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Abstract

This paper presents preliminary evidence on the internal consistency and validity of a scale designed to measure the degree to which one believes women managers experience a greater number of obstacles and more critical judgments about their work performance as compared to managerial men (the Stereotype Beliefs about Women Managers scale; SBWMS). Survey data from 1337 managerial and nonmanagerial men and women employed by a large manufacturing organization revealed that the 6-item scale possessed a single factor. Significant mean group differences and correlations between the SBWMS and a number of organizationally-relevant measures provide good preliminary support for the scale’s validity.
Development and Validation of the Stereotype Beliefs about Women Managers Scale

Despite the fact that women have increasingly occupied managerial positions in recent years, many researchers have noted that women managers continue to face a number of hardships in these roles (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989; Lyness & Thompson, 1997) including negative beliefs and judgments from coworkers about their levels of commitment (Lane & Piercy, 2003), greater levels of work and nonwork-related stress (Lundberg & Frankenheuser, 1999), and slower than expected promotion or advancement as compared to equally qualified or educated men (Stroh, Brett, & Reilly, 1992). Authors have speculated that such outcomes arise from a number of sources, including negative attitudes stemming from the perceived violation of traditional female roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Although there has been some debate over its factor structure (Crino, White, & DeScantis, 1981; Crino, White, & Looney, 1985; Cordano, Scherer, & Owen, 2003; Ilgen & Moore, 1983), the 21- item Women as Managers scale (WAMS; Terborg, Peters, Ilgen, & Smith, 1977) is one of the most often cited instruments for measuring such negative attitudes toward managerial women. The item content for the scale includes statements about women’s leadership potential (e.g., “It is not acceptable for women to assume leadership roles as often as men”) as well as beliefs regarding the degree to which women possess various traits thought to be useful in managerial positions (e.g., “Women are not ambitious enough to be successful in the business world”). The WAMS, however, also contains items that tap attitudes toward women’s employment more globally (e.g., “On the average, a woman who stays at home all the time with her children is a better mother than a woman who works outside the home at least half time”) and general skills (e.g., “Women are less capable of learning mathematical and mechanical skills than are men”). Another measure, the Managerial Attitudes Toward Women Executives
A related, but importantly different perspective of such attitudes is the perception that prejudice and unfair evaluation exist for women managers. That is, even if one does not personally endorse a negative attitude toward women managers, one may still believe that others in the work environment hold such beliefs and treat them unfairly. We argue that this perception of what others believe or of how others treat managerial women, specifically when considered from the viewpoint of managerial women, is similar to the concept of stereotype threat (Steele, 1997). This concept has been defined as “the social-psychological threat that arises when one is in a situation …for which a negative stereotype about one’s group applies (p. 614).” In laboratory experiments, significant performance differences between Black and White students on tests of academic achievement have been explained by stereotype threat, as have performance differences between women and men on mathematics tests. A number of studies have found heightened levels of arousal and anxiety stemming from the stereotype threat to be one of possible underlying mechanisms responsible for performance differences (e.g., Schmader & Johns, 2003). To the extent that such threat or anxiety becomes a form of workplace stress, we believe that a logical extension of this research to the arena of work might be useful in explaining not only performance outcome differences between managerial men and women, but also differences in job attitudes and stress-related health problems.

This paper presents preliminary data on a scale designed to measure the degree to which one believes that women managers confront obstacles to their success and judgments about their work performance that are more critical or harsher than those experienced by managerial men. Unlike the WAMS or the MATWE, the focus of the present scale is narrowed to measure
perceptions of managerial women (rather than working women generally) and the perceived
evaluation-related differences or biases they experience (rather than one’s own positive or
negative beliefs regarding the quality of managerial women’s work performance). Thus,
although we propose that the meaning of these items will be invariant for managerial and
nonmanagerial men and women, we do anticipate significant group differences both in scale
means and the degree to which it correlates with a number of organizationally-relevant
outcomes. For managerial women, we posit that this scale will be associated with the degree of
threat and discomfort one perceives as a function of her own group’s stereotype. To a lesser
degree, we believe that this scale may also be associated with stereotype threat for
nonmanagerial women, given that gender distinctions (i.e., comparison between managerial men
and women) are emphasized with the items on the scale. For men, we likewise believe that this
scale measures their perceptions that managerial women experience harsher performance-related
judgments; however, we would not expect these perceptions to be associated with any personal
threat for men.

These distinctions have important implications for scale validation: If valid, we would
expect significant mean group differences with managerial women scoring highest followed by
nonmanagerial women and then men. Likewise, we posit that a valid scale would show varying
levels of convergence with work-related variables for the three groups. Given the body of
evidence that has shown differences in the perceptions of managerial men and women’s work
performance (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Singh, 2003), we believe that a short, reliable measure
focused specifically on this aspect of managerial women’s job performance could make a useful
contribution to the literature.
Method

Study Site

Data for this study were collected from workers at a very large manufacturing organization; interviews and focus groups revealed that this company had had a historically “male-dominated” atmosphere, though promotion of women and minorities had been emphasized in the previous two decades. The workforce was between 10-15% managerial and approximately 22% female.

Participants

As part of a larger longitudinal study that examined organizational change and worker health, 3700 workers were randomly selected and mailed a survey in 1997; of these, 2279 returned usable questionnaires (62% response rate). Two and one half years later, 1960 of the respondents were still employed with the company and asked to complete a similar survey; 1244 responded (65%).

At Time 3 (summer, 2003), 1076 of the 1244 previous respondents remained with the company. In order to increase the number of participants representing certain demographic groups (e.g., women managers) within our sample, we invited 1409 additional workers to participate at Wave 3 using a stratified random sampling technique. Both new and continuing participants were contacted with a letter sent to their home which described the purpose of the study as well as the terms and conditions of their participation. At all times, the researchers emphasized their independence from the company. Follow-up postcards were sent to all respondents approximately two weeks after the initial letter.
Of the 2485 who were sent a Time 3 questionnaire, 1410 responded (57% response rate), 1337 of whom provided gender and managerial status data. It is the data from this group that we report in the present paper. Subgroup sample sizes used in this study include: (a) managerial men \((n = 305)\), (b) nonmanagerial men \((n = 537)\), (c) managerial women \((n = 214)\), (d) nonmanagerial women \((n = 281)\). Two (gender) by two (managerial status) ANOVAs reflected that men were significantly older than were women \((F = 19.2 [1,1331], p = .0001)\), and reported higher levels of education \((F = 15.9 [1,1319], p = .0001)\). Main effects for managerial status were also obtained on education \((F = 116.3 [1,1319], p = .0001)\) and income \((F = 364.7 [1,1317], p = .0001)\), with managers reporting significantly higher levels on both variables. Thus, these three demographic variables were controlled in the validation-related analyses.

Percentages of racial background (89% white or Caucasian) did not differ by gender and managerial status. Participants who completed surveys were paid $30 for their participation, assured confidentiality of all responses, and promised a summary of results should they desire.

**Materials and Procedure**

Before the Time 3 data collection, we held two focus groups and interviewed some 30 managerial men and women as well as nonmanagerial women so that the unique experiences of managerial women, as different from male managers or all women employees could be more thoroughly understood. We recruited participants for the interviews and focus groups by sending an introductory letter to approximately 200 randomly selected managerial men and women and nonmanagerial women. A randomly selected subset of those who responded to the letter were contacted via telephone to schedule a meeting. Interviews, which were conducted by a member of the research team, were semi-structured and focused on workplace and home-related stressors, workplace change (e.g., layoffs, reengineering), health behaviors, and health-related problems.
A large portion of the interview emphasized the unique work-related stressors of women, and in particular, managerial women. The two focus groups (one containing a mixture of managerial and nonmanagerial men and women, the second containing only managerial women) were similarly structured.

In addition to our knowledge of the extant literature, comments from these interviews and focus groups were used for writing approximately 20 items for the Stereotyped Beliefs of Women Managers scale (SBWMS). Remarks that came up frequently and that were related to work-performance judgments or to the success of women managers were identified as potential items for the SBWMS. To conserve survey space however, we ultimately selected nine items whose content focused specifically on the perceived evaluation-related differences between managerial men and women. Participants were instructed to consider their “beliefs and feelings toward women managers at [name of company]” and indicate their “levels of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about women managers.” Questions were generally written such that respondents were asked to make a comparison between managerial men and women. Responses were recorded on a Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree and were reverse scored so that a higher total score reflected greater levels of stereotyped belief.

In addition to these nine items, the Wave 3 questionnaire contained many standardized scales found in the literature that measured respondent’s job attitudes, job experiences, and health outcomes. The subset of scales used in the present study are summarized in Table 1. In all cases the measures have been scored such that higher numbers reflect more of the named construct.
Results and Discussion

Factor Structure

We randomly selected 50% of all usable cases and explored the factor structure of the nine item scale. Using maximum likelihood extraction, initial estimates revealed that two factors had eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (4.3 and 1.1 for the first two factors, respectively) and together accounted for 60.5% of the common variance (48.3% and 12.2%). Allowing for intercorrelation of the factors, an equamax rotation showed that one item (“Women managers are sometimes promoted only because they are women”) failed to load on either factor; we note that this was the only item without an explicit reference to managerial men or to masculine characteristics. Two other items loaded moderately (range of the four loadings = .32 to .51) on both factors (i.e., “Compared to male managers, female managers’ success is more dependent upon having a good mentor” and “Compared to male managers, female managers are too ‘people oriented’ and caring to move up in the company”). Because we sought to develop a short, single factor measure, these three items were removed from the scale and a second factor analysis was conducted on the holdout subsample. Only one factor had an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 (4.2), and it accounted for 69.4% of the common variance; for this single factor solution, the communality estimates ranged between .32 and .79. Internal consistency reliability for this revised 6 item scale equaled .91 for the holdout subsample and ranged between .87 and .89 for the four subgroups (i.e., managerial and nonmanagerial men and women). Item level means, standard deviations, and item to total correlations for the subgroups are found in Table 2. The final six items are presented in the Appendix.
Validation Evidence

To validate the SBWMS, we employed two strategies. First, we examined the scale means between managerial and nonmanagerial men and women, anticipating that if the scale were valid, women managers would report the highest total scores, followed by nonmanagerial women and then all men. We reasoned that managerial women (and to a lesser extent, nonmanagerial women) would have the greatest awareness of such issues given that they stand to be most impacted by these types of gender differences in work performance related issues. Second, we correlated total scores between the SBWMS and a number of organizationally-relevant work and health variables. In addition to expecting the SBWMS to correlate more strongly with similar than with dissimilar constructs for all participants combined, we also anticipated that the overall pattern of correlations would be strongest for managerial women, and to a lesser extent nonmanagerial women, given the saliency of the topic to female employees. That is, we reasoned that the SBWMS would be linked to personal threat for managerial women and that such threat would be correlated with other forms of stressful workplace experiences, attitudes toward the company, and stress-related health outcomes.

A 2 (gender) by 2 (managerial status) ANOVA, controlling for age, education, and income revealed the expected pattern of scale means. There was a significant main effect for gender ($F[1, 1289] = 500.6; p < .0001$) as well as a significant interaction effect between gender and managerial status ($F[1, 1289] = 58.9; p < .0001$). Adjusted group means for the four groups equaled: managerial women ($M = 22.2$), nonmanagerial women ($M = 19.9$), managerial men ($M = 14.4$), and nonmanagerial men ($M = 16.0$).
The correlation between the SBWMS and the validation measures for all participants and for managerial and nonmanagerial men and women is shown in Table 3; the full intercorrelation matrices are not shown due to space considerations. Turning first to the pattern of correlations for all participants, the two subscales of the generalized workplace abuse measure, isolation and disrespectful treatment, are most strongly correlated with the SBWMS. These two validation measures asked respondents to indicate the number of times they had experienced various forms of workplace abuse (e.g., being humiliated, treated unfairly, or ignored); thus, we had expected these scales to correlate moderately with the SBWMS to the extent that they share the themes of “poor treatment.” Organizational support (i.e., the belief that the organization cares about him/her and notices his/her work) and management integrity (i.e., the degree to which one trusts the top management and believes that its practices are consistent with its philosophy), illustrate smaller but significant negative correlations with the SBWMS. Because these scales do not measure employee maltreatment directly, but instead emphasize one’s opinions of top management’s workplace practices, we reasoned that these constructs were conceptually related to the SBWMS, but to a lesser degree than either of the workplace abuse scales. General job stress, days absent and poor health reveal similarly small but significant correlations with the SBWMS; to the extent that this type of belief about performance appraisal is stressful, we might expect such a relationship with higher levels of overall workplace stress and absenteeism as well as subjective reports of varied stress-related health problems (e.g., headaches).

These correlations by subgroup, however, reveal a very different pattern for managerial women, nonmanagerial women, and men. It is the differences in these patterns that provide some evidence that the SBWMS is associated with stereotype threat for managerial women, and to a lesser degree, nonmanagerial women. As shown in the last four columns of Table 3, the
SBWMS is strongly correlated in the expected directions for managerial women, followed by a more moderate pattern of correlations for nonmanagerial women. The scale fails to correlate with all measures for managerial and nonmanagerial men. For example, the two measures of workplace abuse – both being measures that relate to the treatment employees have personally experienced – are strongly and negatively related to stereotype threat for managerial women. Because it is reasonable for men (both managerial and nonmanagerial) to perceive no personal threat even if they believe the performance evaluation of managerial women to be more critical or unfair than that of managerial men, the SBWMS fails to correlate with men’s own personal experiences of workplace abuse. As we posit that nonmanagerial women identify (albeit to a lesser extent than managerial women) with the SBWMS, workplace abuse is significantly related to SBWMS scale scores, though somewhat less than it is for managerial women. Similarly, the degree to which managerial women feel supported by the larger organization and believe that they can trust top management is, as predicted, strongly and significantly correlated to SBWMS scores. Because it is likely that failure to provide a culture where fair and unbiased performance appraisal occurs would be blamed on top management or the organization as a whole, it is reasonable that higher scores on the SBWMS would be significantly correlated with beliefs related to viewing top management as untrustworthy as well as lower levels of felt support from the organization.

Last, we examined the relationship between one’s most recent retention rating (i.e., “1” “2” or “3”, used as the between subjects variable) on SBWMS total scores for managerial men and women. (Nonmanagerial employees used varied types of retention ratings.) Using the same controls as before, a one-way ANCOVA was nonsignificant for managerial men, but for managerial women, $F(2, 170) = 3.29, p = .04$. Post hoc tests indicated that those managerial
women with the lowest retention ratings (i.e., a “1”) scored significantly higher on the SBWMS (adjusted $M = 23.73$), as compared to those with the highest ratings (i.e., a “3”; adjusted $M = 21.2$). Interestingly, the mean retention ratings for managerial men ($M=2.22$, $SD = .79$) and women ($M = 2.28$, $SD= .79$) were nearly identical and not significantly different. Clearly, our cross-sectional design does not permit causal interpretations; it is possible that stereotype threat and the accompanying anxiety resulted in lower performance ratings or that managerial women who received lower retention ratings made the attribution that they encountered unfair evaluation. Either interpretation, however, supports the scale’s validity.

In sum, the evidence from this sample of managerial and nonmanagerial men and women provides good initial support for the unidimensionality and reliability of the SBWMS. To the extent that the item to total correlations are similar between the four subgroups provides, we have some preliminary evidence that the items similarly tap the same construct for managerial and nonmanagerial men and women. Validation evidence is likewise strong to the extent that mean group differences are consistent with the literature that has found women to possess significantly more positive attitudes than men toward managerial women (Dubno, 1985; Terborg, et al., 1977). The pattern of correlations with organizationally-relevant variables is reasonable given that the relationship of the scale to other measures is strong for managerial women but not strong for men. That is, as managerial women perceive their group’s own performance appraisal and success within the organization to be more difficult or unfair than that of managerial men, we would expect them to feel more personally threatened, distressed, and unsupported by such a perception. The strong relationship between the SBWMS scale and measures of workplace abuse, organizational support, management integrity, job satisfaction, and poor health is consistent with this argument.
Future research should be directed toward providing stronger convergent validation evidence; the present study is limited as we were unable to provide much support that this scale measures men’s perceptions of the evaluation bias for managerial women. Even though we would expect this construct to be associated with greater deleterious outcomes for managerial women, understanding men’s perceptions is an important component in any workplace intervention aimed at changing the perceptions (or reality) of job performance assessment difficulties for managerial women. Although the lack of significant correlations for men is consistent with the logic of discriminant validation, we have little evidence, save for the significantly lower total scores for managerial and nonmanagerial men, that the SBWMS validly measures male perceptions of the job performance evaluation differences for managerial women. Measures of empathy, for example, may be reasonable convergent scales for men. Because of its broad focus on attitudes towards women’s employment, the WAMS or the MATWE might also be suitable.

Given the utility of the stereotype threat concept in a number of arenas where achievement and performance are salient, we believe that the SBWMS can be useful to researchers interested in the work experiences of managerial women. Comments from the interview data collected in this study also highlight that this issue is one of extreme importance to many managerial women. Although we do not want to diminish the importance of striving toward truly equal treatment of men and women in work settings, we believe that the perception of such equal treatment is another important aspect in this research area.
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Table 1  
*Summary of Validation Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolation subscale of the Generalized Workplace Abuse Scale</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>3.35 (.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td>number of times coworker has been excluded or isolated from work activities</td>
<td>Richman, J.A. et al., (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespectful treatment subscale of the Generalized Workplace Abuse Scale</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>4.45 (.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td>number of times one has been treated disrespectfully at work</td>
<td>Richman, J.A. et al., (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>10.01 (.90)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>degree to which one believes the organization cares for one’s well-being</td>
<td>Eisenberger, et al., (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of Management</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>9.58 (.82)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>degree to which one believes that top management is trustworthy/ honest</td>
<td>Kirkpatrick, S., Locke, E. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>11.11 (.82)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>global measure of general job stress (how tense, relaxed, pushed one feels)</td>
<td>Stanton, J.M. et al., (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>10.54 (.89)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>global measure of general job satisfaction</td>
<td>Cammann, C. et al., (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Health Symptoms</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>2.11 (.46)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>checklist of 6 health problems (e.g., back pain, headaches)</td>
<td>modified from Moos et al. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Quinn, R. &amp; Staines, G. (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days Absent from Work*</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>3.45 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>self-report number of days missed from work in previous 12 months</td>
<td>author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rating in past year*</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2.25 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>rating given to employee 1= lowest 3= highest (reported by employee)</td>
<td>company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *a Square root transformation was performed on variable before using it in the validation-related analyses. *b* Reported for managers only.*
Table 2

*Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Item-to-Total Correlations for the Stereotyped Beliefs about Women Managers Scale (SBWMS).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Nonmanagers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
<td>M (SD) ITC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85 1.01 .75</td>
<td>2.66 .90 .69</td>
<td>3.54 .93 .73</td>
<td>2.97 .86 .56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.06 1.00 .81</td>
<td>2.48 .90 .77</td>
<td>3.63 .99 .77</td>
<td>2.72 .96 .75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.24 1.14 .60</td>
<td>2.32 .89 .63</td>
<td>2.96 .97 .64</td>
<td>2.56 .96 .66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.90 1.06 .82</td>
<td>2.33 .82 .82</td>
<td>3.56 .99 .82</td>
<td>2.67 .94 .82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80 1.05 .79</td>
<td>2.32 .92 .80</td>
<td>3.46 1.02 .84</td>
<td>2.72 .98 .79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.44 1.16 .51</td>
<td>2.21 .79 .42</td>
<td>2.73 .96 .42</td>
<td>2.41 .80 .48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Descriptive statistics computed on the holdout subsample where subgroup n’s equaled: managerial women (n = 113), managerial men (n = 160), nonmanagerial women (n = 134), and nonmanagerial men (n = 289). Responses could range from 1 – 5 and were coded such that higher scores reflect greater levels of the stereotyped belief.
Table 3

Partial correlations \(^a\) between the Stereotyped Beliefs about Women Managers Scale (SBWMS) and Validation Measures: for all Participants and for Managerial and Nonmanagerial Women and Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (N = 1254)</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Nonmanagers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Ss (^b)</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespectful</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>-.11***</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Work (^c)</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a\) Age, educational level, and income were controlled in all correlations. \(^b\) Sample sizes are slightly smaller than those reported in method section as we used listwise deletion. Subsample sizes do not add to total sample size used in this analysis as some participants did not report gender or managerial status. \(^c\) Square-root transformation was performed on variable before using it in analyses. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Appendix

Items comprising the Stereotyped Beliefs about Women Managers Scale

Instructions: Consider your beliefs and feelings toward women managers at [name of company]. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about women managers.

1. Women managers have their ideas challenged more often than do managerial men.
2. Women managers have to perform much better than male managers in order to succeed.
3. Women managers must behave in a typically “masculine” way in order to be taken seriously.
4. Compared to male managers, female managers must continually prove themselves.
5. Women managers have their work judged more critically than do men managers.
6. Compared to male managers, female managers are often uncomfortable in taking credit for their successes.

Note: Participants were asked to indicate their answers using a scale anchored from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. Responses were reverse scored so that higher scores are associated with a greater belief in the disparity between the performance evaluation differences of managerial men and women.