (visible and observable structures, processes, and behavior); espoused beliefs and values (ideals, mental models, goals, and rationalizations); and basic underlying assumptions ("unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and values [which] determine behavior, perception, thought, and feeling" [p. 24]). It may be the case that these three elements of culture conveyed information to participants about the appropriateness, acceptability, and desirability of emotion and/or warmth displays. The potential messages conveyed by artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and/or basic underlying assumptions surfaced throughout the interviews.

For example, one participant spoke to observing another woman expressing emotion, and then heard how colleagues negatively perceived those emotional displays (e.g., artifacts). Another participant spoke to the financial industry needing to engender trust from clients, such that extreme emotions would serve to detract from a trustworthy impression (e.g., espoused

beliefs and values). With regard to warmth, one participant shared that failing to display warmth resulted in being publicly chastised (e.g., artifacts). Another shared that she dampened her warmth to increase scientific credibility with colleagues, alluding to the unconscious organizational belief that warmth is not consonant with competence (e.g., basic underlying assumptions).

There were no universal organizational culture findings across all organizations represented in this sample, which actually makes a great deal of sense. Each organization is likely to have its own, unique culture in general, as well as specifically with regard to emotions or warmth. Yet, the commonality in participant experiences suggested there was some overlap in how emotions and warmth were viewed (consciously or unconsciously) within these various male-typed contexts. Thus, the implication for those organizations that are male-dominated or those that exist in male-typed fields or industries is to examine the potential overt and covert messages that are being emitted and reinforced with regard to emotionality and warmth. Leaders may consider asking themselves, and other stakeholder groups, if the culture allows for displays of emotionality, and if so, which emotions and to what extent. They may also ask what level of warmth is expected and how clearly or ambiguously messages about desired warmth levels are communicated. They may consider what the impact is on women leaders when they display the "wrong" emotions, strong emotions, or fail to display the "appropriate" level of warmth, as reflected in **Personal outcomes of modulating emotions** (Theme 5) and **Personal consequences of modulating warmth displays** (Theme 10). Conversely, they may reflect on the impact of implicitly requiring emotional or warmth modulation from women leaders, which is also reflected in **Personal outcomes of modulating emotions** (Theme 5) and **Personal consequences of modulating warmth displays** (Theme 10). Then, they may ask if this is the

type of culture that is most beneficial to the work at hand and to the people within the organization. Women leaders harboring concerns about violating the organizational culture around emotionality and/or warmth may not truly support the organization's capacity to achieve the best possible outcomes.

**Group practical implications.** Next, at the group level, it is suggested that group members who work with women leaders, as well as women leaders themselves, build greater awareness and understanding of the unconscious drivers of emotional or warmth-related displays at work. One such driver relates to the group-as-a-whole perspective (Wells, 1995), which propones that a group is more than the sum of its parts; instead, there are unconscious dynamics at play in groups that affect individuals' feelings and behaviors.

The participants in this study were members of multiple groups (e.g., leading their own teams, working with peers in group settings, and being led by superiors in group settings), which likely presented myriad opportunities for unconscious group processes to surface. It was clear throughout data analysis that individual woman leaders in this sample, as well as their direct reports, peers, and superiors, possessed opinions about their own and others' displays of emotionality or warmth, e.g., **Emotional modulation as a component of competence** (Theme 1), **Emotional modulation is particularly important for women** (Subtheme 1a), **Emotional modulation is particularly important for leaders/managers** (Subtheme 1b), **Warmth as a component of good leadership** (Theme 6), **Predicted or actual workplace consequences of warmth displays** (Theme 8), **Predicted or actual outcomes of not expressing warmth** (Subtheme 8a), **Predicted or actual outcomes of expressing warmth** (Subtheme 8b), and **Predicted or actual outcomes of displaying moderate warmth** (Subtheme 8c). Yet, participants did not report how these beliefs might manifest at the group-as-a-whole level. Thus,

this section ties these individual-level beliefs to group-level phenomena and analysis. Notably, given the fact that these groups were situated in broader organizational contexts, the same artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions that were reported at the organizational level provide the backdrop against which group behavior should be examined.

Group-as-a-whole theory (Wells, 1995) suggests that specific individuals may unconsciously enact aspects of the group life, based on their valence (i.e., personality or disposition) and/or social identity group memberships. While it is alluring to assume, for example, that woman leaders who display a great deal of emotion are incompetent, or those who show too much warmth lack toughness, these assessments fail to account for the effects of group-level forces.

As an example, a woman leader may display tearfulness or sadness and may then be denigrated by her peers or her direct reports (because these emotional displays imply that she lacks competence). On one hand, she certainly may be acting in that manner because of her own individual state of mind. Yet, she may *also* be containing that emotion on behalf of the group at hand because others do not want to identify that emotion in themselves. Perhaps the group has unconsciously "chosen" her to contain these emotions due to her innate personality, her social identity as a woman, or both. Thus, for group members to view her as the *only* sad or tearful person in the group, and then denigrate her for it, does not reflect the complexity of group life. As another example, a woman leader may display warm, nurturing behavior and may then be faced with a critical reaction from the group, whether peers or direct reports. It is certainly conceivable that her behavior is actually ineffective or inappropriate. Yet, taking a group as a whole stance expands our view of what is possible in this scenario. It may be the case that group members are disowning their own feelings of warmth towards others (because displaying warmth

is a sign of weakness in this organizational culture) and instead locating them in the woman leader. When she expresses these disowned feelings, she is then critiqued.

Therefore, increasing awareness of unconscious processes within group life, particularly in groups led by woman leaders or groups inclusive of both woman leaders and male leaders working as peers, may be of benefit to practitioners. As one potential mechanism for increasing awareness, Figures 2 and 3 may serve as a way to broaden group members' understandings of the myriad reasons a woman leader may be acting in various ways. Though these figures do not explicitly speak to group as a whole dynamics, they do identify the role, gender, and contextual pressures impinging on women leaders' behaviors, as well as the potential or actual instrumental effects of modulating emotions or warmth that may be affecting women leaders' behaviors. This may be a way for group members to reality-test their own assumptions about a displayed behavior, allowing them to hone their capacity to reflect before immediately reacting or drawing conclusions.

It is imperative to note that asking women leaders and their direct reports (or their male peers) to adopt a group-as-a-whole perspective is not without its challenges. Indeed, asking entire groups to hold on to more complexity in what they expect of themselves and others, as well as asking men to hold different emotional experiences (e.g., sadness) or to hold more warmth, in service of freeing women up to hold other aspects of group life, is a direct challenge to the status quo and to stereotypic expectations. Those women leaders who have established new group norms may then fail to display warmth or may express "unacceptable" emotions in other settings. This can expose them to backlash from those in the broader organization who are not holding onto the same level complexity in what is expected of women. Similarly, those men who excel in traditionally female-typed tasks may also face a form of backlash by being viewed

as wimpy and ineffectual (Heilman & Wallen, 2010). Thus, instituting change at the group-as-a-whole level must be done thoughtfully and by attending to the broader organizational context and the individual-level implications for group members.

**Individual practical implications.** Related, at the individual level, it may be beneficial for women leaders to review and reflect upon Figures 2 and 3 to deepen their understanding of the potential drivers of their own (and other women leaders') behaviors. It may also serve the function of ameliorating feelings of being alone with struggles or confusions around emotional or warmth displays, as it is clear that many women leaders deal with similar obstacles when working in male-typed contexts.

Moreover, the idea that specific group members may be expressing certain emotional or warmth-related displays *on behalf of* others may be freeing for individual woman leaders. It can provide additional framing around a given behavior that locates the issue as a function of the group, not a problem located within an individual person. For example, a woman leader who has been denigrated for being tearful may then be able to understand that there is not something "wrong" with *her* per se, but instead that the group as a whole does not want to acknowledge this feeling in themselves. Related, individual women leaders may benefit from reflecting on their own valences (Wells, 1995) to determine what aspects of the group life are likely to stick to them like Velcro (Noumair, 2013). Then, they have the potential to move differently in groups, by attending to when and how the group might be unconsciously using them around these areas of emotionality or warmth.

The data analysis also made it clear that women leaders were frequently employing techniques aligned with surface acting (Grandey, 2000) when presented with negative stimuli. This means that participants were often attempting to modulate their visible emotional reactions

*after* being confronted with a stimulus. This has been linked to an array of negative outcomes, including but not limited to work withdrawal and negative affect (Scott & Barnes, 2011), psychosomatic complaints and psychological strain (Hülsheger et al., 2010), and emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003). Leveraging deep acting strategies, which refers to the act of intentionally managing internal feelings, leading to a modification of an observable expression, may result in better outcomes for women leaders. One key takeaway for women leaders may be to attempt to reframe their thinking about negative stimuli in advance of encountering these stimuli or when faced with these stimuli in the moment. This may allow them to align their internal experiences and external expressions of emotions, as opposed to being put in a situation where they essentially plaster a smile over negative emotional reactions. An example of such reframing could include viewing a male colleague's hostile reaction to displaying tears as a product of his inability to tolerate feelings of helplessness when exposed to the sadness of others.

Similarly, with warmth-related displays, women leaders may consider leveraging the learning from studies examining the negative outcomes of response-focused strategies (Baumeister et al., 1998; Gross, 2002) versus the more neutral or positive outcomes of antecedent-focused strategies (Gross, 2002). Antecedent-focused strategies could involve deliberately selecting which situations are encountered in a work day, consciously changing one's thinking about a situation, consciously changing the focus of one's thoughts when encountering a challenging situation, actively modulating the situation to be less negative, or altering the meaning that one attaches to a given situation.

For example, a woman leader might dampen her warmth throughout her work day, given an organizational display rule that showing warmth is equivalent to weakness. She could

potentially reframe this by reflecting on the psychological needs of her colleagues in the workplace (i.e., changing her thinking about the situation). Perhaps in this setting, displays of warmth are frightening or threatening to her colleagues as they may invite more authentic engagement than interacting in a cold, transactional way. In this example, the organizational context may value and reward engaging in cold, transactional ways, such that those same colleagues that critiqued her displays of warmth are simply trying to survive in a challenging, austere organizational culture. Another response to such an organizational culture might be to focus on other aspects of her life that bring her joy, when she is forced to engage in cold interpersonal interactions.

With this said, it is notable that employing deep acting or using antecedent-focused strategies actually requires additional labor on behalf of women leaders. These strategies are offered at the individual level as a way to protect women leaders' psychological resources in the workplace, with the hope that the personal costs of modulating emotions or warmth are lessened through utilizing these strategies. The larger issue of what an organizational culture values or devalues and the extent to which a given woman leader agrees or disagrees with these values is beyond the scope of the individual level. Such discussions would need to take place at the organizational level. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that one single woman leader, or one leader in general, can change the organizational culture around these issues.

One final individual-level implication suggested by this study is the value of engaging men, whether as direct reports, peers, or superiors, in training or educational opportunities to bolster their own understanding of issues relating to gender stereotypes in the workplace, as well as increasing their emotional intelligence (EI). Women cannot be the only ones to hold on to, and attempt to intervene in, gender dynamics at work.

With regard to the warmth component of gender stereotypes, encouraging (or even requiring) men to take up more warmth-related behaviors at work, such as those exhibited by the women leaders in this study, is likely to benefit a number of stakeholders. For example, if men leaders were allocating a significant proportion of their time to mentor and develop direct reports, as mentioned by numerous participants in this study, it would likely benefit individuals, groups, and organizations writ large. Or, if a woman leader was presenting in a highly male-dominated group and displayed warmth behaviors, instead of instantly dismissing her credibility, it would be a powerful intervention for her male peers to reflect in the moment about their unconscious reactions to such warmth displays.

In terms of EI, improving one's capacity to recognize, understand, and thoughtfully use emotion at work should not be a skill delegated solely to women. Though small gender differences have been found, wherein women score better on assessments of EI (as reviewed by Chamorro-Premuzic, 2019), improving men's EI is likely to result in better performance in leadership roles, as EI is associated with leadership effectiveness. Chamorro-Premuzic (2019) concluded that failing to attend to EI may be one reason incompetent men are chosen for positions of leadership. Notably, the reasoning underlying his assertion is that using better selection criteria, such as high EI, will result in better leadership in general, across both men and women. Thus, in addition to men becoming more aware of their own biases towards women leaders' emotions and/or taking up more aspects of the group's emotional life, the men leaders themselves would benefit from actively increasing their EI in the workplace.

In reflecting on the entirety of this section as well as the results presented in Chapter Four, there is one final practical implication worth noting. This study documented the additional work that women leaders engage in on a day-to-day basis at work, in terms of emotional and

warmth modulation. Further, if the majority of the suggestions offered above at the organizational, group, and individual level are adhered to, women leaders are actually being tasked with even more work to do, outside of their concrete job responsibilities. Given the dearth of women leaders, one potential explanation indicated by this study includes the additional labor that women leaders must perform each day. It is arguable that appropriately managing emotions and warmth may allow women leaders to stand on relatively equal footing with male peers in terms of others' perceptions, yet the amount of emotional and warmth modulation work required for those women to achieve that equal footing is likely far greater. It is akin to running a mile before lining up at the starting line of a marathon. Given the deleterious outcomes associated with both emotion and warmth modulation reported in this study (e.g., exhaustion, inauthenticity, discomfort), perhaps this tacitly required modulation is a hurdle in the way of women remaining in leadership roles or advancing even further.

Moreover, it is unlikely that organizational performance metrics account for this unseen work. There may be benefits to organizations, groups, and individual women leaders somehow capturing and documenting emotional and warmth modulation, perhaps through revisions to performance reviews and management systems, multi-rater feedback, or promotion criteria. Without accounting for the extra labor women leaders engage in, as well as the negative effects of this labor, it is challenging to have a robust and accurate understanding of women leaders' overall performance. Yet, it is also important to note that subjective evaluation criteria may actually disadvantage women (Heilman, 2001), thus finding objective ways to account for additional emotional or warmth-related labor is key.

## Final Conclusions

This study began with a quote from Hillary Clinton identifying the challenges she has faced in taking on leadership roles. She alluded to her lived experience of the different standards for men versus women leaders, just as the gender stereotype literature has described different expectations for warmth and competence in men and women. At the outset of this study, I sought to examine the ways in which emotional displays might be modulated to affect the level of warmth conveyed by women leaders. I posited that, at times, emotions communicating warmth might be suppressed to counter the descriptive stereotype that women are only warm and not competent. I also suggested that, at times, emotions communicating warmth might be amplified to align with the prescriptive stereotype that women should be warm. I was particularly interested in examining women leaders, as leadership is traditionally viewed as male-typed and the lack of alignment between women and leadership is likely to make gender identity more salient. Further, I was interested in situating these women leaders in broader male-typed contexts, also increasing the salience of gender identity. Overall, I was interested in documenting whether women leaders in male-typed contexts are engaging in extra labor to manage others' stereotyped expectations for their behavior.

A sample of women leaders who worked in a range of male-typed organizations, fields, and industries provided rich reflections relating to their experiences with emotions and warmth in the workplace. The data ultimately revealed that the majority of participants were engaging in *both* emotion modulation and warmth modulation at work. The research questions then changed to allow me to dive deeply into emotion modulation on its own as well as to explore warmth modulation. I was also able to examine the ways in which emotion and warmth modulation might be related to one another.

In terms of emotions, the vast majority of participants reported modulating emotions at work. Participants tended to most frequently suppress negative emotions and display or amplify positive emotions. Reasons relating to role, gender, organizational context, or instrumentality underlay this modulation. Intrapersonal outcomes stemmed from emotion modulation, including feeling inauthentic or tired. Intrapersonal outcomes were also provoked by a failure to modulate emotions, such as feeling badly or regretful that emotions had been apparent to others.

With regard to warmth, the majority of participants reported consciously modulating warmth in the workplace. They spoke to displaying varying levels of warmth (ranging from open displays of warmth, to moderate warmth, to no warmth). Similar to the emotion modulation findings, role, gender, organizational context, and perceived instrumentality affected why participants modulated warmth. Participants shared an array of workplace-related outcomes that arose from displaying various levels of warmth, ranging from positive (e.g., warmth displays created a positive team environment; lack of warmth was protective against sexism) to negative (e.g., a lack of warmth inhibited political influence; warmth conveys a lack of credibility). Further, they reported many intrapersonal outcomes, such as experiencing emotional reactions to warmth modulation, fatigue, feeling deceptive, and the like. Failing to modulate warmth also related to intrapersonal outcomes, including concerns about decreasing credibility.

The final finding of this study related to the interconnected nature of emotion and warmth modulation. Some participants provided data that aligned somewhat with the initial question posed by this study. In response to a given stimulus, they first reported modulating their emotions, then modulating their warmth. However, the findings overall made it quite apparent that emotion modulation and warmth modulation exist independent of one another, despite some overlap in specific situations. Thus, one takeaway from this study is that participants modulate

emotions for a variety of reasons at work, including but not limited to warmth-related impressions. Another takeaway is that modulation of warmth behavior is not confined to emotions; rather, it comprises traits and behaviors that can exist independent of emotional expressions. Additional theorizing and research to determine how, when, and why these constructs might overlap is needed.

Another key conclusion it that women leaders are clearly undertaking a great deal of extra labor in their attempts to modulate emotions and warmth. This modulation constitutes additional work beyond what is explicitly written in a job description. Given the scarcity of women in positions of leadership, this study unearthed two potential challenges to women advancing to positions of leadership or continuing to advance to higher positions of leadership throughout their careers. It appears that women leaders do not only have to contend with stereotypes about their lack of competence, but they also have to attend to their emotional and warmth displays on a daily, chronic basis at work. They are expending precious cognitive, emotional, and psychological energy attempting to address gendered expectations for their behaviors and traits. In the case of emotions, they feel compelled to appear even-keeled, yet also to strategically leverage (mostly positive) emotions for desired outcomes. In the case of warmth, they seem to continuously adapt the level of warmth they are conveying across situations, attempting to match their warmth to what is appropriate and desired by others or the organization as a whole. These are the hoops through which they must jump frequently, with few indications that such requirements decrease over time. Indeed, as Secretary Clinton stated, it is a "hard path to walk."

Further, there are myriad outcomes, mostly negative, associated with engaging in either emotion or warmth modulation with which women leaders have to contend. Conversely, there

are also negative outcomes when participants neglect to modulate or modulate incorrectly. This seems to set women leaders up for a "lose-lose" situation in that modulating or failing to modulate can both result in negative outcomes.

Yet, as I close this dissertation, I feel compelled to report that the women leaders who participated in this study would likely not frame their thoughts as pessimistically as I have in these closing comments. While each participant was unique in her perspective, experiences, personality, and reactions to gender-related issues, on the whole, the sample was an inspiring, driven, dedicated, courageous group. Many acknowledged the challenges inherent in occupying a leadership role in a male-typed context, but there were no "shrinking violets" in this sample. Many loved their work *despite* the challenges they faced, and those who did not were able to articulate rich and meaningful learnings from their experiences. I felt moved by their stories and deeply grateful that they were forging a path forward in their respective fields and industries.

In summary, this study put forth a more complex point of view of what may be influencing, driving, and reinforcing the emotional or warmth-related displays of women leaders who work in male-typed contexts. Continuing to hold onto the complicated and covert forces that affect women leaders' experiences, behaviors, and outcomes in male-typed contexts is likely to benefit not only individual women leaders, but also the groups they lead and the broader organizations in which they are embedded.

# REFERENCES


Alderfer, C., & Smith, K. (1982). Studying intergroup relations embedded in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *27*, 35–65.

Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond neopositivists, romantics, and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *The Academy of Management Review*, *28*, 13–33.

AMA Physician Masterfile. (2015). *Active physicians by sex and specialty, 2015. Table 1.3: Number and percentage of active physicians by sex and specialty, 2015*. Washington, DC: Association of American Medical Colleges.

Asendorpf, J. B. (2009). Personality: Traits and situations. In P. J. Corr & G. Matthews (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 43–53). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Barger, P. R., & Grandey, A. A. (2006). Service with a smile and encounter satisfaction: Emotional contagion and appraisal mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*, 1229–1238.

Barrett, L. F. (2006). Solving the emotion paradox: Categorization and the experience of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 20–46.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1252–1265.

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Bergeron, D. M., Block, C. J., & Echtenkamp, B. A. (2006). Disabling the able: Stereotype threat and women's work performance. *Human Performance*, *19*, 133–158.

Block, C., Cruz, M., Bairley, M., Harel-Marian, T., & Roberson, L. (in press). Inside the prism of an invisible threat: Shining a light on the hidden work of contending with systemic stereotype threat in STEM fields. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.09.007

Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 317–334.

Bono, J. E., & Vey, M. A. (2005). Toward understanding emotional management at work: A quantitative review of emotional labor research. In C. E. Härtel, W. J. Zerbe, & N. M. Ashkanasy (Eds.), *Emotions in organizational behavior* (pp. 213–233). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bornstein, M. H., Jager, J., & Putnick, D. L. (2013). Sampling in developmental science: Situations, shortcomings, solutions, and standards. *Developmental Review*, *33*, 357–370.

Brazaitis, S. J. (2004). White women: Protectors of the status quo, positioned to disrupt it. In S. Cytrynbaum & D. A. Noumair (Eds.), *Group relations reader 3*. Jupiter, FL: A.K. Rice Institute.

Brescoll, V. L. (2016). Leading with their hearts? How gender stereotypes of emotion lead to biased evaluations of female leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *27*, 415–428.

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science*, *19*, 268–275.

Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995). Beliefs about female and male nonverbal communication. *Sex Roles*, *32*, 79–90.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "People Work." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *60*, 17–39.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*, 365–379.

Bulan, H., Erickson, R., & Wharton, A. (1997). Doing for others on the job: The affective requirements of service work, gender, and emotional well-being. *Social Problems*, *44*, 701–723.

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, *5*, 665–692.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O. K. (2013). Coding in-depth semistructured interviews: Problems of unitization and intercoder reliability and agreement. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *42*, 294–320.

Carli, L. L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 941–951.

Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 724–741.

Catalyst. (2014). *First step: Women in the world*. Catalyst.

Catalyst. (2018a). *Pyramid: Women in S&P 500 companies*. Catalyst.

Catalyst. (2018b). *Quick take: Women in financial services*. Retrieved from https://www.catalyst.org/research/women-in-financial-services/

Catalyst. (2018c). *Quick take: Women in law*. Catalyst.

Catalyst. (2018d). *Quick take: Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM)*. Catalyst.

Cejka, M. A., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 413–423.

Center for American Women and Politics. (2018). *Current numbers: Women officeholders*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for American Women and Politics.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2019). *Why do so many incompetent men become leaders? (And how to fix it)*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 151–192). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Condry, J., & Condry, S. (1976). Sex differences: A study of the eye of the beholder. *Child Development*, *47*, 812–819.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2004). When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *Journal of Social Issues*, *60*, 701–718.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The Stereotype Content Model and the BIAS map. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 40, pp. 61–149). Elsevier.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Beninger, A. (2011). The dynamics of warmth and competence judgments, and their outcomes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 73–98.

Cypress, B. S. (2017). Rigor or reliability and validity in qualitative research: Perspectives, strategies, reconceptualization, and recommendations. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*, *36*, 253–263.

Diefendorff, J. M., Erickson, R. J., Grandey, A. A., & Dahling, J. (2011). Emotional display rules as work unit norms: A multilevel analysis of emotional labor among nurses. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*, 379–392.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 233–256.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573–598.

Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 125–145.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 3–22.

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekman, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123–174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eckes, T. (2002). Paternalistic and envious gender stereotypes: Testing predictions from the Stereotype Content Model. *Sex Roles*, *47*, 99–114.

Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, *6*, 169–200.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1971). Constants across cultures in the face and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *17*, 124–129.

El-Alayli, A., Hansen-Brown, A. A., & Ceynar, M. (2018). Dancing backwards in high heels: Female professors experience more work demands and special favor requests, particularly from academically entitled students. *Sex Roles*, *79*, 136–150.

Ely, R. J. (1995). The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 589–634.

Erlingsson, C., & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *7*, 93–99.

Fabes, R. A., & Martin, C. L. (1991). Gender and age stereotypes of emotionality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 532–540.

Fischer, A. H. (1993). Sex differences in emotionality: Fact or stereotype? *Feminism and Psychology*, *3*, 303–318.

Fiske, S. T., Bersoff, D. N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M. E. (1991). Social science research on trial: Use of sex stereotyping research in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. *American Psychologist*, *46*, 1049–1060.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*, 77–83.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 878–902.

Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 473–489.

Fletcher, J. K. (1999). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power, and relational practice at work*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Fletcher, J. K., Jordan, J. V., & Miller, J. B. (2000). Women and the workplace: Applications of a psychodynamic theory. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *60*, 243–261.

Friborg, O., Hjemdal, O., Rosenvinge, J. H., & Martinussen, M. (2003). A new rating scale for adult resilience: what are the central protective resources behind healthy adjustment? *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, *12*, 65–76.

Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles*, *55*, 51–61.

Gibson, D. E., Schweitzer, M. E., Callister, R. R., & Gray, B. (2009). The influence of anger expressions on outcomes in organizations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *2*, 236–262.

Gipson, A. N., Pfaff, D. L., Mendelsohn, D. B., Catenacci, L. T., & Burke, W. W. (2017). Women and Leadership: Selection, Development, Leadership Style, and Performance. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *53*, 32–65.

Given, L. (2008). Exploratory research. In *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 1323–1334.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491–512.

Goodwin, R. E., Groth, M., & Frenkel, S. J. (2011). Relationships between emotional labor, job performance, and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *79*, 538–548.

Gould, L. J., Stapley, L. F., & Stein, M. (2006). *The systems psychodynamics of organisations*. London: Karnac Books.

Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*, 95–110.

Grandey, A. A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 86–96.

Gross, J. J. (1998a). Antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 224–237.

Gross, J. J. (1998b). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, *2*, 271–299.

Gross, J. J. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, *39*, 281–291.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2002). Wise emotion regulation. In L. F. Barrett & P. Salovey (Eds.), *The wisdom in feeling: Psychological processes in emotional intelligence* (pp. 297–318). New York, NY: Guilford.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 348–362.

Healey, M. P., Hodgkinson, G. P., & Massaro, S. (2017). Emotion regulation in organizations: Integrating neural and social processes. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2017*.

Hebl, M. R., King, E. B., Glick, P., Singletary, S. L., & Kazama, S. (2007). Hostile and benevolent reactions toward pregnant women: Complementary interpersonal punishments and rewards that maintain traditional roles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1499–1511.

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *5*, 269–298.

Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 657–674.

Heilman, M. E. (2012). Gender stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *32*, 113–135.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., & Martell, R. F. (1995). Sex stereotypes: Do they influence perceptions of managers? *Social Behavior & Personality*, *10*, 237–252.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 935–942.

Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks? The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 81–92.

Heilman, M. E., & Wallen, A. S. (2010). Wimpy and undeserving of respect: Penalties for men's gender inconsistent success. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 664–667.

Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 416–427.

Hess, U., Adams, R. B., Grammer, K., & Kleck, R. E. (2009). Face gender and emotion expression: Are angry women more like men? *Journal of Vision*, *9*, 19–19.

Hess, U., Adams, R., & Kleck, R. (2005). Who may frown and who should smile? Dominance, affiliation, and the display of happiness and anger. *Cognition & Emotion*, *19*, 515–536.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2007). *The Hogan guide. Interpretation and use of Hogan inventories*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.

Hopp, H., Rohrmann, S., Zapf, D., & Hodapp, V. (2010). Psychophysiological effects of emotional dissonance in a face-to-face service interaction. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, *23*, 399–414.

Hothschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hoyle, R. H., Harris, M. J., & Judd, C. M. (2002). *Research methods in social relations* (7th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Wadsworth.

Hülsheger, U. R., Lang, J. W. B., & Maier, G. W. (2010). Emotional labor, strain, and performance: Testing reciprocal relationships in a longitudinal panel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *15*, 505–521.

Hülsheger, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*, 361–389.

Humans of New York [Arts & Humanities Website]. (2016a). Retrieved September 7, 2016, from Facebook website: https://www.facebook.com/humansofnewyork/posts/1362236273850469:0

Humans of New York [Arts & Humanities Website]. (2016b). Retrieved September 7, 2018, from Facebook website: https://www.facebook.com/humansofnewyork/posts/1362452657162164

International Labour Organization (ILO). (n.d.). Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM). Retrieved September 30, 2018, from ILOSTAT: the world's leading source of labour statistics website: https://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/ilostat-home/home?_adf.ctrl-state=g84wxsc8q_78&_afrLoop=372639348731165#!

Jarvis, L. M. (2018, March 5). Why can't the drug industry solve its gender diversity problem? *Chemical & Engineering News (C&EN)*, *96*(10). Retrieved from https://cen.acs.org/articles/96/i10/why-cant-the-drug-industry-solve-its-gender-diversity-problem.html

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, *33*, 14–26.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 765–780.

Judge, T. A., Woolf, E. F., & Hurst, C. (2009). Is emotional labor more difficult for some than for others? A multilevel, experience-sampling study. *Personnel Psychology*, *62*, 57–88.

Kachel, S., Steffens, M. C., & Niedlich, C. (2016). Traditional masculinity and femininity: Validation of a new scale assessing gender roles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00956

Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., & Boyle, E. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *27*, 265–279.

Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*, 616–642.

Krantz, J., & Maltz, M. (1997). A framework for consulting to organizational role. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *49*, 137–151.

Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *45*, 214–222.

Kumar Mishra, S., & Bhatnagar, D. (2010). Linking emotional dissonance and organizational identification to turnover intention and emotional well-being: A study of medical representatives in India. *Human Resource Management*, *49*, 401–419.

Kvale, S. (1994). Ten standard objections to qualitative research interviews. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *25*, 147–173.

Lazzaro, S. (2017). 12 statistics about women in tech that show how big the gender gap truly is. Retrieved from Observer website: https://observer.com/2017/06/women-in-tech-statistics/

Lee, J., Ok, C., Lee, S., & Lee, C. (2018). Relationship between emotional labor and customer orientation among airline service employees: Mediating role of depersonalization. *Journal of Travel Research*, *57*, 324–341.

Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 1349–1364.

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*, 221–234.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, *30*, 73–84.

Logel, C., Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., Iserman, E. C., von Hippel, W., & Bell, A. E. (2009). Interacting with sexist men triggers social identity threat among female engineers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 1089–1103.

Marshall, P. (1992). *A league of their own*. Columbia Pictures Corporation.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, *3*, 97–105.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, *63*, 503–517.

McCormick, D. W., & White, J. (2000). Using one's self as an instrument for organizational diagnosis. *Organization Development Journal*, *18*, 49–62.

McDuff, D., Kodra, E., el Kaliouby, R., & LaFrance, M. (2017). A large-scale analysis of sex differences in facial expressions. *PLoS ONE*, *12*, e0173942.

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., DeChurch, L. A., & Wax, A. (2011). Moving emotional labor beyond surface and deep acting: A discordance-congruence perspective. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *2*, 6–53.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*, 16474–16479.

Murphy, M. C., Steele, C. M., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Signaling threat: How situational cues affect women in Math, Science, and Engineering settings. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 879–885.

Nash, J. C. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, *89*, 1–15.

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Noumair, D. A. (2013). Cultural revelations: Shining a light on organizational dynamics. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, *63*, 152–176.

Noumair, D. A., Pfaff, D. L., St. John, C. M., Gipson, A. N., & Brazaitis, S. J. (2017). X-Ray Vision at Work: Seeing Inside Organizational Life. In A. B. (Rami) Shani & D. A. Noumair (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development* (Vol. 25, pp. 203–248). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Oil & Gas UK. (2018). *Industry prepares to welcome over 100 apprentices*. Oil & Gas UK.

Okimoto, T. G., & Brescoll, V. L. (2010). The price of power: Power seeking and backlash against female politicians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 923–936.

Oxford Dictionaries. (n.d.). Oxford Dictionaries. Retrieved March 20, 2019, from English. Oxford Living Dictionaries website: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/frustration

Pew Research Center. (2015). *Women and leadership*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Phelan, J. E., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Competent yet out in the cold: Shifting criteria for hiring reflect backlash toward agentic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *32*, 406–413.

Pierce, J. (1995). *Gender trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Plant, E. A., Hyde, J. S., Keltner, D., & Devine, P. G. (2000). The gender stereotyping of emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *24*, 81–92.

Priest, H. A., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., & Salas, E. (2006). Virtual teams: Creating context for distributed teamwork. In C. A. Bowers, E. Salas, & F. Jentsch (Eds.), *Creating high-tech teams* (pp. 185–212). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Pronin, E., Steele, C. M., & Ross, L. (2004). Identity bifurcation in response to stereotype threat: Women and mathematics. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*, 152–168.

Pugliesi, K. (1999). The consequences of emotional labor: Effects on work stress, job satisfaction, and well-being. *Motivation and Emotion*, *23*, 154–125.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *The Academy of Management Review*, *12*, 23.

Ragins, B. R., & Winkel, D. E. (2011). Gender, emotion and power in work relationships. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*, 377–393.

Roberts, V. Z. (1994). The organization of work: Contributions from open systems theory. In A. Obholzer & Z. G. Roberts (Eds.), *The unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services* (pp. 28–38). New York: Routledge.

Rosete, D., & Ciarrochi, J. (2005). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *25*, 388–399.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 629–645.

Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 157–176.

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

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 743–762.

Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Glick, P., & Phelan, J. E. (2012). Reactions to Vanguards. In P. Devine & A. Plant (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 45, pp. 167–227). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 61–79.

Safdar, S., Friedlmeier, W., Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., Kwantes, C. T., Kakai, H., & Shigemasu, E. (2009). Variations of emotional display rules within and across cultures: A comparison between Canada, USA, and Japan. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, *41*, 1–10.

Sampson, E. E. (1993). Identity politics: Challenges to psychology's understanding. *American Psychologist*, *48*, 1219–1230.

Schaubroeck, J. M., & Shao, P. (2012). The role of attribution in how followers respond to the emotional expression of male and female leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 27–42.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *57*, 95–100.

Schein, V. E. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*, 340–344.

Scott, B. A., & Barnes, C. M. (2011). A multilevel field investigation of emotional labor, affect, work withdrawal, and gender. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*, 116–136.

Simon, R. W., & Nath, L. E. (2004). Gender and emotion in the United States: Do men and women differ in self-reports of feelings and expressive behavior? *American Journal of Sociology*, *109*, 1137–1176.

Simpson, P. A., & Stroh, L. K. (2004). Gender differences: Emotional expression and feelings of personal inauthenticity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 715–721.

Smith, J. S., Brescoll, V. L., & Thomas, E. L. (2015). Constrained by emotion: Women, leadership, and expressing emotion in the workplace. In M. L. Connerley & J. Wu (Eds.), *Handbook on well-being of working women* (pp. 209–224). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *35*, 4–28.

Stebbins, R. A. (2001). *Exploratory Research in the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 613–629.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 379–440). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Sutton, R. I. (1991). Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *36*, 245.

Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual bases of personal memory and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36*, 778–793.

Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: The effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*, 86–94.

U.S. Department of Labor. (2019). *Labor force statistics from the current population survey* (Employed persons by detailed industry, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity [Numbers in Thousands] No. 18).

van Engen, M. L., & Willemsen, T. M. (2004). Sex and leadership styles: A meta-analysis of research published in the 1990s. *Psychological Reports*, *94*, 3–18.

Vassar, L. (2015). *How medical specialties vary by gender*. Washington, DC: American Medical Association.

Wells, L. (1995). The group as a whole: A systematic socioanalytic perspective on interpersonal and group relations. In J. Gillette & M. McCollom (Eds.), *Groups in context: A new perspective on group dynamics*. University Press of America.

Wharton, A. S. (2009). The sociology of emotional labor. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *35*, 147–165.

Wharton, A. S., & Erickson, R. J. (1993). Managing emotions on the job and at home: Understanding the consequences of multiple emotional roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 457.

World Bank. (2019). *World development report 2019: The changing nature of work*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Zelenski, J. M., & Larsen, R. J. (2000). The distribution of basic emotions in everyday life: A state and trait perspective from experience sampling data. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *34*, 178–197.

Zuckerman, M., Klorman, R., Larrance, D. T., & Spiegel, N. H. (1981). Facial, autonomic, and subjective components of emotion: The facial feedback hypothesis versus the externalizer-internalizer distinction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 929–944.

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of Sample*

| |
|---|
| Age in years (mean +/- S.D.)<br>42.45 +/- 9.95 |
| Age ranges<br>(21-30): n = 2 (9.09%)<br>(31-40): n = 9 (40.91%)<br>(41-50): n = 5 (22.73%)<br>(51-60): n = 5 (22.73%)<br>(61-70): n = 1 (4.55%) |
| Gender Identity<br>100% female-identified |
| Race<br>White: n = 18 (81.82%)<br>White, but also specified either British or Northern European: n = 2 (9.09%)<br>Asian: n = 1 (4.55%)<br>Black/Interracial: n=1 (4.55%) |
| Nationality<br>American: n = 17 (77.27%)<br>British: n = 2 (9.09%)<br>American/Italian: n = 1 (4.55%)<br>Italian: n = 1 (4.55%)<br>Portuguese: n = 1 (4.55%) |
| Sexual Orientation:<br>Straight: n = 20 (90.91%)<br>Bisexual: n = 1 (4.55%)<br>Queer: n = 1 (4.55%) |
| Marital Status:<br>Married/Long-term committed relationship: n = 16 (72.73%)<br>Single: n = 4 (18.18%)<br>Divorced: n = 1 (4.55%)<br>Widowed: n = 1 (4.55%) |
| Number of Children:<br>One or more children: n = 12 (54.55%)<br>No children: n = 7 (31.82%)<br>Stepchildren/children of partner: n = 2 (9.09%)<br>Pregnant with 1st child: n = 1 (4.55%) |
| Political Affiliation (total n = 17 for this item):<br>Democrat: n = 6 (35.29%)<br>Independent: n = 6 (35.29%)<br>Republican: n = 2 (11.76%)<br>Liberal/Left-leaning: n = 1 (5.88%)<br>None: n = 1 (5.88%)<br>Progressive/Socialist: n = 1 (5.88%) |

Undergraduate Major:
- Biology: n =3 (13.64%)
- Psychology: n =2 (9.09%)
- Ancient Greek: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Business/Small Business Management: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Chemistry: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Communication Arts & Sciences: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Digital Arts & Sciences: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Economics: n = 1 (4.55%)
- English Literature & Literary History: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Geology & Environmental Studies: n = 1 (4.55%)
- History: n = 1 (4.55%)
- History of Medicine: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Logistics: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Managerial Economics: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Modern History: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Neuroscience: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Psychology & Economics: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Research Meteorology: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Social Studies: Economics: n = 1 (4.55%)

Highest Level of Attainment:
- Masters (e.g., M.A., M.B.A., Ms.C.): n = 7 (31.82%)
- M.D.: n = 5 (22.73%)
- Bachelors (or equivalent): n = 4 (18.18%)
- J.D.: n = 2 (9.09%)
- Ph.D.: n = 2 (9.09%)
- In Ed.D. Program: n = 1 (4.55%)
- In M.B.A. Program: n = 1 (4.55%)

Industry:
- Finance: n = 5 (22.73%)
- Medicine: n = 5 (22.73%)
- Scientific Research: n = 4 (18.18%)
- Sports: n = 2 (9.09%)
- Law: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Offshore Drilling: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Pharmaceuticals: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Risk: n = 1 (4.55%)
- Technology: n =1 (4.55%)
- Video Game Industry: n = 1 (4.55%)

Gender Breakdown of Organization:
- Range: 2-50% Female

Gender Breakdown of Immediate Peer Group:
- Range: 2-55% Female

Gender Breakdown of Supervisor:
- Male: n = 15 (68.18%)
- More than 1, majority male: n = 3 (13.64%)
- Female: n = 2 (9.09%)
- N/A: n = 2 (9.09%)

| |
|---|
| Interview Setting:<br>Virtually (phone or conferencing platform without video): n = 18 (81.82%)<br>In-person: n = 3 (13.64%)<br>Virtually (conferencing platform with video): n = 1 (4.55%) |
| Focus of Interview:<br>Current job: n = 16 (72.73%)<br>Prior job: n = 6 (27.27%) |

Table 2

*Characteristics of Organizational Culture, Reported by Participants*

| |
|---|
| Creative, Driven, Cavalier |
| Staid, Traditional, Hard-working |
| Fast-paced, "Small company feel," Friendly |
| Non-profit, Scientific, Extreme environment |
| Academic, Segmented, Bureaucratic |
| Bro-culture, Collegial, Fast-paced |
| Competitive, Hypermasculine, Loyalty-driven |
| Interactive, Collaborative, Intellectual |
| Macho, Collegial, Storied |
| Competitive, Fast-paced, Arrogant |
| Commercial, Paternal/Familial, Direct |
| Catholic, Local, Stressed |
| Collegial, Driven, Financially-motivated |
| Professional, Efficient, Respectful |
| Growing, Exploratory, Learning |
| Service, Service, Service |
| Hierarchical, Matrixed, Evolving |
| Ethical, Collaborative, Multicultural |
| Isolating, Disconnected (with office), Masculine |
| Pervasive, Respectful, Reactive |
| Professional, Supportive, Demanding |
| Aggressive, Disciplined, Structured |

Table 3

*Emotion-Related Global Codes*

| Code | Did participant report? (Yes / No / Unsure) | Description or Quote(s) - include line # |
|---|---|---|
| Not experiencing emotions at work | | |
| Not being "very emotional" (e.g., "I'm just a very unemotional person;" I'm even-keeled;" "I'm generally happy" etc.) | | |
| Struggling to name discrete emotions or instances of emotionality | | *(Note: self-report by interviewer, no quote needed)* |
| Emotion management/modulation important to the actual work at hand | | |
| Has adapted emotional modulation based on past experiences (e.g., expressed emotions in the past and got feedback) | | |
| Emotionality has decreased over time/she has gotten "used to" various stimuli and reacts less than previously | | |
| Her specific workplace not accepting certain emotions | | |
| Her field or industry not accepting certain emotions | | |
| Gendered expectations and/or consequences for emotional expression (e.g., "Men can scream and shout, but women can't") | | |

Table 4

*Warmth-Related Global Codes*

| Code | Did participant report? (Yes / No / Unsure) | Description or Quote(s) - include line # |
|---|---|---|
| Displays of warmth important to leadership | | |
| Gender NOT affecting displays of warmth | | |
| Different standards/expectations for warmth by gender (e.g., "As a woman, I have to be nice") | | |
| Describes self as, or others see her as, a mother, grandmother, "Mama Goose", "Mama Lion" type figure | | |
| Biological differences by gender OR behavioral/stylistic differences by gender | | |
| Gender identity as advantage in field/role | | |
| Being a woman in a male-typed job, field, or industry feeling salient in the workplace | | |

Table 5

*Emotion List*

| |
|---|
| Specific Positive Emotions |
| Adrenaline (+) |
| Accomplishment/Pride (+) |
| Enjoyment/Satisfaction/Contentment/Fulfillment (+) |
| Excitement/Passion (+) |
| Grateful/Lucky (+) |
| Happiness (+) |
| Other positive emotion (specify) |
| Specific Negative Emotions |
| Anger (-) |
| Annoyance (-) |
| Anxiety/Urgency/Pressure/Stress (-) |
| Boredom (-) |
| Disrespected/Dismissed (-) |
| Fearful/Scared/Unsafe (-) |
| Frustration (-) |
| Frustration & Annoyance *(**only if someone uses these interchangeably)* (-) |
| Humiliation/Shame (-) |
| Impatience (-) |
| Intimidated/Insecure/Self-doubting (-) |
| Isolation/Loneliness/Dehumanized (-) |
| Sadness/Unhappy/Crying (-) |
| Other negative emotion (specify) |
| Broader Emotional Experiences |
| General positive emotions (+) |
| General negative emotions (-) |
| Emotions writ large |

Table 6

*Behavioral and Trait Markers of Warmth*

| Behaviors |
| --- |
| Behavior: Being warm/friendly/approachable |
| Behavior: Not being warm/friendly/approachable |
| Behavior: Tamping down achievement-orientation/competitiveness |
| Behavior: Tamping down assertiveness/directive-ness *(e.g., asking questions instead of issuing statements)* |
| Behavior: Smiling and/or Laughing |
| Behavior: Not smiling and/or laughing |
| Behavior: Adjusting verbal communication style *(e.g., tone, humor, timing [e.g., waiting to speak])* |
| Behavior: Adjusting outward appearance *(e.g., body language, purposefully choosing clothes, makeup, etc.)* |
| Behavior: Acting like "one of the guys" *(e.g., out late drinking, talking about sports)* |
| Behavior: Avoiding doing traditionally feminine things *(e.g., baking)* |
| Behavior: Active listening and/or conveying understanding |
| Behavior: Expressing empathy to others |
| Behavior: Supporting team or individual team members/accessible to team/creating a positive team environment towards overall task or goal |
| Behavior: Protective of team *("I go to bat for my team")* |
| Behavior: Being bounded and/or contained with team |
| Behavior: Mentoring/developing others on own team (direct reports) |
| Behavior: Mentoring/developing others outside of own team |
| Behavior: Managing others' problems/caring for others/nurturing *(e.g., extra-role behavior)* |
| Behavior: Providing spaces for crying/emotional processing |
| Behavior: Resolving Conflict/building consensus/working across varied stakeholders |
| Behavior: Taking about kids/family/personal life |
| Behavior: Not talking about kids/family/personal life |

| |
|---|
| Traits |
| Trait: Warmth |
| Trait: Not being warm |
| Trait: Bubbly/effusiveness |
| Trait: Not being bubbly/effusive |
| Trait: Modesty/Humility |
| Trait: Being masculine/tomboy |
| Trait: Not being masculine/tomboy *(e.g., "I was girly growing up")* |
| Trait: Being empathic *(either explicitly said by participant or observed by coder as participant recounts a situation)* |
| Trait: Not being empathetic |
| Trait: Concern for team *(e.g., "I worry about my team members")* |
| Other (specify) |

Table 7

*Summary Section*

| Final Impressions | Yes/ No/ Unsure | Why? (In own words) |
|---|---|---|
| Do you think this person modulates emotions at work? | | |
| Do you think this person modulates warmth at work? | | |
| Anything else salient? | | |

Table 8

*Sample Emotion Table in Worksheet*

| Emotions named by participant | **If other, specify* | Stimulus (write in or quote) | Openly Displayed? (yes, no, unsure) | Consciously modulated? (yes, no, unsure) | Why displayed or modulated? | How managed, if at all? | Impact on self? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Anger* | | *Spoken over in a meeting* | *Yes* | *No* | *"It didn't occur to me to stifle my anger."* | *Did not think about managing it: "I yelled at him publicly"* | *"I worried afterwards about the impact it could have on my career."* |
| *Frustration* | | *Direct report made a public error* | *No* | *Yes* | *Inappropriate: "It's not appropriate for leaders to display frustration to their team"* | *Correction afterwards: "I gently corrected her when she was done speaking so I didn't embarrass her."* | *Extra-workplace management: "I carried the frustration back to my office and vented to my husband over text."* |

Table 9

*Sample Warmth Table in Worksheet*

| Markers of warmth reported by participant | **If other, specify* | Describe (include detail about behavior /trait and situation) | Consciously modulated? (yes, no, unsure) | Relevant personality variables? | Why displayed or modulated? | Impact on self? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Behavior: Being warm / friendly / approachable* | | *"I walk the halls at least once a day and check in with individual team members"* | *Yes* | *Naturally introverted* | *Leadership ideal: "I think leaders have to be approachable…you want people to tell you what's really going on or feel like they can come to you for help."* | *"I suppose it's tiring, but can be satisfying, too."* |
| *Trait: Not being masculine* | | *"I was never a tomboy. I used to play with dolls…I do my hair and nails for work."* | *No* | | *Does not think about it: "I haven't thought about adjusting my physical appearance for work. I just show up as I am."* | *Hard to bond with peers: "I guess sometimes I could bond more with my male peers if I acted more like a guy."* |

Table 10

*Sample Summary Table in Worksheet*

| Final impressions: | Yes/No/Unsure | Why? | Summary narrative |
|---|---|---|---|
| Do you think this person modulates emotions at work? | *Yes* | *Offered a variety of examples; modulates for effective task accomplishment; manages her anger and frustration through exercise* | *She believes that displaying anger or frustration in most cases will not solve the problem at hand and thinks modulating them helps to get to the root cause of the issue; at times, will express frustration to convey a message to staff. She will not express sadness or crying because of the interaction of her gender and her industry.* |
| Do you think this person modulates warmth at work? | *Yes* | *Believes that warmth and understanding will help get to the root of the problem, as opposed to a more aggressive approach* | *She thinks that being kind and understanding is most effective for getting work done and amplifies that perception, particularly when there is a problem. She also uses warmth behaviors to work effectively across diverse stakeholders. She does maintain boundaries with her team at the same time.* |
| Anything else salient? | No | | |

Table 11

*Summary Table: Emotion*

| Code | Yes | No | Unsure |
|---|---|---|---|
| Do you think this person modulates emotions at work? | 95% | 5% | 0% |

Table 12

*Frequencies of Global Emotion-Related Codes*

| Code | Yes | No | Unsure |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not experiencing emotions at work | 5% | 95% | 0% |
| Not being "very emotional" (e.g., "I'm just a very unemotional person;" I'm even-keeled;" "I'm generally happy" etc.) | 27% | 64% | 9% |
| Struggling to name discrete emotions or instances of emotionality | 14% | 86% | 0% |
| Emotion management/modulation important to the actual work at hand | 82% | 14% | 5% |
| Has adapted emotional modulation based on past experiences (e.g., expressed emotions in the past and got feedback) | 41% | 50% | 9% |
| Emotionality has decreased over time/she has gotten "used to" various stimuli and reacts less than previously | 32% | 64% | 5% |
| Her specific workplace not accepting certain emotions | 68% | 27% | 5% |
| Her field or industry not accepting certain emotions | 45% | 50% | 5% |
| Gendered expectations and/or consequences for emotional expression (e.g., "Men can scream and shout, but women can't") | 73% | 18% | 9% |

Table 13

*Frequencies of Each Emotion*

| Code | % of Participants Who Reported at Least One Instance |
|---|---|
| General negative emotions (-) | 77% |
| Frustration (-) | 73% |
| Emotions writ large | 64% |
| Other (specify)* | 50% |
| Anxiety/urgency/pressure/stress (-) | 45% |
| Enjoyment/satisfaction/contentment/fulfillment (+) | 45% |
| Intimidated/insecure/self-doubting (-) | 45% |
| General positive emotions (+) | 41% |
| Anger (-) | 36% |
| Sadness/unhappy/crying (-) | 32% |
| Accomplishment/Pride (+) | 18% |
| Fearful/scared/unsafe (-) | 18% |
| Isolation/loneliness/dehumanized (-) | 18% |
| Happiness (+) | 18% |
| Annoyance (-) | 14% |
| Excitement/Passion (+) | 14% |
| Frustration & Annoyance *(**only if someone uses these interchangeably)* (-) | 14% |
| Disrespected/dismissed (-) | 9% |
| Impatience (-) | 9% |
| Adrenaline (+) | 5% |
| Boredom (-) | 5% |
| Grateful/lucky (+) | 5% |
| Humiliation / shame (-) | 5% |

*Most common "Other" was exhaustion/tiredness (n = 3).

Table 14

*Summary Table: Warmth*

| Code | Yes | No | Unsure |
|---|---|---|---|
| Do you think this person modulates warmth at work? | 86% | 14% | 0% |

Table 15

*Frequencies of Global Warmth-Related Codes*

| Code | Yes | No | Unsure |
|---|---|---|---|
| Displays of warmth important to leadership | 64% | 32% | 5% |
| Gender NOT affecting displays of warmth | 23% | 77% | 0% |
| Different standards/expectations for warmth by gender (e.g., “As a woman, I have to be nice”) | 73% | 23% | 5% |
| Describes self as, or others see her as, a mother, grandmother, “Mama Goose,” “Mama Lion” type figure | 36% | 59% | 5% |
| Biological differences by gender OR behavioral/stylistic differences by gender | 59% | 32% | 9% |
| Gender identity as advantage in field/role | 32% | 68% | 0% |
| Being a woman in a male-typed job, field, or industry feeling salient in the workplace | 91% | 5% | 5% |

Table 16

*Frequencies of Each Warmth-Related Behavior or Trait*

| Code | % of Participants Who Reported at Least One Instance |
|---|---|
| Other Trait or Behavior (specify)* | 95% |
| Behavior: Being warm/friendly/approachable | 91% |
| Behavior: Supporting team or individual team members/accessible to team/creating a positive team environment towards overall task or goal | 50% |
| Behavior: Adjusting verbal communication style *(e.g., tone, humor, timing [e.g., waiting to speak])* | 41% |
| Behavior: Managing others' problems/caring for others/nurturing *(e.g., extra-role behavior)* | 41% |
| Behavior: Resolving Conflict/building consensus/working across varied stakeholders | 41% |
| Trait: Warmth | 41% |
| Behavior: Not being warm/friendly/approachable | 32% |
| Behavior: Active listening and/or conveying understanding | 32% |
| Behavior: Mentoring/developing others on own team (direct reports) | 32% |
| Trait: Being masculine/tomboy | 32% |
| Behavior: Tamping down assertiveness/directive-ness *(e.g., asking questions instead of issuing statements)* | 23% |
| Behavior: Protective of team *(e.g., "I go to bat for my team")* | 23% |
| Behavior: Being bounded and/or contained with team | 23% |
| Trait: Being empathic *(either explicitly said by participant or observed by coder as participant recounts a situation)* | 18% |
| Trait: Concern for team *(e.g., "I worry about my team members")* | 18% |
| Behavior: Adjusting outward appearance *(e.g., body language, purposefully choosing clothes, makeup, etc.)* | 14% |
| Behavior: Mentoring (unspecified if on team or outside of team)** | 14% |
| Behavior: Providing spaces for crying/emotional processing | 14% |
| Behavior: Taking about kids/family/personal life | 14% |
| Trait: Not being warm | 14% |
| Trait: Not being bubbly/effusive | 14% |

| Code | % of Participants Who Reported at Least One Instance |
|---|---|
| Trait: Modesty/Humility | 14% |
| Behavior: Smiling and/or laughing | 9% |
| Behavior: Expressing empathy to others | 9% |
| Behavior: Mentoring/developing others outside of own team | 9% |
| Trait: Bubbly/effusiveness | 9% |
| Trait: Not being masculine/tomboy *(e.g., "I was girly growing up")* | 9% |
| Behavior: Tamping down achievement-orientation/competitiveness | 5% |
| Behavior: Not smiling and/or laughing | 5% |
| Behavior: Acting like "one of the guys" *(e.g., out late drinking, talking about sports)* | 5% |
| Behavior: Not talking about kids/family/personal life | 5% |
| Trait: Not being empathetic | 5% |
| Behavior: Avoiding doing traditionally feminine things *(e.g., baking)* | 0% (in past, 9%) |

* Other trait or behavior combined into one item; most common "Other" was a cluster of behaviors conveying assertiveness, e.g., standing up for oneself or one's point of view, being direct or vocal, describing self as "bossy" (n = 12).
**Several participants did not clarify whether mentorship was provided to direct reports or those outside of their team; thus, a new category was established during analysis.

Table 17

*List of Themes*

**Emotion**

Theme 1: Emotional modulation as a component of competence
- Subtheme 1a: Emotional modulation is particularly important for women
- Subtheme 1b: Emotional modulation is particularly important for leaders/managers

Theme 2: Emotionality as a tool

Theme 3: Unacceptable emotions
- Subtheme 3a: Implicit norms of expression and modulation

Theme 4: Techniques for processing emotions
- Subtheme 4a: Intra-workplace management
- Subtheme 4b: Extra-workplace management

Theme 5: Personal outcomes of modulating emotions

**Warmth**

Theme 6: Warmth as a component of good leadership

Theme 7: Others' gendered expectations about warmth

Theme 8: Predicted or actual workplace consequences of warmth displays
- Subtheme 8a: Predicted or actual outcomes of not expressing warmth
- Subtheme 8b: Predicted or actual outcomes of expressing warmth
- Subtheme 8c: Predicted or actual outcomes of displaying moderate warmth

Theme 9: Warmth communications to others

Theme 10: Personal consequences of modulating warmth displays

**Intersection**

Theme 11: Intersection of warmth and emotion
- Subtheme 11a: Negative emotions and warmth
- Subtheme 11b: Positive emotions and warmth

Table 18

*Sample Stimuli*

| |
|---|
| General Stimuli |
| Work in general |
| Leadership role |
| Male-typed environment |
| Working with team members |
| Working with colleagues/peers |
| Working with superiors |
| Working across departments |
| Specific Negative Stimuli |
| Direct report(s) makes/make a mistake, has/have bad attitude, is not/are not proactive |
| Colleague asks obvious question |
| Male colleague acts inappropriately or makes sexist comment |
| Spoken over/ignored by others |
| Emergency or dangerous situation |
| Aspects of organizational culture |
| Specific Positive Stimuli |
| Physical environment is beautiful |
| Seeing current or former mentees succeed |
| When a patient is doing well |
| Winning a piece of business |
| Challenging procedure that goes well |
| Experiencing success at difficult task |

Table 19

*Intrapersonal Outcomes of Modulating and Not Modulating Emotions*

| |
|---|
| Emotion Modulation |
| Spouse commenting on impact of emotional modulation |
| Modulating emotions at work, but bringing home emotions |
| Fatigue |
| Internal strife, turmoil |
| Feeling inauthentic |
| Additional negative emotional reactions |
| Clouding in functioning |
| Poor sleep |
| Colleagues commenting on lack of emotionality |
| Feeling positive if issue is resolved |
| Enjoys giving out positive reinforcement |
| Not Modulating Emotion |
| Feelings of guilt, regret |
| Sense of overreacting |
| Experiencing difficulty in job |
| Feeling unprofessional |

Table 20

*Intrapersonal Outcomes of Modulating and Not Modulating Warmth*

| |
|---|
| Warmth Modulation |
| Feelings of confusion |
| Concern about reputation |
| Feeling inauthentic |
| Frustration |
| Concerns about being manipulative or deceptive |
| Exhaustion |
| Feelings of discomfort, tumult |
| Comparisons to male peers and reflection on whether men have to worry about warmth |
| Not Modulating Warmth |
| Feeling dismissed |
| Contribution to departing role |
| Feelings of self-doubt, anxiety |
| Poor sleep |
| Subsequently amplifying warmth |
| Questioning when and how to voice opinions |


*Figure 1.* Organizational culture as described by participants. This figure reflects aspects of organizational culture reported by participants. The two largest words (collegial and fast-paced) were reported by three participants, whereas the other large words were reported by two participants. All other words were reported by one participant.

| | Positive | Negative |
|---|---|---|
| **Expressed** | • Appropriate as a leader to share positive emotions (role)<br>• Wants to engage others (instrumentality)<br>• Wants to create a positive work environment (instrumentality)<br>• As a form of positive feedback to direct reports (instrumentality)<br>• Does not think about modulating it (*unmodulated*)<br>• Reaction is immediate or too powerful to control (*unmodulated*) | • Amplifies to make a point (instrumentality)<br>• Wants to convey displeasure with something (instrumentality)<br>• Wants to motivate others to take action to fix something (instrumentality)<br>• Does not think about modulating it (*unmodulated*)<br>• Reaction is immediate or too powerful to control (*unmodulated*)<br>• Wants to tamp it down, but it still seeps through (*failed modulation; modulation initially driven by role, gender, instrumentality, or context*) |
| **Not Expressed** | • Positive emotion is in relation to something in her personal life; not appropriate to share (role)<br>• Happy about achievement that affected others negatively within her workplace (role)<br>• Does not want to appear outwardly happy because it implies she is surprised she succeeded at her job (role)<br>• Is waiting to take cue from conversation partner on appropriate emotional displays to effectively engage (instrumentality) | • Not appropriate leadership behavior (role)<br>• Unprofessional to show (role)<br>• Unacceptable as a woman (gender)<br>• Unacceptable in organizational culture (context)<br>• Will not be efficacious for the task to show reaction or will not motivate the particular person at hand (instrumentality)<br>• Is waiting to take cue from conversation partner on appropriate emotional displays to effectively engage (instrumentality) |

*Figure 2*. Participant reasoning for emotional displays

| | Shows Warmth | Does Not Show Warmth | Shows Moderate Warmth |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Modulated** | • Part of leadership or management role (role)<br>• Required to get a task done safely or well (role)<br>• To align and motivate team around task (role)<br>• Effective problem-solving *within team* (role)<br>• Expected because of gender identity (gender)<br>• To avoid being seen as non-collaborative or hard to work with (context)<br>• To ensure her message gets across (perceived instrumentality)<br>• To appear collaborative and easy to work with (perceived instrumentality)<br>• To work effectively across stakeholder groups (perceived instrumentality)<br>• To gain additional work (perceived instrumentality)<br>• To create an overall positive environment (perceived instrumentality) | • Not in line with job responsibilities or title (role)<br>• Will diminish credibility / wants to be taken seriously (role)<br>• Does not want to call attention to gender identity (gender)<br>• Does not want to be seen as flirting with others (gender)<br>• May lead to sexual harassment / flirting / unwanted advances (context)<br>• Unacceptable in organizational culture (context)<br>• Wants to advance in the organization (context)<br>• Needs to advocate for self (perceived instrumentality)<br>• Needs to communicate that something is not acceptable (perceived instrumentality) | • Desire to be approachable while holding high standards for direct reports (role)<br>• Want to harness positive aspects of warmth while avoiding being walked over (role)<br>• Per the personalities or requests of direct reports (role)<br>• Want to avoid appearing either too feminine or too masculine (gender; context)<br>• Want to appear friendly but not too friendly (context) |
| **Not Modulated** | • Natural personality is warm and it comes through<br>• Natural behavioral displays include warmth | • Natural personality is not warm and does not modulate it<br>• Natural behavioral displays do not include warmth | • Natural personality is somewhat warm<br>• Natural behavioral displays include moderate warmth |

*Figure 3.* Participant reasoning for modulating warmth

## APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT MATERIALS

## APPENDIX A1: TEACHERS COLLEGE PORTAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Research Study: Seeking Women Leaders in Male-Typed Contexts

This is an exploratory study documenting the ways in which women leaders do or do not modulate emotional displays in male-typed jobs, functions, or industries (those where men are currently in the majority, have historically been in the majority, or are perceived to be the majority).

The study includes an interview (60-75 minutes) and a brief questionnaire assessing demographic and occupational factors (10-15 minutes). It can be completed in-person or virtually. Participation is entirely confidential. There are no direct benefits and minimal risks.

If you are interested in participating (or would like to refer someone who may be interested), please email **Danielle Pfaff** at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu.

(IRB protocol #: **18-480**)

## APPENDIX A2: FACEBOOK ANNOUNCEMENT

Facebook friends—I am collecting data for my dissertation and am asking for your help in referring potential participants. If you know anyone who may be interested, please reach out to me at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu. The study is exploring the experiences of women leaders who work in male-typed contexts, meaning that their roles, functions, or industries are currently dominated by men, have been traditionally dominated by men, or are perceived to be dominated by men. For example, those working in finance, management consulting, the military, certain branches of medicine, senior leadership roles in general, the STEM field, etc. may qualify. Participation is entirely confidential, there are no direct benefits, and minimal risks. Thanks in advance for your help!

(IRB protocol #: **18-480**)

## APPENDIX A3: EMAIL SENT TO CURRENT STUDENTS AND ALUMNI KNOWN TO THE AUTHOR

Subject: Research Study: Seeking Women Leaders in Male-Typed Contexts

Dear [XMA Students/ Doctoral Program Students/XMA Alumni/PPOD Alumni/Doctoral Program Alumni],

I hope all is well! I am currently working on my dissertation and was hoping that you may be able to help me find eligible participants. I have explained the commitment below, and I was wondering if you would be willing to forward this email to anyone in your network that might be interested?

The study is related to women leaders' behaviors in the workplace, particularly those in jobs that are "male-typed," meaning the majority of job-holders are males, or that the job is seen as stereotypically "male" in nature by a layperson. I am conducting a qualitative study, encompassing interviews with 20-25 women leaders in male-typed jobs/functions/industries. The study will involve a time commitment of between 70 and 90 minutes. The bulk of the study involves an interview, which can be conducted in-person, by phone, or by video-conferencing software. Then, there will be a brief questionnaire to gather basic demographic and occupational information. Participation and all data will remain completely confidential. There are no direct benefits for participation.

Might you consider participating if you think you are eligible, and/or forwarding this email to anyone in your network that could be interested? Anyone who may be interested should please contact me at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu. I am also happy to speak to prospective participants in-person or via phone if there are any questions or concerns.

Thank you for considering,
Danielle Pfaff
(IRB protocol #: **18-480**)

## APPENDIX A4: EMAIL SENT TO CURRENT STUDENTS AND ALUMNI UNKNOWN TO THE AUTHOR; EMAIL SENT TO ADJUNCT FACULTY IN SOCIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM

Subject: Research Study: Seeking Women Leaders in Male-Typed Contexts

Dear [MA Students/PPOD Alumni/MA Program Alumni/Social-Organizational Psychology Adjunct Faculty],

My name is Danielle Pfaff and I am a doctoral student in the Social-Organizational Psychology program. I am currently working on my dissertation and was hoping that you may be able to help me find eligible participants. I have explained the commitment below, and I was wondering if you would be willing to forward this email to anyone in your network that might be interested?

The study is related to women leaders' behaviors in the workplace, particularly those in jobs that are "male-typed," meaning the majority of job-holders are males, or that the job is seen as stereotypically "male" in nature by a layperson. Because of the nature of my research question (inquiring about women leaders' behaviors and perceptions), I am conducting a qualitative study, encompassing interviews with 20-25 women leaders in male-typed jobs/functions/industries.

The study will involve a time commitment of between 70 and 90 minutes. The bulk of the study involves an interview, which can be conducted in-person, by phone, or by video-conferencing software. Then, there will be a brief questionnaire to gather basic demographic and occupational information. Participation and all data will remain completely confidential. There are no direct benefits for participation.

Might you consider participating if you think you are eligible, and/or forwarding this email to anyone in your network that could be interested? Anyone who may be interested should please contact me at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu. I am also happy to speak to prospective participants in-person or via phone if there are any questions or concerns.

Thank you for considering,
Danielle Pfaff
(IRB protocol #: **18-480**)

## APPENDIX A5: EMAIL SENT TO FULL-TIME FACULTY IN SOCIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM

Subject: Research Study: Seeking Women Leaders in Male-Typed Contexts

Dear [Social-Organizational Psychology Faculty Member Name],

I hope all is well! As you may know, I am currently working on my dissertation and was hoping that you may be able to help me find eligible participants. I have explained the commitment below, and I was wondering if you would be willing to forward this email to anyone in your network that might be interested?

The study is related to women leaders' behaviors in the workplace, particularly those in jobs that are "male-typed," meaning the majority of job-holders are males, or that the job is seen as stereotypically "male" in nature by a layperson. I feel passionate about this topic and am hopeful that this research study will shed additional light on women leaders' experiences. Because of the nature of my research question (inquiring about women leaders' behaviors and perceptions), I am conducting a qualitative study, encompassing interviews with 20-25 women leaders in male-typed jobs/functions/industries.

The study will involve a time commitment of between 70 and 90 minutes. The bulk of the study involves an interview, which can be conducted in-person, by phone, or by video-conferencing software. Then, there will be a brief questionnaire to gather basic demographic and occupational information. Participation and all data will remain completely confidential. There are no direct benefits for participation.

Might you consider forwarding this email to anyone in your network that could be interested? Notably, please do not forward this to current students or recent alumni (2012-present) of any of our Social-Organizational Psychology Programs, as those groups have been contacted separately. Anyone who may be interested should please contact me at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu. I am also happy to speak to prospective participants in-person or via phone if there are any questions or concerns.

Thank you for considering,
Danielle Pfaff
(IRB protocol #: **18-480**)

## APPENDIX A6: EMAIL SENT TO MY PERSONAL NETWORK

Subject: Research Study: Seeking Women Leaders in Male-Typed Contexts

Dear [Family Members/Friends/Colleagues/Prior Coworkers],

I hope all is well! I am writing to ask for your help with my dissertation. I am currently recruiting participants for my study and was hoping you might forward the email below to prospective participants in your network. However, please don't feel any pressure- I will totally understand if you do not feel comfortable passing along this email request. If you do, I would be most grateful!

The study is related to women leaders' behaviors in the workplace, particularly those in jobs that are "male-typed," meaning the majority of job-holders are males, or that the job is seen as stereotypically "male" in nature by a layperson. I feel passionate about this topic and am hopeful that this research study will shed additional light on women leaders' experiences. Because of the nature of my research question (inquiring about women leaders' behaviors and perceptions), I am conducting a qualitative study, encompassing interviews with 20-25 women leaders in male-typed jobs/functions/industries.

The study will involve a time commitment of between 70 and 90 minutes. The bulk of the study involves an interview, which can be conducted in-person, by phone, or by video-conferencing software. Then, there will be a brief questionnaire to gather basic demographic and occupational information. Participation and all data will remain completely confidential. There are no direct benefits for participation.

Anyone who may be interested should please contact me at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu. I am also happy to speak to prospective participants in-person or via phone if there are any questions or concerns.

Thank you for considering,
Danielle Pfaff

(IRB protocol #: **18-480**)

## APPENDIX A7: SNOWBALL SAMPLING EMAIL

Subject: Research Study Follow-up

Dear [Participant name],

Thank you so much for taking the time to complete the study [yesterday/the other day]. I very much appreciated your reflectiveness and candor. I am looking forward to making meaning from the entire range of interviews, in service of expanding our understanding of this topic. I will be in touch in the coming [weeks/months] with preliminary findings to solicit your feedback, if you are interested in providing it.

I am also reaching out to ask if you would be willing to forward my contact information to anyone in your professional or personal network who may be qualified and interested in participating. They can work at your same organization or can work somewhere completely different. This study is utilizing a "snowball" sample, meaning that I am asking all participants to refer potential additional participants. Of course, this is entirely optional and if you would prefer not to refer anyone, I completely understand. Thank you for considering and if you do want to refer someone, please have her contact me at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu.

Again, I wanted to express my gratitude for you taking the time and energy to contribute to my study. If you have any additional questions or if any other reflections occur to you related to the study topic, please don't hesitate to reach out at any time.

All my best,
Danielle

(IRB protocol #: **18-480**)

## APPENDIX B: SCREENING EMAIL SENT TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Dear [Potential participant name],

Thank you so much for your interest in the study! I have included more information about the study below, to make sure it is something you would like to do:
This is an exploratory study documenting the ways in which women leaders do or do not modulate emotional displays at work. The study includes an interview to understand your work context, what emotions you may experience on a daily basis in your interactions with colleagues, how you modulate those emotions (if at all), and why you may be tuned into modulating those emotions. I will also ask you to complete a brief questionnaire assessing some demographic and occupational factors after the interview. The interview will take between 60-75 minutes, and the questionnaire should take no longer than 10-15 minutes. I am sensitive to your time, so we can make sure to schedule your participation at a time that is most convenient for you, and we can certainly limit the interview to 60 minutes if you prefer.

Importantly, I would like to **record the interview** (just audio, no video), so please keep this in mind as you consider participating. The interview will then be transcribed by a professional transcription service, and they will sign an NDA before having access to your interview. Your participation in the study as a whole will remain entirely confidential.

In order to ensure that the study is a good fit for you, please take a moment to answer these standard screening questions?

1) Do you work in a job that requires you to lead/manage/oversee two or more people towards a common goal?

2) What is your formal job title?

3) Are the majority of others with your same job title male? Female?

4) What is the gender makeup of your organization? Of your field? (An approximate percentage of women vs. men is great.)

If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to reach out.

Thank you again, and looking forward to hearing back,
Danielle

## APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM

Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York NY 10027
212 678 3000

**Protocol Title**: Emotion Displays in Women Leaders in Male-typed Contexts
**Principal Investigator**: Danielle L. Pfaff, Graduate Student, Teachers College
631-807-0973, dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu

---

**INTRODUCTION**

You are being invited to participate in this research study called "Emotion Displays in Women Leaders in Male-typed Contexts." You may qualify to take part in this research study because you are female, are over 18 years old, hold a leadership or managerial position, and work in an organizational role, function, level, or industry that has been historically dominated by men or is currently dominated by men**.** Approximately twenty-five women will participate in this study and it will take 90 minutes of your time to complete.

**WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?**

This study is being done to explore how women leaders express emotions in the workplace, specifically when working in male-typed contexts.

**WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IF I AGREE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?**

If you decide to participate, the principal investigator will interview you for up to 75 minutes either face-to face, on the phone, or virtually (e.g., Skype or Zoom). You will be asked to choose the location that is most convenient for you and your schedule. This interview will be audio-recorded.

During the interview, you will be asked to discuss your current occupation, your interactions with a range of colleagues, the extent to which you do and do not experience various emotions at work, and how you manage your emotional displays.

You will also be asked to fill out a survey about your current occupation and a demographic survey (e.g., race, ethnicity, age, etc.). The two surveys will take about fifteen minutes to complete in total.

After the interview is transcribed, you will have the opportunity to engage in three optional independent reviews of your participation: 1) You will be asked to review your interview transcript and suggest any applicable corrections ; 2) You will be asked to review preliminary themes that emerge from the study as a whole; 3) You will be asked to review finalized themes that emerge from the study as a whole. If you choose to give feedback, the researcher will contact you at a later time.

**WHAT POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?**

This is a minimal risk study, which means the harms or discomforts that you may experience are not greater than you would ordinarily encounter in daily life while taking routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. However, there are some risks to consider. Discussing challenges in your workplace, particularly as they relate to being female, may be challenging, frustrating, or upsetting for some people. **However, you do not have to answer any questions or divulge anything you don't want to talk about. You can stop participating in the study at any time without penalty.**

Your name will not be associated with your interview recording, transcript, or your demographic and occupational questionnaires.

**WHAT POSSIBLE BENEFITS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?**

There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study.

**WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY?**

You will not be paid to participate. There are no costs to you for taking part in this study.

**WHEN IS THE STUDY OVER? CAN I LEAVE THE STUDY BEFORE IT ENDS?**

The study is over when you have completed the interview and filled out the questionnaires. However, you can leave the study at any time even if you haven't finished.

**PROTECTION OF YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY**

The principal investigator is taking precautions to keep your information confidential and prevent anyone from discovering or guessing your identity, such as using a randomly-generated code instead of your name and keeping all information on a password-protected computer and locked in a lock box.

The audio-recording file will be professionally transcribed. The transcriptionist will sign a non-disclosure agreement.

After the audio-recording is written down (transcribed) and data collection is completed, the audio-recording will be deleted. If you do not wish to be audio-recorded, you will still be able to participate, and the principal investigator will take typed notes.

Regulations require that your data (interview transcription and questionnaire responses) are stored for a minimum of three years, after which time, they will be destroyed.

For quality assurance, the study team and/or members of the Teachers College Institutional Review Board (IRB) may review the data collected from you as part of this study. Otherwise, all information obtained from your participation in this study will be held strictly confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by U.S. or State law.

**HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE USED?**

This study is being conducted as part of the dissertation of the principal investigator and will also be used for journal articles, and/or conference presentations.

**CONSENT FOR AUDIO RECORDING**

Audio recording is part of this research study. You can choose whether to give permission to be recorded. If you decide that you do not wish to be recorded, you will still be able to participate in this study.

_____I give my consent to be recorded _____

Signature

_____I **do not** consent to be recorded _____

Signature

**WHO MAY VIEW MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY**

___I consent to allow written materials viewed at an educational setting or at a conference outside of Teachers College

_____

Signature

___I **do not** consent to allow written materials viewed outside of Teachers College Columbia University

_____

Signature

**OPTIONAL CONSENT FOR FUTURE CONTACT**

The investigator may wish to contact you in the future. This will include an optional opportunity to review your interview transcript and emerging themes. Please initial the appropriate statements to indicate whether or not you give permission for future contact.

I give permission to be contacted in the future for information relating to this study:

Yes _____ No_____

Initial Initial

**WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?**

**If you have any questions about taking part in this research study, you should contact the principal investigator, Danielle L. Pfaff, at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu. You can also contact the faculty advisor, Dr. Caryn Block at cjb17@tc.columbia.edu.**

**If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (the human research ethics committee) at 212-678-4105 or email IRB@tc.edu. Or you can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 1002. The IRB is the committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University.**

## PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

- I have read and discussed the informed consent with the researcher. I have had ample opportunity to ask questions about the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits regarding this research study.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw participation at any time without penalty.
- The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his or her professional discretion.
- If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue my participation, the investigator will provide this information to me.
- Any information derived from the research study that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
- Identifiers may be removed from the data. De-identifiable data may be used for future research studies, or distributed to another investigator for future research without additional informed consent from the subject or the representative.
- I should receive a copy of the Informed Consent document.

**My signature means that I agree to participate in this study**

**Print name**: _____ **Date**: _____

**Signature:** _____

## APPENDIX D: EMAIL SENT TO ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS WITH ADDITIONAL DETAILS

Dear [Potential participant name],

Thank you for taking the time to answer those questions! After reviewing your responses, you qualify for the study. If you would still like to participate, we can move forward.

In terms of scheduling, please let me know what dates/times would work for you. I can be flexible to your schedule. We should plan to allot a 90 minute block, if possible, but can also complete the study in 75 minutes if that is preferable to you. If you don't mind sending over some options, I can work from your suggestions.

I am not sure if you are local to NYC or are farther away? We can meet in-person or virtually if you live in NYC. If not, we can plan on virtual participation-- I am happy to do a phone call, or to use video conferencing (Adobe Connect, FaceTime, Google Hangout, Skype, Zoom). Please let me know your preference.

I have also attached the consent form here for you to review and sign. Please note that there are two versions, for your convenience:

- One is a fillable form, if you would prefer (you will need an adobe "digital ID" to sign it-- it will make you re-save it each time you sign in the different sections where your signature is required, unfortunately, but you can re-save over the same file name).
- The other can be printed and signed by you (I just need a scanned copy emailed to me before we commence the study).

Please read this over and if you have any questions, don't hesitate to ask before signing. We can also chat on the phone if you have questions, if that is easier. One note-- there is a check box asking you if you consent to allow "written materials viewed at an educational setting or a conference outside of Teachers College" -- this does not mean your name or company would ever be published-- it means that you give permission for quotes from your interview to be included in the dissertation, with your permission. (I will email you to ask for your permission before including any quotes, which will be anonymized. I will also follow up a few weeks after the interview to allow you the opportunity [if you wish] to review and comment on the interview transcript if there are any corrections.) Importantly, your participation is entirely confidential and no one will know you participated except for me. You will be assigned a 4-digit code, which will be used to identify your data.

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Thanks again,
Danielle

## APPENDIX E: SCRIPT TO ORIENT PARTICIPANTS

This is an exploratory study documenting the ways in which women leaders like yourself do or do not modulate emotional displays at work. In particular, I am interested in women leaders who work in male-typed jobs, functions, or industries, which simply means that men are currently in the majority, have historically been in the majority, or are perceived to be the majority. The study includes an interview to understand your current work context, what emotions you may experience on a daily basis in your interactions with colleagues, how you modulate those emotions (if at all), and why you may be tuned into modulating those emotions. I will also ask you to complete a brief questionnaire assessing some demographic and occupational factors.

This study will ultimately help us to have a better understanding of women leaders' experiences in male-typed contexts. It is exploratory in nature as there has been little prior work documenting the extent to which women leaders are thinking about their emotional displays at work.

Do you have any questions?

Of course, participation in this study is completely voluntary and you can withdraw at any point in time with no negative consequences. I thank you for taking the time to participate and am happy to answer any questions you might have. Also, please note that your participation will remain entirely confidential. I will be the only person to know that you participated, and your data will be identified with a randomly-generated 4 digit numerical code to protect your identity. If you would like your data to be destroyed at any point in time during the study or after you complete it, I will happily oblige. *[If they have agreed to be audiorecorded: As indicated on the consent form, I will now begin audiorecording.]* The interview portion will take between 60-75 minutes, but we can take a break at any time, just let me know. Then, I will ask you to complete a brief questionnaire, which should take about 10-15 minutes. Do you have any questions before we get started?

## APPENDIX F: DEMOGRAPHIC AND OCCUPATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Women Leaders in Male-Typed Contexts

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Below, you will find questions relating to your demographic characteristics and occupational background. Please answer each question to the best of your knowledge. For the occupational background portion, you should focus on the organization and role that was discussed during your interview.

The questionnaire should take between 10 and 15 minutes. All answers will remain confidential. These data will be reported out in aggregate in the final dissertation but will not be linked to you individually.

If you have any questions or concerns, please email Danielle Pfaff at dlp2140@tc.columbia.edu. Thank you!

What is your 4-digit code?
*(Please ask Danielle for the code if you do not remember.)*

Age:

Race & Ethnicity:

Sexual Orientation:

Gender Identity:

Marital Status:

Number of Children:
*(Please write 0 if not applicable.)*

Nationality:

Political Affiliation:

Educational Attainment:
*(Please write the highest degree you have achieved, e.g., BA/BS, MA, MD, MBA, PhD, etc.)*

Undergraduate Major:

Tenure at organization:

Gender breakdown at organization:
*(Please estimate to the best of your knowledge.)*

Gender breakdown of immediate peer group:
*(Please estimate to the best of your knowledge.)*

Gender of supervisor(s):
*(If you do not have a supervisor, please write "N/A.")*

Please write three words to describe the culture of the organization:

Relevant prior work experience:
*(If you would like to share any other professional experiences that may be relevant to this study, please do so here.)*

## APPENDIX G: SCRIPT TO DEBRIEF PARTICIPANTS

Thank you so much for participating. I am incredibly appreciative of you taking the time to speak with me today. I wanted to provide a bit more background on the study. I did not want to tell you this before you participated, as it could have potentially affected what you said. The theoretical foundation for the study relates to gender stereotypes. There is one type of gender stereotype that suggests that women are warm, but not competent. There is another type of gender stereotype that dictates that women *must be* warm and if they are not, there is a backlash effect, such as being called "hostile" or "an ice queen." Because warmth and competence exist in opposition to one another, when women are solely warm, they are not seen as competent; and when they show their competence, they are perceived as lacking warmth. This creates a situation where women are often walking a tightrope to show both warmth and competence. This study is aiming to better understand if women leaders are aware of these stereotypes, particularly relating to displays of warmth. This area is under-researched and we are trying to ascertain if women modulate warmth displays, either by suppressing their warmth or amplifying their warmth, to fend off the conflicting expectations of gender stereotypes. This may or may not be an experience that you have had, which is totally fine either way. Because this is a nascent exploration of this phenomenon, your insights are invaluable to myself and my advisor developing a more thorough understanding of women leaders and warmth. If you have any questions about this idea, please let me know.

Also, I wanted to let you know that I will follow-up with you in [a few weeks/a month] with an optional request. I am asking all participants to look over the preliminary "codes," which are simply common ideas that arise across all or most interviews, to ask for feedback. This is totally optional, but if you would like to provide your thoughts at this time, I would value your input. Further, I will contact you in 2-3 months to ask for your feedback on the final "themes," which are a distillation of all data and analysis, to ask for your feedback. Again, this is totally optional, but because of your unique experience, it would be wonderful to have your feedback, if you have the time and desire.

Lastly, I know we just spoke at length about your experience in relation to warmth in the workplace. With that said, you may have additional ideas or insights once we end our time together today. I would welcome you reaching out at anytime if you have any other reflections on this topic. Thank you so much!"

## APPENDIX H: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. In order to get started, can you briefly describe your key responsibilities on a day-to-day basis in your organization?
    Probes: Can you tell me more about that?
        Have these changed over time?
        Does this seem similar to others in your position in your organization?

2. How much interaction with others in your workplace, whether it is supervisors, peers, or direct reports, does your job require?
    Probes: Do you have an example of that?
        How much of your work is interdependent, meaning that you need to collaborate with others around you to accomplish it?

*(Note that if person mentions clients, I will tell her to focus on internal interactions with coworkers/peers/direct reports/etc. for this study.)*

3. On a day-to-day basis at work, what emotions do you find yourself most commonly <u>experiencing</u>? If it is helpful, please think of specific instances where you find yourself experiencing emotions and describe them to me.
    Probes: Are there particular emotions that are stronger than others? Which ones?
        *If participant says that they do not experience emotion, or cannot identify which emotions they experience*:
        To what extent do your colleagues express emotion?
        How do others react to emotional displays at work?
        What is the organizational culture at your workplace around expressing emotion?

4. How do you cope with the emotions you experience? As in, in the instance(s) you just described, how did you manage your emotions?
    Probes: What emotions do you find yourself <u>expressing</u> to others?
        Do you always show your emotions to others around you?
            If "yes," then, "Anyone in particular? How do others react?"
            If "no," then, "Why not? How do you decide which emotions to display? Is there anyone in particular you try to hide them from?"

5. If there are times when you hide your emotions, what do you think is stopping you from displaying how you are feeling?

6. At times when you display your emotions, what do you think is helping you to feel comfortable displaying how you are feeling?
    Probes: How effective does it seem to be when you display your emotions?

7. What expectations do your colleagues (whether superiors, peers, or direct reports) seem to hold for emotions related to warmth, such as those that convey kindness, friendliness, approachability, etc.?

Probe: How does it feel that others have expectations about your emotional displays?

8. Do you ever feel as if you are displaying emotions that you are not really experiencing?
   Probes: What emotions do you find yourself "faking"?
   When and with whom does this seem to happen?
   What does this experience feel like?
   Why do you think this is? Are there specific triggers that cause you to display specific emotions?

9. How do you think your identity as a woman impacts your experiences with displaying emotions consistent with conveying warmth, such as kindness, friendliness, approachability, etc. in the workplace?
   Probes: To what extent do male colleagues display these particular emotions?
   Are there similar or different expectations relating to displaying emotion for men versus women in your workplace?

10. If you were giving advice to another woman stepping into your position at your organization, what would it be?