
Dissertations

Spring 3-4-2017

The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer

Sam Garzaniti II
Brandman University, sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd_dissertations



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Garzaniti, Sam II, "The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer" (2017). *Dissertations*. 90.
https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd_dissertations/90

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by UMass Global ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UMass Global ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact christine.bombaro@umassglobal.edu.

The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for
Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer

A Dissertation by

Sam G. Garzaniti II

Brandman University

Irvine, California

School of Education

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

March 2017

Committee in charge:

Marilou Ryder, Ed.D., Committee Chair

Jeffrey Lee, Ed.D.

Linda Scharpenberg, Ed.D.

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY

Chapman University System

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

The dissertation of Sam G. Garzaniti II is approved.

 _____, Dissertation Chair

Marilou Ryder, Ed.D.

 _____, Committee Member

Jeffrey Lee, Ed.D.

 _____, Committee Member

Linda Scharpenberg, Ed.D.

 _____, Associate Dean

Patricia Clark-White, Ed.D.

March 4, 2017

The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for
Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer

Copyright © 2017

by Sam G. Garzaniti II

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my Lord and Savior, none of this would have been possible without your grace and mercy guiding me through every step. I owe you everything. Miserere mei, Deus, miserere mei quoniam in te confidit anima mea.

To my darling wife, words can't begin to describe how much I owe you for getting me through this journey. Thank you for providing me the time and space I needed to research and write, listen to my incoherent mumblings, nurse me through my diabetic madness, and give me a reality check when I needed it. You rock!

To my dear boy, thank you for understanding and having patience with me during this journey. I owe you more than one bike ride and cheeseburger. I plan on delivering!

To my dissertation chair, Dr. Ryder, a real-life Wonder Woman. No one could ask for a better guide. Your knowledge, strength and guidance were a constant reminder that there was always light at the end of the tunnel. It was and will always be an honor.

To my committee, Dr. Lee and Dr. Scharpenberg, a big thank you for your knowledge and wisdom.

To Octopus Prime and my fellow octopi, thank you for being there to bounce off ideas and keep the sanity. Our rant sessions helped provide a level of clarity that provided much-needed focus.

Rita & Eric, I would not have made it through this without your help navigating the community college system. I'll be forever grateful.

To Bob Ross, thank you for reminding me that we don't make mistakes, only happy accidents. Rest in peace and God bless my friend.

To the people in my sample, thank you for the time you gave me. You were a lively bunch!

To the countless others to contributed to this success, I am grateful for your support.

Finally to Miss Goodness, my dissertation cat. How many hours you spent with me sleeping between my legs while I banged away hour after hour on the keyboard...thank you for not biting me more than you did.

ABSTRACT

The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer

by Sam Garzaniti

Purpose: The purpose of this qualitative, replication study was to discover what behaviors female administrators exhibit that may prompt male administrators with whom they work in a California community college to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance and also to determine what impact these dissonant behaviors may have on women's potential eligibility for advancement to the position of community college Chief Executive Officer (CEO) in California.

Methodology: This qualitative, phenomenological study identified and collected the lived experiences of seven female and seven male Community College CEOs in California. Respondents were purposively chosen based on delimiting criteria. A panel of experts evaluated interview questions and protocols which were then field tested to fine-tune precision and accuracy of the instrument. The researcher conducted face-to-face, semi-structured interviews to gather data and used specialized software to help interpret the data.

Findings: Based upon information gathered during interviews, these data show that females exhibit specific behaviors associated with gender dissonance that cause men to exhibit dissonant behaviors. Most of the study's participants agree that because females exhibit these behaviors, it is a possibility females will not receive promotions to the CEO position.

Conclusions: Based on findings, the researcher can conclude males and females will continue to mis-understand one another until efforts are made to change the status quo, females are caught in a leadership double-bind, communication has improved in the last 20 years, and perception is reality causes strife.

Recommendations: After in-depth review of conclusions, further research is needed to better inform community college administrators of their challenges. Several replicative studies could be undertaken to prove more data. A researcher may focus on different aspects of the community college leadership structure. Studies could look at geographical locations of schools, generational differences among the CEOs, or use a different sample from the same population. Studies could also focus on different industries like K-12 administration or the corporate sector to provide comparative data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	3
Theoretical framework.....	4
Comparison of Brain Composition and Function.....	7
Problems Women in Face in Leadership Today.....	8
Barriers to Advancement for Women.....	10
Gender Roles and Stereotypes Affecting Female Community College Leaders.....	11
Gender Dissonance.....	12
Role Confusion.....	12
Communication Differences.....	13
Cultural Differences.....	13
Women's Personal Power.....	14
Statement of the Research Problem.....	14
Purpose Statement.....	16
Research Questions.....	16
Significance of the Problem.....	16
Definitions.....	18
Delimitations.....	21
Organization of the Study.....	21
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	23
Background.....	23
Theory.....	24
Expectation States Theory.....	24
Social Role Theory.....	26
Role Congruity Theory.....	28
Expectation Violations Theory.....	29
Gender Role Strain.....	30
Comparison of Brain Composition and Function.....	33
Leadership.....	36
Problems Women in Face in Leadership Today.....	37
Barriers to Advancement.....	42
Internal Barriers.....	42
External Barriers.....	44
Gender Roles and Stereotypes Affecting Female Leaders.....	47
Gender Dissonance.....	49
Role Confusion.....	50
Communication Differences.....	55
Cultural Differences.....	62
Women's Personal Power.....	66
Summary.....	68
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	70

Overview	70
Purpose Statement.....	71
Research Questions	71
Research Design.....	71
Expert Panel	73
Timeframe of Study	75
Population	75
Sample.....	77
Instrumentation	78
Background of Researcher.....	79
Data Collection	80
Personal Referrals	80
Mass Correspondence	81
Selection Criteria	81
Interviews.....	82
Field Test	83
Data Analysis	83
Ethical Considerations	85
Validity	87
Reliability.....	87
Limitations	89
Summary	90
 CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS.....	91
Overview	91
Purpose Statement.....	92
Research Questions	92
Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures	92
Population	93
Sample.....	94
Demographic Data	94
Presentation and Analysis of Data	96
Perceived Gender Dissonant Behaviors.....	96
Role Confusion	99
Communication Differences	110
Cultural Differences.....	115
Women's Personal Power	120
Effects of Dissonant Behaviors.....	126
Findings Related to Research Question One	128
Finding 1: Expressions of Sexuality	129
Finding 2: Evolution of the Female Role.....	129
Finding 3: Conflict with Men's Stereotypes and the Female Work and Sex Role ...	130
Finding 4: Differing leadership skills between men and women	130
Finding 5: Different Conversational Styles	131
Finding 6: Different Conversational Rituals.....	131
Finding 7: Confrontation of the Dominant Culture	132
Finding 8: Encroaching on Men's Sense of Entitlement, Prestige, or Power.....	132

Finding 9: Women’s Personal Power	133
Finding 10: Evolution of Gender Interaction.....	133
Findings Related to Research Question Two.....	134
Finding 11: Effects on Future Employment.....	134
Summary	135
 CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	138
Purpose Statement.....	138
Research Questions	138
Methods.....	139
Population	139
Sample.....	140
Major Findings.....	140
Summary of Findings Related to Research Question One.....	141
Finding 1: Role Confusion - Expressions of Sexuality.....	141
Finding 2: Role Confusion - Evolution of the Female Role	141
Finding 3: Role Confusion - Conflict with Men’s Stereotypes and the Female Work and Sex Role	142
Finding 4: Role Confusion - Differing leadership skills between men and women .	142
Finding 5: Communication Differences - Different Conversational Styles.....	142
Finding 6: Communication Differences - Different Conversational Rituals	142
Finding 7: Cultural Differences - Confrontation of the Dominant Culture	143
Finding 8: Cultural Differences - Encroaching on Men’s Sense of Entitlement, Prestige, or Power	143
Finding 9: Women’s Personal Power	143
Finding 10: Evolution of Gender Interaction.....	144
Summary of Findings Related to Research Question Two	144
Finding 11: Effects on Future Employment.....	144
Unexpected Findings	145
Conclusions.....	146
Conclusion 1: Male Administrators Become Frustrated and Lose Respect for Women Leaders When Presented with Any Form of Sexuality in the Workplace	146
Conclusion 2: Women Leaders Continue to Experience a No-Win Situation and Need to Increase Their Emotional and Political Intelligence Awareness of This Situation as They Navigate New Leadership Roles Predominately Held by Males	146
Conclusion 3: While Over the Past Decade Communication Clashes Between Men and Women Have Improved, Women who Criticize Men are at Risk of Alienating Men in the Workplace.....	147
Conclusion 4: Despite Improvement, Some Males Still Perceive Females as Imposters in the Workplace who Threaten the Males’ Way of Life	148
Conclusion 5: Internal Struggles with Personal Power Continue to Haunt Female Leaders	149
Conclusion 6: Unintended Consequences Emerge as a Result of Equality Measures	149
Conclusion 7: Females Need to be Aware of Gender Dissonance in the Workplace that May Have an Effect on Promotion Outcomes as a Way to Increase Their	

Opportunities to Advance to Top Positions of Leadership in Community Colleges	150
Implications for Action	151
Recommendations for Further Research.....	153
A Comparative Look at the Original Study	154
Concluding Remarks and Reflections.....	156
REFERENCES	157
APPENDICES	177

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Values Spectrum	40
Table 2. Expert Panel Qualifications	74
Table 3. Demographic Data of Sample.....	95
Table 4. Gender Dissonance Conceptual Framework.....	97
Table 5. Behaviors Related to Role Confusion that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs.....	99
Table 6. Women who Create Sexual Tension for Men at Work.....	102
Table 7. Evolution of the Female Sex Role	106
Table 8. Conflict with Men’s Stereotypes and the Female Work and Sex Role	108
Table 9. Women who Exhibit Traditionally Female Leadership Characteristics	110
Table 10. Behaviors Related to Communication Differences that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs.....	111
Table 11. Different Conversational Styles.....	113
Table 12. Different Conversational Rituals	115
Table 13. Behaviors Related to Cultural Differences that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs	116
Table 14. Women’s Confrontation of the Dominant Culture	117
Table 15. Women’s Competition with Men	120
Table 16. Behaviors Related to Women’s Personal Power that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs.....	121
Table 17. Self-Confidence Issues – Women who Need to Prove Themselves.....	123
Table 18. Power Issues – Women who Need to Control and Dominate.....	124
Table 19. Evolution of Gender Interaction	125

Table 20. Specific Behaviors that Community College CEOs Perceive are Likely to Limit a Woman's Potential Eligibility for Advancement to a CEO Position.....	127
---	-----

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Role Confusion Conceptual Area.....	51
Figure 2. Communication Differences Conceptual Area.....	57
Figure 3. Cultural Differences Conceptual Area	64
Figure 4. Women's Personal Power Conceptual Area.....	67

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Over the last twenty years, women have made inroads in achieving promotions to the highest levels within organizations albeit at differing rates depending on the industry (Pew Research, 2015). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014), women made up 47% of the total workforce within the United States at the end of 2014. This number is poised to increase past 50% within the next five years (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014).

The election cycle in 2014 witnessed a record number of 100 women elected to the 113th Congress; 21 senators and 79 representatives. The record number actually represents a gain of about one member a year since the first female was elected to Congress in 1916 (U.S. Office of History, Art, & Archives, 2007). One hundred members out of a total 535 is hardly representative of the 50.8% of women who compose the U.S. population (U.S. Census, 2010). The gains in private industry have been more modest. Standard and Poor's 500 companies reported that approximately 45% of the workforce was female (Catalyst, 2016a). As levels of leadership progress from first level supervisors to senior level managers to board members to Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), the female makeup at each level drops by about ten percent, bottoming out at just 4.2% for CEOs.

Community colleges nationwide fair slightly better with female representation, where 278 women occupy the role of CEO in 986 public institutions. This statistic shows that females filled less than a third of the top positions while females comprised 57% of the nation's student body. (American Association of Community Colleges, 2014). The State of California improves on that number. According to the Community College

League (2012), females account for approximately 42% of the CEOs within the state; a number closely representative of the 53% female student population in the 2012-2013 academic year as reported by the California Community College Chancellor's Office (2013).

Despite forward progress, women leaders still have difficulty attaining those coveted positions of authority protected by glass ceilings (Johns, 2013; Jones & Palmer, 2011). Women face pressures that challenge them on personal and professional levels. Participating in a man's world exposes women to biases and judgments in the workplace (Ghaeus, 2015) that are not easily overcome. As a result, women may make compromises that change who they are as a person, how they think, how they interact with those around them, and how they conduct themselves as leaders in order to assimilate in the workplace.

Research has shown that leadership styles for the sexes differ (Baker, 2014; Coder & Spiller, 2013; Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie & Reichard, 2008) and those differences in style sometimes threaten the organization's cultural status quo (Festing, Knappert, & Kornau; 2013) possibly causing disharmony in the workplace. Many individuals believe that females lack the ability to make cogent decisions and are unwilling to take risks (Herrera, Duncan Green, & Skaggs, 2012), traits normally found in their male counterparts (Herrera et al, 2012). Others feel that women executives are too collaborative resulting in lengthy decision making processes and failure to communicate effectively with the workforce (Chin, 2012). All of these behaviors may cause uneasy feelings or dissonance in the workplace that may lead to unequal treatment of the female leader (Cundiff & Komaraju, 2008; Furst & Reeves, 2008) by not providing mentorship,

sponsorship, or access to top level positions or job opportunities otherwise afforded to her male counterparts (Livingstone, Pollock, Raykov, 2014). With organizations being subject to societal norms (Claus, Callahan & Sandlin, 2013) and falling back on old stereotypes (Claus et al., 2013), conducting business the “man’s way” is natural and preferred to the accommodation of a single female executive. Studies of female community college CEOs show they are not immune to such treatment (Campbell, Mueller, & Souza, 2010).

Background

Leadership is not easy. Shouldering the responsibility of an entire organization requires a resilient individual. Society has determined that one exhibiting agentic characteristics like aggression, dominance, and ambition, is more suited to bear the burden of leadership; qualities that are associated with males, not females (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Research corroborates these assertions. As a result, women leaders continue to find themselves in precarious predicaments faced with a myriad of obstacles: they lag behind in promotions to the highest levels in most industries despite any advances achieved in recent history (Furst & Reeves, 2008), they are subjected to unwelcoming workplace environments (Pew Research, 2015; Catalyst, 2014) and they are unfairly judged because of their gender (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Subsequently, despite women’s progress over the years, many barriers still exist to keep women from advancing in their careers (Basham & Mathur, 2010; Campbell, Mueller & Souza, 2010; Festing, Knappert, Kornau, 2013; Gheaus, 2015; Gill & Jones, 2013; Johns; Haveman & Beresford, 2012; Jones & Palmer, 2011; Knight, 2014; Musil, 2011). Some of these barriers are internal to the woman; she perceives that the

organization, its workers or even herself poses a threat to her career. On the other hand, some of the barriers are external to the woman. She sees that the organization is hindering her ability to flourish as a member of the team. It is her reaction to these barriers that may cause dissonance to occur.

Theoretical Framework

A theoretical framework is a tool to provide meaning to a study. The framework provides essential elements to a study like “rationale for research questions...a scholarly perspective for the problem studied...and...justification for the selection of the subjects, variables, and design. Results are interpreted and explained in light of theory” (Schumacher & McMillan, 2010, p. 74). There are five theories that are a part of this framework: expectation states, social role, role congruity, expectancy violations, and gender role strain. These models discuss and describe behaviors that impede women’s progress in ascending to upper management positions.

Expectation states theory. The idea of expectation states is one that posits that society establishes status hierarchies (Bales, 1950) within small groups that are attempting to achieve a common goal (Correll & Ridgeway, 2003). Hierarchies are created when groups use status characteristics to classify members. These characteristics are abilities a group may assume a member possesses. These characteristics may or may not be supportive of the group’s goals. There are two categories of these characteristics: status characteristics that are general expectations of a member based on personality and diffuse status characteristics which are general assumptions based on society’s view (Berger & Fisek, 1974). Gender falls into the second category.

Social role theory. According to DeBeauvoir (1949), men have been in charge since pre-history, leaving the cave to hunt for sustenance leaving women behind to care for the home. With the progression of time into modern day, it seems little has changed. About forty years after DeBeauvoir's observations, Eagly outlines this relationship of the male breadwinner and female domestic in forwarding the social role theory (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood & Diekmann, 2000). The social implications of this male/female gender role stereotype relationship are far-reaching in the workplace especially when women are in positions of authority. They find themselves subject to discriminatory practices like glass ceilings or tokenism (Ghaeus, 2015; Hoyt, Simon, & Reid, 2009; Johns, 2013).

These stereotypes put women at a disadvantage when they are in leadership positions (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008). Acceptable women's behavior, according to society, is that women are nurturing, sympathetic, and collaborative (Eagly & Karau, 2002). These characteristics are not in alignment with the idea of what makes a good leader like assertiveness, aggressiveness; those attributes generally associated with a male (Baker, 2014; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Research shows it is when women decide to break the gender role and take on the male, agentic characteristics that they enter the double bind (Herrera, Duncan, Green & Skaggs, 2012), that is either they maintain the feminine standard and stay in lower positions or they opt for the masculine model and risk backlash and prejudice from the workforce.

Role congruity theory. Eagly and Karau (2002), who are credited with the advancement of role congruity, furthered the social role theory postulating that when the actions of an individual do not meet the social or gender expectations of others, incongruity occurs. When these actions transpire, prejudice against the individual is

likely to ensue. In leadership, this prejudice occurs when females display masculine leadership attributes (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005).

Prejudice against female leaders is common because they may not display those characteristics that society or their organizations has deemed appropriate for their gender roles like empathy, pity, and kindness (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

When female leaders are incongruent in their behavior and opt for the male leadership attributes like risk-taking and assertiveness, they put themselves at risk of upsetting the social structure and norms of their organizations causing them hardship in the form of lesser assignments, poor evaluations and less support (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

Expectancy violations theory. Common sense dictates that effective communication is a necessity in the workplace. Common sense also dictates that the process of communication can be complex. Burgoon and Hale (1988) describe a phenomenon called the expectancy violations theory that details a facet of this complexity. They posit that when the speaker violates the expectations of the audience, the violation can be received positively or negatively and the stronger the violation, the stronger the opinion the audience will have about the speaker and the behavior (Burgoon, 1993; Burgoon & Hale, 1988).

Females engaging in communication behaviors incongruent with their gender roles, that is they take on male attributes, stand to violate the expectations of their audience (Burgoon, 1993; Burgoon & Hale, 1988). In doing so, they may suffer prejudicial treatment (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

Gender role strain. Taking the focus off females, gender role strain conveys a theory that males are under pressure, or strain, to act either as society dictates or according to their upbringings (Pleck, 1995). This theory provides a possible glimpse into male workplace behavior. There are three types of gender role strain: discrepancy, trauma, and dysfunction. Levant (2011) sums up each stating that discrepancy arises when a male fails, in his mind, to fulfill what society has labeled as a “man.” Levant (2011) continues detailing trauma stating that the attainment of the idealized gender role causes severe distress and generally has long-reaching side effects in the individual. Levant (2011) finishes with dysfunction stating that when males attain the desired gender role state, they dislike the results.

These five theories provide a framework for this study that shows how females and males are viewed and treated by society. More importantly, they tell of wide-scale inequality that continues to vex the individual, while at the same time is accepted by the larger society. It should not be surprising that gender dissonance may be a result of fracturing one of society’s unwritten rules outlined in one of these theories.

Comparison of Brain Composition and Function

Much research has been conducted to determine the differences between men and women. Gurian and Annis (2008) explore how brain function differs between the sexes. After examining empirical evidence about brain physiology and function in men and women, results suggest there is a direct relation to not only how the genders may interact in the workplace, but also why genders act a particular way (Annis & Merron, 2014; Gurian & Annis, 2008).

Women make decisions differently than men (Fumagalli, Ferruci, Mameli, Marceglia, Mrakic-Sposta, Zago, Lucchiari, Consonni, Nordio, Pravettoni, Cappa, Priori, 2010; Gill & Jones, 2013; Tannen, 1995). An illustration of these differences is examined in mapping blood flow not only within the brain, but within particular regions in the brain. This brain activity shows that there is a greater reliance on blood flow in the female brain in order to feed the “verbal-emotive” centers in both hemispheres, while necessary only in the right hemisphere of the male brain (Gurian & Annis, 2008). The researchers posit that these biological differences help account for how females and males differ in their leadership styles.

Problems Women in Face in Leadership Today

Despite composing about 51% of the U.S. population and 47% of the total workforce (Catalyst, 2014), women continue to be underrepresented in leadership positions (Pew Research, 2015; U.S. Department of Labor, 2014). Women are not at a loss for education. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2012), for the academic year 2011-2012, females earned 58% of the degrees conferred by institutes of higher learning. Broken down by degree, females earned 57% of Bachelor’s degrees, 60% of Master’s degrees, and 51% of Doctoral degrees. Some researchers suggest that society, despite a cultural revolution in the United States fifty years ago and a revival about a decade ago, is still ill-prepared to have women in the upper echelons of organizations, be they corporations, the military or the government. Common thought is these entities fail to hire women for two main reasons: women are held to a higher standard than men, that is they must out-perform their male counterparts to get equal treatment (Chin, 2012) or make fewer mistakes than their male counterparts (Lively,

2000), and organizations are not ready to have women occupy those positions (Pew Research, 2015). Since few women occupy these elevated positions, as a group, they may be viewed as unworthy to lead such institutions making promotions for future females more difficult.

Before defining leadership differences between the sexes, female and male must be defined. Investigations that attempt to outline femaleness and maleness have demonstrated that sex and gender can make up an individual's identity. Sex is the assignment of characteristics to an individual that determine reproductive role (Encarta, n. d.) whereas gender, based on the ideas of Wood and Eagly (2015), is defined as "people's understanding of themselves in terms of cultural definitions of female and male" (p. 461). As culture defines femaleness and maleness (Wood & Eagly, 2015), a picture emerges as to what gender roles fit each member of the dyad. Society views men as strong possessing confidence, aggression and assertiveness compared to women who are viewed as motherly, possessing compassion, kindness and care (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, Wood & Diekmann, 2000).

Studies convey that leadership styles between the sexes are viewed as vastly different; however, both are subject to the male dominated model that was conceived during the 1920's (Gurian and Annis, 2008). Women are viewed as relationship builders (Annis & Merron, 2014; Gill & Jones, 2013; Sandberg, 2013), collaborative (Sandberg, 2013), emotional (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Sandberg, 2013) and authentic (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). In stark contrast, men are viewed as dominant, aggressive and result-oriented; characteristics more favored for leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2003). This male-

driven model is a basis for problems women face in leadership (Furst & Reeves, 2008; Gurian & Annis, 2008).

Barriers to Advancement for Women

Barriers to advancement for women are categorized in two forms: internal and external. Chin (2012) demonstrates this citing female self-image and inequality in the workplace as challenges to women. Within those two categories exists a menagerie of challenges females face in their leadership roles. These barriers represent factors that hold back female leaders from promotion whether self-inflicted (Sandberg, 2013) or organizational (Festing, Knappert, Kornau, 2013).

Internal barriers are those that may plague the minds of female leaders. Sandberg (2013) characterizes these challenges as personal insecurities. These types of insecurities begin early in life and, many times, are attributed to social interactions. Chesler (2002) wrote that women are social beings from a young age. They are concerned about self and others within a social group and to be excluded would be disastrous (Chesler, 2002). Exclusion and possibly a resulting decreased social status may give rise to personal insecurities. These insecurities are brought forward into adulthood (Sandberg, 2013) possibly causing issues for female leaders in the workplace. Female leaders tend to concern themselves with workplace dynamics with both male and female colleagues as well as self-image, status in the workplace and social expectation (Ryder & Briles, 2003).

The most well-known external barrier for women leaders is the glass ceiling. A structure in place in many organizations throughout the world, the ceiling represents a barrier to advancement for female leaders (Festing, Knappert, Kornau, 2013; Gill & Jones, 2013). The ceiling consists of gender stereotypes and unreasonable expectations

(Pew Research, 2015; Vinkenberg, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011) for those subjected to it. The structure under the glass ceiling contains and maintains other external barriers for female leaders like the lack of procuring a mentor or sponsor (Johns, 2013; Powell, 2011; Vecchio, 2002) or organizational infrastructure and culture (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011).

Gender Roles and Stereotypes Affecting Female Community College Leaders

Eagly and Karau (2002) present that the construction of gender roles and stereotypes helps to conveniently classify people into groups. According to Hofstede (1998), society defines gender. By defining gender, society also determines gender roles (Eagly, 1987). According to society, males are supposed to demonstrate agentic qualities, that is, acting with assertiveness, aggression, and dominance, while females are expected to demonstrate more communal qualities like being nurturing, sympathetic, and collaborative (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). The same roles and stereotypes exist within the community college.

According to Gill and Jones (2013), female leaders still have to confront stereotypes to ascend to higher leadership levels. Ballenger (2010) goes further stating women's work in higher education is considered second-rate and undervalued. Some community college female presidents have complained about the patriarchal system in which they work (Gill & Jones, 2013). Coder and Spiller (2013) advance the idea that though thoughts on gender roles are changing in the workplace, instructional materials presented within the leadership education domain that discuss gender roles may not reflect these changes. The authors clarify that information presented in these materials is based on research instruments developed almost 50 years ago. They contend that without

updated instruments, students can be misled about what makes exceptional, good, or decent leaders today.

Gender Dissonance

According to Ryder and Briles (2003), gender dissonance is the “subconscious discomfort, uneasiness or anger that men may feel when they work or interact with women” (p. 29). Rosner (1995) outlines three problem areas that may lead to gender dissonance: how men perceive women co-workers, how men and women communicate, and how men and women interact in the workplace. Ryder (1998) introduced a fourth problem area; how men perceive women manage themselves in the workplace.

Role Confusion

The role congruity theory emphasizes that when genders adhere to socially assigned roles, confusion is averted (Eagly & Karau, 2002). When these expectations are violated, dissonance may occur. Since the workplace is generally run on the male-dominated leadership model (Campbell, Mueller & Souza, 2010; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007), men’s confusion is all but a surety when women are considered for higher posts. They experience an unfamiliar world in the workplace; high-pitched voices and dresses instead of suits. They may see their leadership methods under attack having to “make room” for foreign leadership concepts like consensus-building and compassion. With changing times and the inclusion, or perhaps according to the male community, invasion, of females within the upper echelons of leadership, the ‘good ol’ boys club, males may see their traditions fall.

Communication Differences

Women and men communicate differently. As Gurian and Annis (2008) point out, women use both hemispheres of their brains to take in the details of a conversation, think about the details and how those details could be connected to information from past conversations, then reply. Conversely, men may get some details from a conversation and make a quick decision. Dissonance between the sexes arises from these different communicating styles. Males may see females as taking too long or not wanting to make decisions; a gender stereotype with which females must contend. Litosseliti (2006) sums up communication between the sexes noting that women are in a “no-win” situation. Further, she writes, if females retain the feminine communicative style, they look weak and if they adopt the masculine style of communication, they are considered hostile and unauthentic according to their peers.

Cultural Differences

By nature (DeBoer, 2004; Gurian & Annis, 2008), males are competitive with an innate need to win. In the past, males served as competitors against one another. However, with the gradual changes in society and its norms, females have become part of the competition (Oakley, 2000). Females show in their willingness to violate social roles and engage in role incongruity (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002) that they will compete with males. Competition in the workplace where none existed previously can be a trigger for dissonance causing ill-will among employees.

The workplace culture found in institutions of higher learning is typically male-dominated (Diekmann, Johnston, & Loescher, 2013; Gill & Jones, 2013) and biased against females (Haveman & Beresford, 2012). Working within such a culture can be

challenging for females; further reinforcing the status quo. Kovala (2014) conveys that changing the culture of a community college is sacrilege. Any attempt to change traditional practices within the organization may cause dissonance between employees.

Women's Personal Power

Howard Phillips Lovecraft wrote, "The oldest and strongest emotion of mankind is fear, and the oldest and strongest kind of fear is fear of the unknown." Women's personal power originates in a fear of the unknown: a lack of self-confidence, a lack of experience and a lack of self-esteem (Briles, 1996; Ryder & Briles, 2003; Sandberg, 2013). Out of these fears, women leaders may overcompensate for their feelings of "lacking" that cause dissonant behavior and even workplace bullying (Leo, Reid, Geldenhuys, & Gobind, 2014).

Statement of the Research Problem

Over the last twenty years, women have made inroads in achieving promotions to the highest levels within organizations albeit at differing rates depending on the industry (Pew Research, 2015). Women have taken the helm at large corporations, like General Motors and Lockheed Martin, that typically employ males as Chief Executive Officers (CEOs). This shows a marked progress from past practice as no females served as CEO in 1995 (Pew Research, 2015). Currently, of the S&P 500 companies, 45% of the workforce is female, but only 21 women are serving as CEOs equaling 4.2% (Catalyst, 2016b). And yet, despite these advances in the workplace, Borstein (2008) and Cook and Glass (2014) observe that there is still a wide gender gap and women remain underrepresented in top level positions in all fields.

Studies convey that leadership attributes between the sexes are viewed as vastly different and in line with their gender roles; men are strong and assertive while women are weak and indecisive (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Research suggests these differences may contribute to the gender gap as both sexes are subject to the male-dominated leadership model based on male attributes of aggression, dominance and ego (Johns, 2013; Vinkenbergh, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011). Women are viewed as relationship builders, collaborative, emotional, and authentic (Annis & Merron, 2014; Gill & Jones, 2013; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Sandberg, 2013). Vecchio (2002) explains that because of gender stereotyping, the male style is preferred. To this day, the male-driven model is a basis for problems women face in leadership positions (Furst & Reeves, 2008; Gurian & Annis, 2008) and for barriers they face in climbing the leadership ladder.

Barriers to advancement for women, both personal and professional, largely originate in the workplace. Studies outline some of these personal barriers citing female inner struggles that stem from the workplace like lack of self-esteem (Chin, 2012), lack of self-confidence (Ryder & Briles, 2003) and lower career ambitions (Johns, 2013). The organization bears responsibility as well (Festing, Knappert, Kornau, 2013). Workplace culture, or traditions, may foster an environment that is not conducive to equitable treatment between the sexes thereby hindering any possibility of female advancement. Glass ceilings, 'old boys' clubs and gender stereotypes remain in place despite evidence showing women are as capable as men in leadership (Baker, 2014; Herrera, Duncan Green, & Skaggs, 2012). In an attempt to shatter barriers and overcome workplace

prejudice, women's desire to achieve likely gave rise to an added challenge to female advancement: the expression of dissonant behaviors between females and males.

Purpose Statement

The first purpose of this qualitative replication study was to discover what behaviors female administrators exhibit that may prompt male administrators with whom they work in a California community college to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance.

The second purpose of this study was to determine what impact these dissonant behaviors may have on women's potential eligibility for advancement to the position of community college CEO in California.

Research Questions

1. What behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college Chief Executive Officers as prompting male administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance?
2. How do selected community college Chief Executive Officers feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement?

Significance of the Problem

The United States celebrated 2010 as the "Year of the Woman" in politics (Parker, 2010, para. 1). According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS) (2015), election results for the 111th Congress in 2008 yielded 96 seats to female politicians; 79 seats in the House of Representatives and 17 seats in the Senate. The CRS (2015)

detailed election results for the 112th Congress in 2010 showing females won 79 seats in the House of Representatives and 17 seats in the Senate. Despite women composing more than half of the U.S. population at the time (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), females attained a zero seat gain in Congress; no progress toward parity for women in one of the most visible male-dominated institutions in the country.

The United States Army celebrated a first in 1970; it promoted its first female to the rank of 1-star general (Begley, 2015). With this promotion, the Army could brag that it was the most progressive of the four services as this advancement was the first of its kind (Begley, 2015). In 2008, the Army would celebrate again. This time it promoted General Ann Dunwoody as the first female from any service, to 4-star general; 38 years after promoting its first general officer. In an interview with the Army Times in 2015, General Dunwoody, when asked how she managed the promotion, stated, “I had advocates (in the military), then there were detractors. They just don't like you, maybe they think it's a man's Army and women don't belong here.” In 2009, just one female 4-star general served out of 203,375 females serving in all four branches of the military showing that the glass ceiling remained firmly in place (Department of Defense, 2010).

Females serving at community colleges suffered the same sluggish promotion rates as females in the political and military fields (Ballenger, 2010; Knight, 2011; Muñoz, 2010). Ballenger (2010) created a list citing barriers females face that impede promotions like the glass ceiling, good old boys clubs, and lack of a mentors or sponsors. Muñoz (2010) added gender stereotypes, lack of role models, and females' isolation from information networks to the list of barriers to promotion. Knight (2011) contributed

individual and institution fit, an effective chain of support and self-awareness to finish the list.

Women leaders continue to find themselves in precarious predicaments faced with a myriad of obstacles: they lag behind in promotions to the highest levels in most industries (Furst & Reeves, 2008), they are subjected to unwelcoming workplace environments (Pew Research, 2015; Catalyst, 2014) and they are unfairly judged because of their gender (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Ghaeus (2015) suggests that working in a man's world contributes to the continued lack of workplace equality for women and their exposure to prejudicial treatment from male colleagues. It is important to determine the root cause for such practices. Building on Ryder's 1998 study that revealed these types of dissonant behaviors exist between females and males in the K-12 superintendency, and about 18 years of further research in gender studies and leadership, this study will attempt to determine if those same dissonant behaviors exist in the community college CEO population. To fill the gap in knowledge, the research will examine any behaviors female community college CEOs exhibit that inhibit chances for a female administrator to advance to the CEO position; a novel approach for female leaders at this level.

Definitions

The following are the operational and technical terms and definitions used in this study:

Agentic behavior. A type of conduct which is associated with masculine characteristics. This behavior includes aggression, assertiveness, and dominance.

Barrier. A type of hindrance that obstructs forward progress.

Chancellor. An administrative representative of a Board of Trustees who is charged with the operation of a community college district or school. Individual oversees community college presidents within a district.

Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The highest ranking individual in an institution who has the responsibility to make corporate decisions.

Communal behavior. A type of conduct which is associated with feminine characteristics. This behavior includes teamwork, emotion, and participation.

Communication. The exchange of information between individuals using verbal or non-verbal methods.

Community college. An institution of higher learning that generally offers two year degree programs. Colleges are organized into districts and are governed by CEOs.

Culture. The beliefs and customs of a society; a way of thinking, behaving or working within an organization (Merriam-Webster, 2016).

External barriers. Factors extrinsic to women that impede their ability to attain promotions to positions of increased responsibility.

Gender. The attitudes and behaviors a culture or society attributes to an individual's sex (American Psychological Association, 2015).

Gender dissonance. The conscious or subconscious incongruity that men and women may feel when they work together (Ryder and Briles, 2003).

Gender roles. Customary functions assigned to men and women according to a society's cultural view of the sexes. These functions are exemplified in the society's stereotypes (Wood & Eagly, 2010).

Gender stereotype. The categorization and expectation of attitudes and behaviors according to maleness (agency) and femaleness (communion). Stereotypes exist at both implicit and explicit levels (Steinberg & Diekmann, 2016).

Glass ceiling. A metaphor used to describe the invisible barriers women encounter to achieve promotions to elevated positions of responsibility.

Glass cliff. A metaphor used to describe situations when women are more likely to be appointed to an elevated position when an organization is in distress.

Glass escalator. A metaphor used to describe a situation when men enjoy better upward mobility over women in traditionally female-dominated industries like education. This phenomenon is also known as the “glass elevator.”

Internal barriers. Intrinsic factors that affect women which impede their ability to attain promotions to positions of increased responsibility.

Male gender dissonance. The conscious or subconscious incongruity that men may feel when interacting with women in the workplace (Ryder and Briles, 2003).

Mentor. An individual who educates a less experienced person in an organization about organizational business.

President. Chief administrator at a community college who oversees day-to-day operations at a school and ensures compliance with policies and procedures set forth by the Board of Trustees.

Sex. The biological assignment of XX and XY chromosomes, gonads, reproductive organs and external genitalia to an individual (American Psychological Association, 2011).

Sponsor. An individual, generally higher ranking, who assists a junior employee gain exposure to senior levels of management to facilitate networking and assist in promotions.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to California community college CEOs and those promoted to the CEO position. Only CEOs who: (1) had a minimum of two years' experience as a senior community college administrator – vice president or higher, (2) were knowledgeable of women's issues in community college leadership; (3) exhibited strong verbal and non-verbal communication skills, and (4) were recognized throughout the community college arena for their continued support to mentor female community college educators were asked to participate in this study. To satisfy these delimiters, the researcher employed snowball sampling and reputational cases provided by two subject matter experts who each possess more than a decade of experience working in the community college environment. Finally, owing to these restrictions, findings from this study were only generalizable to this specific population.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters with accompanying references and appendices. Chapter I provided an overview of gender, leadership, and barriers to advancement. The chapter also detailed the problem, the purpose of the study and the research questions. Chapter II provided an in-depth analysis of literature surrounding the study's central purpose. The evaluation of relevant theories and studies on gender, leadership, and barriers to advancement laid the framework for coming chapters. Chapter III detailed the methodology and design. The chapter outlined who participated, which

method was used, how data was collected, the worthiness of the collection instrument, the expert panel, limitations the study encountered, then finally data evaluation and analysis. Chapter IV analyzed and discussed results from data collection. Chapter V provided a synopsis of the findings and suggested conclusions based on the data. Limitations were addressed as well as recommendations for future study.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Where chapter I provided a background for the study, chapter II imparts a more thorough explanation of the study's topic through the execution of an intensive literature review. A breakdown of the chapter offers a detailed, systematic dissection of the elements that compose the purpose statement and research questions included in chapter I. The elements include a detailing of the study's underlying theories, gender differences in leadership and communication with a crescendo discussing the challenges resulting from the aforementioned items. The minutia of these challenges focuses on role confusion, communication differences, cultural differences and women's power. The goal of this literature review is to impart perspicuity of this complex topic, which, layered like a personality, must be peeled to its core to be understood. The chapter finishes with a compare/contrast with the original study, then a summary that unifies all the disparate parts.

Background

Despite forward progress over the years, women still face challenges advancing in the workplace. Society, it seems, still has its ideas of what defines females and males and the roles they serve. With roots in the 20th century, these concepts, anachronistic some would say, impede the cause for gender equality (Bales, 1950; Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch, 1972; Eagly, 1987). These ideas continue to hold sway over the treatment of the genders in the work environment. As a result of these ideas, barriers have arisen over time that hinder female promotions (Gheaus, 2015; Gill & Jones, 2013; Knight, 2014; Musil, 2011). Categorized as two types of barriers, internal barriers arise from personal doubt. It is woman's perception of herself and possibly how she interacts with her

environment interacts that causes issue. External barriers are those behaviors in an organization that are discriminatory in nature that hinder a woman's ability to evolve as a productive member of the team. Her reaction to these barriers may cause dissonance to occur in the workplace.

Theory

There is no lack of theoretical intuitions that address the idea at hand. Each provides its own slant first describing, then expanding upon, and finally enriching aspects that may better explain how gender dissonance occurs in the workplace. The five theories detailed below discuss interactions between women and men, perception of behaviors and their impact, and interaction outcomes.

Expectation States Theory

The eldest of the theories covered in this study, the expectation states theory provides a solid foundation for future socio-gender theories that follow. The theory discusses the establishment of status hierarchies (Bales, 1950) within a group, or "systems of human interaction" (Bales, 1950, p. 257) attempting to achieve a common goal (Correll & Ridgeway, 2003). Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch (1972) detail the outcomes, some describe as inequalities (Ridgeway, 2001), that spring from these hierarchies:

1. Individuals either give or do not give action opportunities to others, as when one individual asks another for an opinion. In this instance, on a mixed-gender team, a male team member may pass over female team members for input.
2. Given an action opportunity, individuals either do or do not contribute a performance output to the interaction of the group. In this instance, on a

mixed-gender team, a male team member may decide to withhold information from the group that would better a project's outcome.

3. Given a performance output, others evaluate it, positively or negatively; in evaluating it they either communicate a reward action to another or they do not. In this instance, on a mixed-gender team, male team members may more positively evaluate and reward other male team members for project input, while female team members are critiqued more closely and denigrated for their results.
4. In exchanging views about the task, sometimes one individual is influenced by another, that is, changes stance after differing in opinion with another. In this instance, on a mixed-gender team, team members may change to identify with a male team member because he is more forceful in his speech and sounds more confident. (Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch, 1972, p. 242)

Hierarchies are established by groups' use of status characteristics. The following characteristics are abilities a group may assume a member possesses whether pertinent to the group's goals; status characteristics, or general expectations of a member based on that individual's persona; diffuse status characteristics (Berger & Fisek, 1974). Gender falls into the latter category as general assumptions are made about men and women in the workplace; that men are seen as assertive and dominant while women are seen as empathetic and hesitant (Eagly, 1987).

The theory also posits, like social role theory (Eagly, 1987), that, in a group setting, men enjoy status, influence, and competence over women absent any defining characteristic that would overtly communicate success when working together in small

groups (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972). The theory reinforces social stereotypes outlining not only how gender roles are, but also how they should be; men are expected to be the dominator and women the dominated. Thomas-Hunt and Phillips (2004) write about this expectation claiming that female leaders, despite having expert power, were not only less influential than males, but also their expertise was considered a detriment; that the group perceived them as less knowledgeable.

These assertions hurt women's chances for a level playing field in workplace leadership. Snap judgments based upon these diffuse status characteristics undermines the authority of the female leader's position. These types of occurrences can impact not just present projects on which the leader is working, but also future interactions with the female leader.

Social Role Theory

The origins of role theory date back to the 1920's with American philosopher, George Herbert Mead advancing the idea that, foremost, individuals are perceived as merely things to other individuals. Based on these observations, individuals label themselves. By this labeling, human beings classify themselves into categories (Gillespie, 2006).

Advancing this viewpoint, Alice Eagly further refined Mead's assertions detailing a social role aspect through a social role theory (SRT). In this model, Eagly (1987) discussed the differences between women and men not just from a societal viewpoint; of how men and women are expected to behave in a social context that essentially defined masculinity and femininity, but most notably in the division of labor between the sexes; stereotypes used to identify and categorize people. Eagly (1987) went further stating that

it was the evolution of society's norms that produced these stereotypes not some cultural happenstance.

Eagly (1987) went on to describe these stereotypes into behaviors of agency and communality; terms that would resonate over not just a social setting, but would also enter into leadership and communication styles. Behaviors of agency, Eagly (1987) said, were those that showed ambition, assertiveness, dominance, and logic. These behaviors were classified as masculine and therefore identified a man. Behaviors of communality were those that showed empathy, kindness, tact and emotion. These behaviors were classified as feminine and therefore identified a woman. Thus exemplifying the concept of a woman's place is in the home while the man works to provide. For women to pursue any other avenue than to stay at home risked scandal (Gardner, 2015).

While these labels help classify groups and the people who populate them (Eagly 1983), some argue that these stereotypes can fail to accurately define individuals and misrepresent their beings; as Kierkegaard said, "Once you label me, you negate me." As these labels were put into practice in the past, the seemingly agentic men worked and gained in power and prestige in varying fields of industry while the communal women were left to carry out housework or the menial administrative jobs (Gardner, 2015) one could find with little prospect of achieving a higher rank (Baker, 2014; Coder & Spiller, 2013; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Meacham, 2014).

Equality has improved in the 21st century between the genders though the stereotypes remain though more and more of these society-imposed monikers have been challenged especially within the leadership context (Pew Research, 2015). Eagly (2007) and Eagly and Carli (2003) demonstrated that female leaders were more highly rated than

their male counterparts in leadership qualities (Baker, 2014; Coder & Spiller, 2013; Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie & Reichard, 2008), though their leadership styles, still seen as communal, constrained them in occupying high level positions in corporations. Women who dared to exhibit agentic qualities to emulate male behavior in order to advance in the workplace risked isolation by way of role incongruity.

Role Congruity Theory

As social role theory (SRT) discusses society's view of sex differences and the subsequent classification of their inequalities, the role congruity theory (RCT), a grandchild of sorts of SRT, takes the discussion further. RCT not only discusses violation of those traditional social norms, but it also brings to light the possible fallout the perpetrator may face due to those violations. Oddly, existing research has been mostly focused on women violators as men who violate are sometimes seen, in the end, as beneficiaries of the *glass escalator* phenomenon which will be discussed in detail in later sections of this study.

Introducing the world to their idea, Eagly and Karau (2002) postulate that when the actions of an individual do not meet the social or gender expectations of others, incongruity occurs; i.e. the violation. When these actions transpire, prejudice against the individual is likely to ensue; i.e. the fallout. Essentially, the violation, or incongruity, is the result of one sex taking on the role characteristics of the other sex causing confusion and discomfort within a community of people. In leadership, this prejudice occurs when females display masculine leadership attributes like dominance, ambition, and objectivity (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005) attributes that are considered necessary to be an effective leader (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Prejudice against female leaders is common because they may not display those characteristics that society or their organizations has deemed appropriate for their gender roles like empathy, pity, and kindness (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

When female leaders are incongruent in their behavior and opt for the male leadership attributes like risk-taking and assertiveness, they put themselves at risk of upsetting the social structure and norms of their organizations causing them hardship in the form of lesser assignments, poor evaluations and less support (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

Expectation Violations Theory

Burgoon and Hale (1988) describe a communication phenomenon called expectancy violation. Burgoon and Walther (1990) characterize expectations as “cognitions about the anticipated communication behavior of specific others” (p. 236). They posit that when a speaker violates the expectations of an audience, the violation can be received positively or negatively. The stronger the violation is to the audience, the stronger the opinion the audience may have about the speaker and the behavior (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon, 1993). Violations invite uncertainty (Afifi & Burgoon, 2000).

Audience expectations are the backbone of this theory; expectations that may rely on societal norms to inform them. Though no formal study has been found that link this theory with others, it provides clarity to two theories included in this study: expectation states and role congruity. One can surmise that if societal norms and subsequent gender roles were evident in the workplace, expectancy violations would occur. Female leaders need to lead the same as their male counter-parts.

Regarding expectation states, diffuse status characteristics, such as gender, are used to subordinate group members. When females communicate information within the group that is imparted in an unexpected way, a violation occurs. Evidence of this is seen in Thomas-Hart and Phillips's (2004) earlier example of a female who shares her expertise only to see her knowledge rebuffed and her credibility questioned; a specialist considered non compos mentis because of her gender.

This theory has especially far-reaching implications in the role congruity theory. Since communication is often viewed as possessing agentic and communal characteristics (Smith & Huntoon, 2014), females engaging in agentic behavior incongruent with their communal gender role while communicating, that is they take on male attributes, stand to violate the expectations of their audience (Burgoon & Hale, 1988, Burgoon, 1993). In doing so, they may encounter a hostile work environment (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Carli, 2003), suffer retribution from seniors, peers, or subordinates (Smith & Huntoon, 2014), or fall victim to career-altering events (Rudman & Glick, 1999). This puts females in a "double bind" (Eagly & Carli, 2000). Failure to boast of their accomplishments puts females at a disadvantage for promotion as they will not be able to adequately convey their job experience. If females do boast, they are seen as braggarts who violate gender norms and cause discomfort in the workplace (Bowles & Babcock, 2012).

Gender Role Strain

Joseph Pleck theorized in 1981 and further refined in 1995, the idea of a masculine ideology called the gender role strain paradigm. The paradigm discusses masculinity, its relation to gender roles and the level of strain men may feel when addressing gender roles

(Pleck, 1995). In his treatise, Pleck outlined three types of strain, men may experience that may provide insight into their behavior toward females especially in the workplace. This strain along with traditional gender roles has been connected to inimical feelings toward females and their equal treatment (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Robinson & Schwartz, 2004; Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2001). The three categories of strain are discrepancy, trauma, and dysfunction (Pleck, 1995).

Discrepancy strain. This first classification of strain is similar to role congruity. It depends on social roles and their contravention. Pleck (1995) provides this explanation about this type of strain:

A significant proportion of males exhibit long-term failure to fulfill male role expectations. The resulting disjuncture between these expectations and these males' characteristics leads to low self-esteem and other negative psychological consequences. (p. 12)

Levant (2011) sums up stating that this strain is what occurs when the agentic male fails to satisfy his idea of what composes the ideal man. This ideal is typically in line of what society describes as a masculine individual. Liu, Rochlan and Mohr (2005) verify this in their study showing that "some men may still envision themselves...to retain some socialized masculine roles and ideals..." (p. 139)

An example of discrepancy strain in the workplace may involve a male working on a project led by a female colleague. The male may feel anger, anxiety or depression when he meets with his supervisor to express his displeasure that the project on which he is working should have been his to lead not his female colleague. Additionally he feels

he has not lived up to the stereotypical male gender role by feeling weak for having to seek out his supervisor to discuss a work project.

Dysfunction strain. The second classification of strain shows that even the fulfillment of gender roles can have unexpected results. Pleck (1995) provides, “the successful fulfillment of male role expectations can have negative consequences because many of the characteristics viewed as desirable or acceptable in men have inherent negative side effects, either for males themselves or for others” (p. 139).

Males experiencing dysfunction disregard convention and “act out.” A result of this behavior is a lack of consideration for females or female equality (Levant, 2011) causing a hostile work environment. Levant also detailed even more severe behaviors that men may exhibit like sexual harassment or sexual assault of a co-worker as a result of this dysfunction.

An example of dysfunctional strain in the workplace may involve the same male employee led by his female colleague. During team meetings, the male may become withdrawn and provide no productive input or may become combative with the leader and openly attack her. He is miserable and makes others miserable. Even though he carries those feelings of anger and anxiety, he feels men just “grin and bear it.” In the meantime, the project team’s work environment becomes toxic causing in-fighting and ill-will.

Trauma strain. The third classification of strain is more severe and more far-reaching. Pleck (1995) provides that, “If male role expectations are successfully fulfilled, the socialization process leading to this fulfillment is traumatic, or the fulfillment itself is traumatic, with long-term side effects” (p. 139). This type of strain may be a result of

having a difficult experience with a gender role issue (Levant, 2011). Levant (2011) identifies *alexithymia*, defined as without words for emotion, as a possible outcome of this experience. These types of experiences may have devastating effects on team building within mixed-gender teams as males may have difficulty expressing themselves.

An example of trauma strain in the workplace is from the same male employee. The male may come from a traditional family that teaches traditional gender roles; men are head of the household while women care for the house. In his family, to contravene these ideals risked familial ridicule at best or sanction at worst. Manifesting those lessons later in life in the workplace, on his team project, shows he may suffer from trauma.

Comparison of Brain Composition and Function

The human brain...an organ of vast power and mystery, it is the command center of the human body charged to execute a legion of tasks to ensure its host remains a part of this world. Memory, thought, autonomic functions like breathing, the brain deftly handles all of these processes and more. A conundrum, though, is whether the brains of females and males operate in the same fashion or do they differ.

Much research has been conducted to determine the cognitive neurological differences between men and women like memory, emotion, and thought (Annis, 2010) to predict their behaviors when they interact. Only within the last 20 years have scientists put forth effort to gauge differences that are measured from a physiological stand point. They are “looking at” the brain while females and males undergo experiments and begin to understand gender differences from a new standpoint.

Gurian and Annis (2008) explore how brain function differs between the sexes. After examining empirical evidence about brain physiology and function in men and women, results suggest there is a direct relation to not only why genders act a particular way, but also how the genders may interact in the workplace (Annis & Merron, 2014; Gurian & Annis, 2008). Before plumbing the depths of the brain, a quick review of those agentic and communal behaviors detailed earlier in the study is necessary. Eagly (1987) outlined behaviors of agency to include aggression, assertiveness, dominance, logic, and objectivity. Aggression, it seems, can be associated with the decreased size of the right anterior cingulate cortex (Kret, 2011), a part of the brain that processes emotion. Behaviors of communality included empathy, kindness, tact, emotion, and subjectivity (Eagly, 1987).

Females generally enjoy a superior memory to males as they take in more information of the activities taking place around them, while males take in details that are necessary (Gurian & Annis, 2008). Tang, Eaves, Ng, Carpenter, Mai, Schroeder, Condon, Colom, and Haier (2010) support this idea, noting in their study on intelligence and brain function, that females were the only reason any significance was realized for the study's memory factor. Tang et al. (2010) continued stating their results provide "additional support for the notion that females rely on both hemispheres and benefit from better hemispheric connections" (p. 301). Ability to recall affects how females make decisions which, in turn, may cause dissonance in the workplace as some believe, or mistake, that taking the time to think and connect pertinent events as an inability to make a decision (Rhee & Sigler, 2015).

Women make decisions differently than men (Fumagalli, Ferruci, Mameli, Marceglia, Mrakic-Sposta, Zago, Lucchiari, Consonni, Nordio, Pravettoni, Cappa, Priori, 2010; Gill & Jones, 2013; Tannen, 1995). An illustration of these differences is examined in mapping blood flow not only within the brain, but within particular regions in the brain. This brain activity shows that there is a greater reliance on blood flow in the female brain in order to feed the “verbal-emotive” centers in both hemispheres, while necessary only in the right hemisphere of the male brain (Annis, 2010). Gurian and Annis (2008) posit that these biological differences help account for how females and males differ in their leadership styles as females talk, feel, relate, and socialize while males focus to accomplish a task expeditiously (Liu, Zubieta, & Heitzig, 2011); two styles which are necessary in the workplace. Gurian and Annis (2008) also convey that

In the female brain, more neural activity occurs in the parts that think in and create words and in the parts that connect those words to memories, emotions, and sensory cues; in the male brain, more neural activity occurs in the parts that use physical and kinesthetic intelligence, as well as spatial mechanics and abstraction. (p. 27)

Further evidence of the complementary relationship of the female-male brain comparison, Ingallhalikar, Smith, Parker, Satterthwaite, Elliott, Ruparel, Hakonarson, Gur, Gur and Verma (2013) confirm Gurian’s and Annis’s assertions calling the findings of Ingallhalikar et al “unique sex differences in brain activity” (p. 823) showing that the supertentorial region that contains the cerebrum, the largest part of the brain, is inter-hemispherically connected in females while intra-hemispherically in males. This region of the brain is responsible for “movement, sensory processing and higher functions such

as the senses, memory, reasoning, intelligence and moral sense” (Arnould-Taylor, 1998, p. 52) as well as language, learning and communication (Annis & Merron, 2014).

Knowing this information helps to enlighten that females, with a global view, and males, with a detail-oriented view, do well to work together to address short order projects as well as those that require long-term strategy.

Leadership

When trying to define leadership, an Internet search provided 204 million results when asked to explain the term. Given that number, it can be said that approximately 2/3 of Americans, 318.9 million people, have a definition for leadership. The number of Internet search hits shows how truly complex leadership has become. With this deluge of definitions and advice to leaders, the individual goes forth to assume responsibility of an entire organization. To be successful, the leader requires resiliency and other “optimal” qualities.

Eagly and Carli (2003) outline these leadership “credentials” as dominance, aggression, and ambition; those qualities that compose the male gender stereotype (Eagly & Karau, 2002) as observed by society. If females attempt to emulate these credentials, they violate role congruity. Research (Eagly, 2005; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006) corroborates these violations. Partly because of these violations and the resulting environment they create in the workplace, many female leaders lag behind in promotions to the highest levels in most industries despite any advances achieved in recent history (Furst & Reeves, 2008).

Problems Women in Face in Leadership Today

Eagly (2005) provides an explanation about the advancement problem facing women today stating, “In relation to most high-level leadership roles, women have outsider status because few women have attained these roles” (p.463). Since few women occupy these high-level positions, as a group, they may be viewed as undeserving or worse still, unworthy to lead. This viewpoint makes achieving promotions for future female leaders all the more difficult. As a result, female leaders continue to find themselves mired in iniquity in a workplace (Catalyst, 2014; Pew Research, 2015) that overtly or covertly disapproves of their presence (Smith, Caputi, & Crittenden, 2012). This disapproval persists despite females comprising more than half of the U.S. population, approximately half of the total labor force and more than half of management and professional positions (Catalyst, 2016a).

Females are not at a loss for education. For the last five years, females have out earned males in not only undergraduate degrees, but also graduate level (ed.gov, 2014). There is an education many females lack; the kind of informal knowledge one gains about an organization through having a guide; a mentor or a sponsor to serve as sage and promoter, to develop a leader and to trumpet her merits. This problem is not seen as a minor annoyance, but as a barrier that impedes women’s progress toward upward mobility (Grove & Montgomery, 2000).

Mentors. Having a mentor is vital element that helps contribute to a leader’s success, and for women, to help negotiate an organization to help avoid barriers. This success, however, hinges on the mentor’s organizational access (Ibarra, Carter, & Silva,

2010). If the mentor is too low in the organizational hierarchy, any knowledge passed to the female leader may not be enough to help with career progression.

Males, it seems, have an easier time acquiring a mentor at the right organizational level to promote career progression. Annis and Gray (2013) mention the reason for this is men feel better around other men; that they know what to expect. For a male mentor-mentee relationship, it is a kind of “re-living the glory days” for the mentor passing on his wisdom to a younger man. This father-son dynamic changes when a male mentors a female. With fewer female leaders available to serve as mentor, to include in the community college domain (Gill & Jones, 2013), males fear the perception of mentoring a female. It is the thought of impropriety, of saying the wrong thing, of offending the mentee with no intention to do so that gives pause for males to take up the mantle. For a male mentor to engage in this relationship takes courage to stand up to the prevailing male gender workplace ideal.

Research (Gill & Jones, 2013; Growe & Montgomery, 2000) suggests that many females take what they can get for a mentor, though all mention that a female is preferred. A female mentor-mentee relationship can provide a familiarity and a perspective that a mixed gender relationship could not. The possibility of entering this relationship has three-fold benefit: the mentor has the opportunity to pass on wisdom to the next generation feeling as though the mentor’s legacy is assured, the mentee is the beneficiary of a wealth of knowledge that will help ensure success in the workplace, the organization will have continuity in knowledge, that should one leader choose to leave, the mentee can fill the void with competence and confidence.

Sponsors. Sponsorship does more than mentorship. Acquiring a sponsor ensures access for the sponsored to an organization's network or category of influential individuals. This type of access has the ability to cast aside some of the barriers female face for advancement (Foust-Cummings, Dinolfo, & Kohler, 2011). Some female CEOs stated they would not have achieved as much as they had without the help of a sponsor (Hewlett, Marshall, & Sherbin, 2011).

As well, sponsorship is a growth opportunity for both involved parties that focuses not just on the health of a person's career, but also on the sponsor (Foust-Cummings, Dinolfo, & Kohler, 2011). A relationship based on trust and loyalty (Hewlett, 2013), sponsorship is described as a high-stakes interaction that requires spending of political capital of the sponsor while the individual being sponsored has to live up to the sponsor's rhetoric. Little research to date has been done to determine an effect on female leaders at community colleges.

Leadership differences. The essence of what is female and what is male must be defined to facilitate delineating leadership differences between females and males. According to the American Psychological Association (APA), femaleness and maleness are outlined into sex and gender which make up physiological and psychological identity. The APA defines sex as "assigned at birth and is associated primarily with physical attributes such as chromosomes, hormone prevalence, and external and internal anatomy" (American Psychological Association, 2011b, para. 1 & 2). Gender, based on the ideas of Wood and Eagly (2015), is defined as "people's understanding of themselves in terms of cultural definitions of female and male" (p. 461). The APA adds that gender is "socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities and attributes that a given society

considers appropriate for boys and girls” (American Psychological Association, 2011a, para. 2). As culture defines femaleness and maleness (Wood & Eagly, 2015), a picture emerges as to what gender roles fit each member of the dyad. Society views men as possessing those agentic qualities that show him as strong, confident, aggressive and assertive compared to women who are viewed as doting, compassionate, kind, and empathetic (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000).

Studies (Burke & Collins, 2001; Furst & Reeves, 2008) convey that leadership styles between the sexes are viewed as vastly different and incongruous. This difference is a challenge women face in leadership since society, and the business world, use male agentic qualities as standard operating procedure to measure leaders (Furst & Reeves, 2008; Gurian & Annis, 2008). Society views women leaders as relationship builders (Annis & Merron, 2014; Gill & Jones, 2013; Sandberg, 2013), collaborative (Sandberg, 2013), emotional (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Sandberg, 2013) and authentic (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). Male leaders are viewed as dominant, aggressive and result-oriented; characteristics more favored for leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2003). These differences can be seen in Table 1 of Annis and Gray’s *Value Spectrum*:

Table 1

Value Spectrum

Leadership attributes	Women’s inclination	Men’s Inclination
Improve vs. Maintain	“Anything can be improved and made to work better”	“If it’s not broken, don’t fix it”

(continued)

Leadership attributes	Women's inclination	Men's Inclination
Together vs. Independently	"I come up with more ideas when I'm working with others"	"I come up with my best ideas when I can concentrate alone"
Journey vs. results	"Our efforts together matter as much as our results"	"Winning matters most"
Sharing vs. declaring	"Everyone should contribute to the decision"	"A leader leads. I'm expected to make decisions"

(Annis & Gray, 2013, p. 212)

Lately, though, some progress toward equity has been reported. This news conveys that society, grudgingly, has begun to accept that there is a place for both methods of leadership with some organizations capitalizing on each style's strengths (Nielsen, 2014).

Lack of access. Female leaders complain that a lack of access to informal networks impedes their ability to lead effectively. Maranto and Griffin (2011) claim that lack of access may be caused by uneasiness in socialization. The authors convey that because there are fewer female contemporaries to befriend at senior levels and females may feel uncomfortable with forming ties with males, females run the risk of being excluded from informal networks.

R. Grogan, a veteran with about a decade of experience in the California community college domain, intimated in conversation that many times business between community college CEOs takes place in the good old boys club (personal communication, September 5, 2015). Annis and Gray (2013) back this assertion stating that these informal networks are usually by men, for men. R. Grogan continued confirming that locations are typically male-oriented like a golf course or a particular

establishment (personal communication, September 5, 2015). She said that it was not uncommon for female CEOs to ask to be included but be given the incorrect time or location of an event. When males were questioned about false information, males reply with disbelief saying that they did not think the female CEO really wanted to be there. It is the exclusion from these networks that leads to a lack of information that may ultimately lead to an impediment for the female to advance to higher levels.

Barriers to Advancement

It is common for women to encounter barriers to when they attempt to advance in rank (Furst & Reeves, 2008; Johns, 2013). These barriers represent factors that hold back female leaders from promotion whether self-inflicted (Sandberg, 2013) or organizational (Festing, Knappert, & Kornau, 2013). Barriers are categorized as internal, those in the mind of the individual female, and external, those factors outside of the person. Chin (2012) educates citing female self-image as an example of an internal barrier while Oakley (2000) lists gender stereotypes as one of many external barrier examples that compose a cavalcade of gender inequity challenges women face in the workplace. While females encounter barriers to promotion, they also face these challenges in their leadership roles (Coder & Spiller, 2013; Furst & Reeves, 2008).

Internal Barriers

Internal barriers are those that take place at the micro-level; within the mind and body of the individual. They plague the minds of female leaders. Sandberg (2013) characterizes these challenges as a jeremiad of personal insecurities. These insecurities, like lack of self-esteem, lack of confidence, self-doubt, could be viewed as terrible drawbacks of females' ability to take time to ruminate on an issue. An example Sandberg

(2013) provides is the announcement of a new position. She mentions that, within minutes, males are lined up outside her door to showcase their abilities. When talking to females later, a common theme of self-doubt and lack of confidence emerges.

Expecting fairness, a kind of noblesse oblige thought about leadership, may be the standout challenge. The “double-bind” personifies this as the female is in a no-win situation (Jamieson, 1995; Oakley, 2000). If the individual acts in an agentic manner, personifying the attributes of a male leader, she will be seen as acting out the wrong gender role and possibly ostracized by her leadership. If she follows the traditional norms of her gender role, then her leadership may view her as weak and incompetent.

Chesler (2002) describes females as socially-minded individuals from their youth almost akin to a possessing a pack mentality. They concern themselves about others within a social group as well as themselves. For females to be on the outside of the group is disastrous (Chesler, 2002). Seidel, Silani, Metzler, Thaler, Lamm, Gur, Kryspin-Exner, Habel, and Derntl (2013) go so far as to say that “social exclusion represents an extremely aversive and threatening situation in daily life” (p. 2926) with females being particularly vulnerable (Benenson, Markovits, Thompson, & Wrangham, 2011).

Additional internal barriers that are causes of concern for female leaders are workplace dynamics with both male and female colleagues like status in the workplace and social expectations (Ryder & Briles, 2003). Particularly vexing are female-female relationships. Briles (2000) states that women are far more likely to sabotage other women in the workplace than they are men, likely out of fear because they feel their livelihoods are being threatened. Though female workplace relationships are worth mentioning, it is certainly a topic for a different study.

External Barriers

These types of barriers are on the macro-level. They constitute the dangers, types of discrimination (Williams, 1992) females face coming from society, an institution, or the workforce that limit upward mobility (Jones & Palmer, 2011). These barriers spring from “having” and “not having”; qualities which will be discussed in the following text.

Glass ceiling. Recently, the United States Democratic Party chose as its candidate the first-ever female as nominee to run for President of the United States. CBS News captured Democratic presidential candidate, Hillary Clinton, in her acceptance speech stating

I can't believe we just put the biggest crack in that glass ceiling yet, thanks to you and to everyone who's fought so hard to make this possible; this is really your victory, this is really your night...and if there are any little girls out there who stayed up late to watch, let me just say I may become the first woman President, but one of you is next! CBS News – YouTube, “Hillary Clinton appears in video at DNC,” (2016).

Upon her nomination, many national pundits said the final glass ceiling had been shattered. Some academics think that the metaphor is no longer useful as females have reached the upper echelons of leadership in both the public and private sectors (Smith, Caputi, & Crittenden, 2012). While certainly a seismic victory for females in a previously unconquered realm, empirical and anecdotal evidence suggests the contrary when looking at society at large (Konrath, Au, & Ramsey, 2012; Latu, Mast, Lammers, & Bombari, 2013; Wienclaw, 2015). The evidence states the glass ceiling remains firmly in

place (Festing, Knappert, Kornau, 2013; Gill & Jones, 2013; Pew Research, 2015; Vinkenbergh, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011).

A structure held in place in many institutions world-wide, the ceiling consists of four categories: societal, governmental, internal business, and business structural (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). These concepts represent barriers not only to advancement for female leaders (Festing, Knappert, Kornau, 2013; Gill & Jones, 2013), but also pay disparity and lack of opportunity.

Societally, the ceiling consists of gender stereotypes and unreasonable expectations (Pew Research, 2015; Vinkenbergh, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011) for those subjected to it. Harken back to role congruity, women use the words, worried, concerned, and apprehensive (Jones & Palmer, 2011) when describing their feelings to aspire to higher levels of leadership. They feel those aspirations will cast them in a negative light; that having ambition, a non-communal attribute, is negative.

Governmentally, the ceiling originates in a lack of transparency and administrative ambivalence. The Glass Ceiling Commission (1995) conveyed that the government did not claim its share of the responsibility and serve as an example to make any lasting change. Rather, it ferreted out some of its component agencies as violators and claimed progress. Nowhere is this more evident than in the military.

Organizationally, the structure under the glass ceiling contains and maintains organizational infrastructure and cultural hurdles (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011) for female leaders like lead to lack of promotions based on company policies or the inability to procure mentors or sponsors (Johns, 2013; Powell, 2011; Vecchio, 2002).

Glass cliff. Hunt-Earle (2012) states that the glass cliff is a result of the glass ceiling. The glass cliff phenomenon is the breaking of the glass ceiling of sorts though not in the best circumstances. According to Haslam and Ryan (2005, 2008), the glass cliff occurs when an individual, typically a female, either accepts or is appointed the leader of an entity when the entity teeters on the brink of failure. The authors go on to say that not only are females put in difficult, stressful situations, but they will likely take any blame for failure rather than looking at the context of the entity's failing situation. Either the leader succeeds or falls off the cliff. Some females claim they will not turn down any leadership position fearing any kind of future reprisal for not taking the position (Cook & Glass, 2013).

This phenomenon has led to the idea of a companion concept to Schein's (1973, 1975) "Think Manager, Think Male" paradigm that may benefit females. Ryan, Haslam, Hersby, and Bongiorno (2011) suggest the "think female, think crisis" paradigm. They posit that organizations may find female leadership attributes more effective when faced with a crisis. While this may be true, it must be mentioned that medical professionals have studied extensively the effects of stress on the health and welfare of women leaders. Any individual who may bounce from one high stress situation to another risks health problems that may have disastrous consequences.

Glass escalator. A companion to the glass ceiling and the glass cliff, the glass escalator metaphor is another barrier that puts females at a disadvantage in ascending to higher echelons within an organization. Williams (1992) defines the escalator as when men who seek and find employment in fields previously dominated by females, like education and nursing, achieve promotions at a faster rate than women co-workers and

are provided with better opportunities. Though a risk to upset an organization's work dynamic, the decision to favor the male for his perceived agentic qualities seems to outweigh any internal strife.

In this situation, being a token employee can be beneficial to an individual. A token male in a female-dominated organization can be put on a fast-track for promotion and development opportunities to gain more money and power. There are drawbacks. Williams (1992) outlines situations where males fall victim to male stereotypes in some situations. They are asked to lift heavy items, do "undesirable" tasks, or in a classroom environment, deal with problem children.

Females in community colleges are at risk for this to occur. As of 2003 in California, female faculty outnumbered male members with the gap widening each year until present. As of 2006, females dominated the numbers as educational administrators. The latest statistics from the state of California show that females were in the majority of every employee category: 53% adjunct, 54% tenure/tenure track, and 53% educational administrators. When it came to the top position, however, only 42% of community college CEOs were female (CCCCO.edu, 2015).

Gender Roles and Stereotypes Affecting Female Leaders

As gender roles were discussed in preceding theories as those characteristics that identify one as male or female based on society's viewpoint, gender stereotypes provide a convenient way to categorize people based on perceived differences. Eagly and Karau (2002) declare that the construction of gender roles and stereotypes helps to conveniently classify people into groups. According to Hofstede (1998) and more recently Nielsen (2014), society defines gender. In doing so, society determines gender roles and the

accompanying stereotypes (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Johnson, 1990) like the assertiveness, aggression and dominance of males and the nurturing, sympathetic, and collaborative qualities of females (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Since society prefers the male approach, therefore men's values define the workplace. This same system of gender roles and stereotypes exists within the community college (R. Grogan, & E. Ramones, personal communication, January 17, 2016).

Annis and Gray (2013) add a sobering point conveying that neither males nor females have done enough to set aside these negative denotations stating that anxiety and confusion cloud the issue. The authors state that,

Gender roles have changed dramatically since the 1960s, adding more confusion to our expectations of each other with every succeeding decade. It actually hasn't been business as usual for 50 years. Yet, men and women haven't really learned anything about each other in all this time and are still confused about what makes the other gender tick. What we have failed to see is that we are not the same and that we remain gender ignorant when we force sameness on each other and expect sameness in return. (p. 49)

As these stereotypes provide a convenient way to classify people in benign ways, some classifications are more nefarious. According to Gill and Jones (2013), female leaders still have to confront stereotypes to ascend to higher leadership levels. Ballenger (2010) goes further stating women's work in higher education is considered second-rate and undervalued with some female leaders feeling their commitment and competence are called into question (Annis & Gray, 2013). Some community college female presidents

have complained about the patriarchal system in which they work (Gill & Jones, 2013). A female leader echoes the complaint detailing an encounter with blatant discrimination with a male leader who stated, “(I) couldn’t envision a woman as a dean and that is plain and simple” (Campbell, Mueller & Souza, 2010, p. 27). Coder and Spiller (2013) advance the idea that though thoughts on gender roles are changing in the workplace, instructional materials presented within the leadership education domain that discuss gender roles may not reflect these changes. The authors clarify that information presented in these materials is based on research instruments developed almost 50 years ago. They contend that without updated instruments, students may be mis-informed on what qualities good leader needs in today’s environment.

Gender Dissonance

In 1957, Leon Festinger published his theory on cognitive dissonance. In his theory he educates stating,

The terms ‘dissonance’ and ‘consonance’ refer to relations which exist between pairs of ‘elements’...these elements refer to what has been called cognition, that is, the things a person knows about himself, about his behavior, and about his surroundings...elements of cognition correspond for the most part with what the person actually does or feels or with what actually exists in the environment. (pp. 9, 11)

Festinger (1957) goes further into detail stating that dissonance occurs when two realities are not in alignment. Even more interesting, he continues conveying that all other details surrounding the two dissonant realities will become irrelevant until the two

dissonant realities are brought into alignment. Until there is reconciliation, there will be disharmony and discomfort.

Gender dissonance seems to be a natural extension of the cognitive dissonance theory. According to Ryder and Briles (2003), gender dissonance is the “subconscious discomfort, uneasiness or anger that men may feel when they work or interact with women” (p. 29). Nowadays, the workplace largely seems to be painted as antiquated in mindset moving at a snail’s pace toward gender equality. As illustrated earlier in this review, females and males are wholly different from the way they think, to the way they lead, to the way they communicate. The occurrence of gender dissonance in the workplace is not surprising.

Rosner (1995) outlines three problem areas that may lead to gender dissonance: how men perceive females co-workers, how men and females communicate, and how men and females interact in the workplace. Ryder (1998) introduced a fourth problem area; how men perceive females manage themselves in the workplace. Due to a lack of studies specifically targeting gender dissonance, anecdotes from journal studies were used to populate the four problem areas: role confusion, communication differences, cultural differences, and women’s personal power. The following entries provide insight into each phenomenon as well as serve as the conceptual framework that guides data collection for one-on-one interviews as interview questions are fashioned according to these content areas. Figures are provided for each conceptual area for ease of reference.

Role Confusion

With the attempted shift to the center to encompass male and female leadership styles in the workplace, males are often confounded by what they encounter. They

witness differing leadership styles, experience the need for behavioral changes, and reflect on who they are and who they need to become to comply with organizational standards. With these stimuli, it is reasonable to expect that discontent and discomfort are likely to occur.

In general, men do not know how to act around women which is certain to cause dissonance in the workplace. Many men harken back to their socially engineered behaviors as a guide to engage the opposite sex; behaviors that may be decades out of vogue, but nonetheless, are ingrained as canon. When past meets the present, men find themselves in their current predicament; a precarious one to be sure. Figure 1 outlines the role confusion concept and provides further background into its component areas.

Conceptual Area	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature Updated Conceptual Framework
Role Confusion	Expressions of Sexuality	Women whose behavior is perceived by men as a potential source of sexual harassment	Annis, 2013; eeoc.gov, 2016; telegraph.co.uk, 2015
		Women who create sexual tension for men at work	Annis, 2013; Glick, Chrislock, Petersik, Vijay, & Turek 2008
	Sex Role Socialization	Women who exhibit behaviors associated with power that are incompatible with men's perceptions of the evolving female sex role	Annis, 2013; Maranto & Griffin 2011; Eagly & Carli 2003; Eagly & Carli 2007; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra 2006
		Women who exhibit behaviors that are incompatible with men's stereotype of female work and sex roles	Annis, 2013; Maranto & Griffin 2011; Eagly & Carli 2003; Eagly & Carli 2007; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra 2006

(continued)

Conceptual Area	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature Updated Conceptual Framework
	Differing Leadership Skills between Men and Women	<p>Women who exhibit leadership skills like collaboration, shared power, and relationship building that are incongruent to male leadership skills of command and control</p> <p>Women who demonstrate leadership skills such as collaboration, shared power, and relationship building that are viewed as more effective by their organizations than skills of command and control that some males currently use.</p>	<p>Annis, 2013; Claus, Callahan & Sandlin 2013; Diekman, Johnston, & Loescher 2013; Eagly & Carli 2007; Gill & Jones 2013; Herrera, Duncan, Green and Skaggs 2012</p> <p>Annis, 2013; Claus, Callahan & Sandlin 2013; Diekman, Johnston, & Loescher 2013; Eagly & Carli 2007; Gill & Jones 2013</p>

Figure 1. Role Confusion Conceptual Area (Ryder, 1998)

Expressions of sexuality. Generally, men have good intentions; they do not want nor do they mean to offend women. Annis (2013) writes, “Men often find themselves walking on eggshells with women in the workplace, an apprehensive and hesitant feeling that can potentially surface any time men interact with women” (p. 93). According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, in Fiscal Year 2015, females filed 83% of a total 6822 cases of all sexual harassment claims in that year (eeoc.gov, 2016).

Because of this phenomenon, men do not take on female protégés for fear that doing or saying the wrong thing will have disastrous consequences. Females are at a disadvantage because of these fears; fears that a complaint or a sexual harassment lawsuit are a moment away. This may lead to less interaction between the leader and the led, disingenuous feedback on evaluations, and, ultimately, an atmosphere of distrust. These

assertions are verified by an online poll conducted by the British news outlet, The Daily Telegraph (telegraph.co.uk, 2015). Out of 10,863 participants, 87% said that men are too fearful to help women in the workplace and progress on equality has begun moving in the opposite direction. This fear and uncertainty could lead to dissonance in the workplace.

Glick, Chrislock, Petersik, Vijay, and Turek (2008) address female dress in the workplace as a source of tension and possible dissonance. In the study, a statistically significant number of the 185 males and females who participated stated that women who show women's dress to be an issue in the workplace. More men than women stated that while suggestive dress and exposure of cleavage may help to sell a product, it is distracting in the workplace. The study also conveyed that while the use of sexual priming may get a foot in the door, the practice does not bode well for promotion beyond an entry-level position.

Sex role socialization. Annis and Gray (2013) convey that men are comfortable around other men; that they do not have to worry about what they say. This leads to the creation of exclusive groups like good old boys clubs. The role congruity theory emphasizes that when genders adhere to socially assigned roles, confusion is averted (Eagly & Karau, 2002). When these expectations are violated, dissonance may occur.

Eagly and Carli (2007) demonstrate men's reticence stating that this sex-role socialization is the first disastrous step toward men losing total control over leadership. With the first step will follow the second until the male-dominated system is no longer recognizable. Labeling them bullies, broads, and bitches (Annis & Gray, 2013), men convey that women do not portray good attributes as leaders.

Adding to the incongruity argument, Musil (2011) discusses in her study that for women to be promoted to higher positions of responsibility, institutions need to change; that the reigning male-dominated model be altered or replaced. She states in her invective either “fix the women or fix the institution” (p. 2), though women do not appear to be the problem. Musil (2011) finishes, citing as examples, Princeton and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology the years of work they have put into “updating” their institutions by hiring a more diverse workforce. Musil also highlights their need for changes in policy to ensure a more equitable work environment.

Differing leadership skills between men and women. Since the workplace is generally run on the male-dominated leadership model (Campbell, Mueller & Souza, 2010; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007), men’s confusion is all but a surety when females are considered for higher posts. They experience an unfamiliar world in the workplace; communal leaders with incompatible leadership styles speaking in high-pitched voices wearing dresses instead of suits. They may see their leadership methods under attack having to “make room” for foreign leadership concepts like consensus-building and compassion. With changing times and the inclusion, or perhaps according to the male community, invasion of females within the upper echelons of leadership, the ‘good ol’ boys club, males may see their traditions fall.

Alimo-Metcalf (2010) provides an example of the wide rift in definitions of leadership as believed by the two genders. In a sample of 12 female leaders and 12 male leaders in the health industry who work together, the results were diametrically opposite. During data collection, the females relay that, in their workplaces, they continue to believe strongly that leadership takes community, thought, and participation; people

before profit. Speaking to the males, the researcher found they clung to self-interest, vision, and action.

Communication Differences

Communication is the process of imparting symbols that permit a sender and receiver to share a common meaning (Hackman & Johnson, 2013). Effective communication in the workplace is of paramount importance. The life of an organization may depend on it. A complex process, achieving effective communication can depend on variables like gender, age and race. Working with people from other countries or cultures, in addition to those variables already mentioned, can add additional challenges. Facing these challenges can be a source of confusion and irritation for anyone. Add to the mix that males and females have different communication styles.

Annis (2010) defines communication between the genders as a paradox: the genders listen to and speak differently about the same topic with wholly different outcomes. As an example, a man and a woman hear the same words in the same speech, upon its conclusion, they discuss the speech. After a few moments of sharing, both genders realize that the other took away a completely different meaning of the same message (Annis, 2010). The result of this paradox is a phenomenon Tannen (1990) labeled as “talking at cross-purposes” (p. 49). She claims that when discussing a problem, a female looks for validation of the problem, while a male offers advice to fix it. This phenomenon reveals the communication styles grounded in agentic and communal qualities. Lakoff (1973) took the position that differences in communication seemed to originate in social expectation of the sexes; that men and women spoke different languages based on their genders. A few years later, Baird (1976) provided an overview

of these gendered characteristics tied in with preferred forms of communication for the sexes,

Males, encouraged to be independent, aggressive, problem-oriented, and risk taking generally are more task-oriented in their interactions, more active and aggressive verbally, more interested and capable in problem-solving, more willing to take risks, more resistant to social influence, more competitive when bargaining, and more likely to assume leadership in task-oriented situations.

Females, taught to be noncompetitive, dependent, empathetic, passive, and interpersonally oriented, typically are more willing to self-disclose, more expressive of emotions and perceptive of others' emotional states, more sensitive to nonverbal cues, less interested and able in problem-solving, relatively unwilling to assume risks, more yielding to social pressure, and less likely to assume leadership, although capable of providing leadership in certain situations.

(p. 192)

Adding to the gender communication paradox is not what females say, but how they say it. In recent decades, two different methods of speech delivery have become pervasive in society that may have consequences for females in the workplace (Counter, 2016). They are “high rising terminal” or “uptalk” and “vocal fry”.

Uptalk occurs when an individual who is speaking raises the intonation of the voice at the end of a sentence making a statement sound like a question. Women are twice more likely to use uptalk than men (Hoffman, 2015). Some women claim that this method is a way for women to be heard, that it allows them to better control a conversation (Hoffman, 2013). Conversely, some have complained that, during a

briefing, participants did not know if they were asked for information or told information (Wolf, 2015). Regardless of the stance, with this question vs. statement confusion, the use of uptalk has the potential to add to dissonance in the workplace

Vocal fry occurs when an individual drops the voice register to accommodate a low creaking, guttural sound some equate to a growl (Wolf, 2015). The practice was made popular by celebrities in the U.S. Research (Anderson, Klostad, Mayew & Venkatachalam, 2014) shows that a sizeable population of young females in the United States use vocal fry. Anderson, et. al, (2014) conveyed two conclusions about vocal fry. The first conclusion mentions this method of speaking may be used to deliberately sound more masculine as the male voice is perceived as stronger. The second conclusion focuses on perception of use. Results reveal that females are perceived as, “less competent, less educated, less trustworthy, less attractive, and less hireable” (p. 5) when they use vocal fry. Figure 2 provides a comprehensive view of communication differences delineating the fine details.

Conceptual Area	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature Updated Conceptual Framework
Communication Differences	Different Conversational Styles	Women who boast	Annis & Gray, 2013; Smith & Huntoon 2014; Briles, 1996
		Women who talk in an indirect manner	Annis & Gray, 2013; Annis & Merron, 2014; Sandberg, 2013; Tannen, 1994
		Women who are perceived to talk too much	Annis & Gray, 2013; Gurian & Annis 2008; Sandberg, 2013
		Women who are perceived to use annoying methods of speech	Hoffman, 2013; Hoffman, 2015; Wolf, 2015

(continued)

Conceptual Area	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature Updated Conceptual Framework
	Conversational Rituals	Women who use apology	Annis & Gray, 2013; Briles, 2000; Gurian & Annis 2008; Tannen, 1990
		Women who criticize others	Annis & Gray, 2013; Annis & Merron, 2014; Sandberg, 2013;
		Women who are overly sensitive to criticism	Annis & Gray, 2013; Gurian & Annis 2008; Sandberg, 2013
		Women who gossip	Annis & Gray, 2013; Annis & Merron, 2014; Farley, Timme, & Hart, 2010; Tannen, 1990
		Women who ask others' opinions before making a decision	Alimo-Metcalf, 2010; Annis, 2010; Annis & Gray, 2013; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011 Gurian & Annis 2008

Figure 2. Communication Differences Conceptual Area (Ryder, 1998)

Conversational styles. Advancing 40 years after Lakoff and Baird, females still fit that same social characterization; that females are perceived to be weak and unsure of themselves (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Litosseliti, 2006) speaking in an indirect manner causing confusion, asking too many questions. Additionally, women who self-promote are braggarts (Smith & Huntoon, 2014). The following examples highlight stylistic challenges faced in the workplace.

Smith and Huntoon (2014) comment in their study that females who brag about themselves risk role incongruity. In doing so they risk dissonance in the workplace. The

researchers also shared that given a choice between a self-promoting female and self-promoting male to serve as leader, their participants, both males and females, overwhelmingly chose the male to lead. Finally they reveal in their discussion that women who self-promote were judged more harshly than those who did not brag. The researchers intimate that if someone is to “talk-up” a female, it is best to be one of her colleagues.

Annis and Gray (2013) tell the story that males do not understand how females communicate; a cause of dissonance. They cite research that conveys that females use innuendo and indirect speech to avoid being nagging or nitpicking. In conveying a point that may seem to be encoded (Annis & Merron, 2014), males may lose the meaning of a message thus becoming another cause for dissonance. As Sandberg (2013) said speak openly and authentically. Few people in the world can read minds.

Women love to talk or at least that is what society would have people believe. Research has divulged that women need to use more words a day to connect with and to explain the events occurring around them (Annis, 2010; Annis & Gray, 2013; Gurian & Annis, 2014). Using these extra words, says Annis helps encourage the brain to process. However, men require fewer words for explanation and connection and tend to interrupt a speaker when the “word limit” has been reached (Gurian & Annis, 2008). Women want to be heard, but men are unable to concentrate. When women insist on speaking after this point is reached, dissonance may occur.

Conversational rituals. Males and females communicate differently not just in content, but also in meaning. Males complain that females are overly critical when they communicate (Annis, 2010; Litosseliti, 2006); that they devolve into gossip checking on

social issues of the day. Males claim that females should not portray the same air of confidence and certainty as men; but to be more modest (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Women are about rapport, while men are about report says Tannen (1990, 1994), however, when females engage in communication methods attributed to the opposite sex, it invokes the same role incongruity as with leadership. The following examples highlight ritualistic challenges faced in the workplace.

“Women tend to apologize as a way to diminish hierarchy, not because they are really sorry,” (Gurian & Annis, 2008, p. 57); they are trying to be polite and build community. To see it explained in such a way would mean female leaders try to make themselves equals with others. However, according to some males the use of apology makes females seem weak, ineffective, and irritating. “Constant apologies drive me crazy,” “No patience for apology,” and “Do not apologize for doing your job” are common themes from males who claim that the leader just needs to be assertive and get the job done. This stance leads to a conundrum, the double bind, for the female; either she continues to apologize to stay within her gender role and risk dissonance or she quits apologizing and gets the job done taking on agentic qualities thus violating role congruity and risking dissonance.

Overly critical females are challenging in the workplace. Annis and Gray (2013) share a male’s experience working in Silicon Valley with a critical female boss. The male detailed a workplace that was constantly on edge because of what he perceived as her need to show who was the boss. He said, “She would take a contrarian position on everything” (p. 104). Adding to the disdain of the criticism, this aggressive behavior

toward males is another behavior that is in opposition with the female gender role causing anger, anxiety, and confusion.

Annis and Gray (2013) discuss men's challenges with women's sensitivity to criticism through sharing an anecdote from a gentleman who attended their conference. The man, who was a supervisor, invited his female subordinate to join him in a conference room for a counseling session to share feedback. In the course of the session the supervisor touched upon an area where the employee did not perform to standard. In discussing the sensitive subject, and critical feedback, the employee began to show emotion and cry. The man became so flustered he left the room not knowing what to do. Upon visiting the Director of Human Resources and relaying the story, the director asked how he reacted, the man replied that he did not know what to do so he left her crying in the room. The man further stated to the director that with men, he knew what to expect providing feedback, with women, he never knew what to expect. Annis and Gray (2013) add that all too often these situations occur; no real understanding of communication between the sexes leaving one bewildered and one emotional.

To hear the word gossip usually carries a negative vision of whispered secrets between people eviscerating an unfortunate third party. Some claim gossip can be positive strengthening social bonds between individuals as well as providing an informal avenue to clarify formal workplace communication (Farley, Timme, & Hart, 2010). The same authors also describe the female who gossips as one who seeks to gain control through the use of gossip displaying aggression while doing so. Because of this she may be seen as unlikeable and untrustworthy because she is not acting in a communal way.

Displaying these agentic characteristics causes confusion and anxiety in men possibly causing dissonance.

Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) discuss the collaborative leadership phenomenon in schools that emphasizes discussion and deliberation before making decisions. This method of operation has men in a quandary as it is perceived as indecision and incompetence and goes against the snap decision-making, aggressive leadership style to which males are accustomed, not what. Annis (2010) provides the experience of a female leader who states, “When I try to talk through problems at work I just get grunts from men. It’s as though men want to get to the bottom line and get on to something else, as fast as possible” (p. 64).

Cultural Differences

The male model of providing leadership and conducting business is the model of choice according to society (Jonsen, Maznevski, & Schneider, 2010). Having the dominant model affords the opportunity to determine the prevailing culture. It is when females are immersed into this dominant culture that dissonance can occur. By taking their authentic selves into the workplace (Annis & Gray, 2013), females may introduce those uncommon or unwanted communal characteristics into a macho environment.

Males are comfortable with what they know. They are happy to compete against one another (DeBoer, 2004; Gurian & Annis, 2008). Men know how men think whereas women are an enigma; ever-changing emotions and an unreasonable need to talk (Annis, 2010). One point males remember from what is likely a gendered upbringing is no boy likes to lose. To be in what DeBoer (2004) refers to as a “turf battle” (P. 86) with a

female and lose may not just upset the social setting in the workplace, but also may be an attack on his masculinity at its core.

Unwelcome change alters the once male-dominated landscape. These changes give rise to those male-oriented, male-driven institutions and processes like the good old boys clubs (R. Grogan, personal communication, September 5, 2015), exclusive informal networks (Annis & Gray, 2013), and a selective process for choosing who to mentor or sponsor (Foust-Cummings, Dinolfo, & Kohler, 2011). When females attempt to vanquish these barriers, or obtain reasonable accommodations like flexible hours and parental leave (Friedman, 2015) or parity in pay (Friedman, 2015; Warner, 2014) it causes irritation and confusion, and likely dissonance in the workplace.

Though considered to be a female industry, education is typically male-dominated at the higher echelons of leadership (Diekman, Johnston, & Loescher, 2013; Gill & Jones, 2013) and is biased against females (Haveman & Beresford, 2012). Working within such a culture can be challenging, and disparaging, for females wishing to move up in the ranks. Kovala (2014) conveys that changing the cultural landscape of a community college is akin to sacrilege. Any attempt to change the sacrosanct traditions within the organization may cause dissonance between employees. Figure 3 shows a detailed view of cultural differences and the factors that may impact the male-female work dynamic.

Conceptual Area	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature Updated Conceptual Framework
Cultural Differences	Women's Confrontation of the Dominant Culture	Women intrude into previously male dominated areas of work	Maranto & Griffin 2011; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Grogan & Shakeshaft 2011; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Sandberg, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2007
		Women who request and receive special advantages or considerations in the work setting because they are women	Jones & Palmer 2011; Litosseliti 2006; Sandberg, 2013; Stromquist 2013; Vinkenberg, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt (2011
	Men's Competition with Women	Women who encroach upon men's sense of entitlement, prestige, and power	Maranto & Griffin 2011; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Sandberg, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2007
		Women who gain administrative promotions that men perceive are not based solely on qualifications but on gender	Maranto & Griffin 2011; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Sandberg, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Annis, 2010

Figure 3. Cultural Differences Conceptual Area (Ryder, 1998)

Women's confrontation of the dominant culture. Introducing change is difficult, especially in an antiquated, homogenous environment. According to Maranto

and Griffin's 2011 study, females are perceived to be excluded from informal interaction in a male-dominated work setting. In a sample that included 366 males and females total, a statistically significant number reported witnessing females, not only lacking membership in informal collaboration circles, but also experiencing outright isolation. In addition to these exclusionary elements, females were more likely to lack proper evaluation and feedback on projects and input.

Wienclaw (2015) conveys to the public that women lack a workplace support mechanism to be a breadwinner and a caretaker. She tells her audience that mothers, who try to fulfill two roles, are typically unable to get support from the workplace to do so and when they do they are made to feel entitled for receiving accommodation. It is because of this "special treatment" that some females receive lower pay and fewer opportunities in the workplace.

Men's competition with women. The challenges males may have with competing females may originate in sex role socialization and the adherence to those concepts. Eagly and Carli (2007) demonstrate this revealing

Men's collective self-interest encourages them to thwart gender equality even while social and economic pressures encourage them to accept it. Few positions exist, and the advancement of women means that fewer still are available for men...also, some men undoubtedly take comfort in thinking of themselves as superior to women and as rightly deserving higher status. (p. 197)

While Eagly and Carli (2007) repeatedly detail males' inconsistency about the female rise to power, they do convey that more and more men have become supportive.

This competition can also condemn female leaders to worse situations (Gurian & Annis, 2008; R. Grogan, personal communication, October 10, 2015; R. Grogan, personal communication, March 19, 2016; Sandberg, 2013) like a glass cliff situation. As Haslam and Ryan (2008) mention in their seminal study, that females are more likely to be placed in a precarious leadership situation than a male facilitating the outlook that failure is the fault of the female.

Women's Personal Power

Women's personal power has its origins in internal barriers. Since women are affected by a lack of self-confidence, a lack of experience and a lack of self-esteem this would seem accurate (Briles, 1996; Ryder & Briles, 2003; Sandberg, 2013). Out of these feelings, women leaders may cause dissonant behavior in the workplace (Leo, Reid, Geldenhuys, & Gobind, 2014).

As women gain confidence and ambition in the workplace, these feelings tend to go away. Sandberg (2013) confirms this sharing a story on "having it all", "(Women) are more enlightened (than men) with different and more meaningful goals" (p. 18). This confidence shows in women's advancement in Fortune 500 companies (Catalyst, 2016b). Though the fill-rate is slowly increasing, it is increasing nonetheless.

Conceptual Area	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature Updated Conceptual Framework
Women's Personal Power	Women's Self-Confidence Issues	Women who need to prove themselves	DeBoer, 2004; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Ramones, 2016; Sandberg, 2013
	Women's Power Issues	Women who need to control and dominate	DeBoer, 2004; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Ramones, 2016; Sandberg, 2013

Figure 4. Women's Personal Power Conceptual Area (Ryder, 1998)

More and more women are embracing workplace discomfort, showing their pluck to reach higher levels (Sutton, 2015). As Ginni Rometty, current Chairwoman, President and CEO of IBM stated, "Growth and comfort don't coexist." This endurance may come from female's want to be seen as a competent and committed contributor (Annis & Gray, 2013) in an attempt to quash gender stereotypes.

R. Grogan illustrates this in personal conversation recounting conversations with women leaders in community colleges. She started saying, "Women have a rough go of it." Shaking her head and with a raised voice, she continued, "Women have to get out there and do more than the men!" She finished on a somber note stating that, "If women did not have the internal drive and confidence to do more than just the job, they would not last long in any leadership position" (personal communication, March 19, 2016).

R. Grogan also discusses the leader's need to control. "Looking at women presidents in the community college system, I think they walk a fine line." She provided further explanation stating, "Women have several audiences they address: the college's board of trustees, the college leadership, and the faculty. Each of those operates in a

male-dominated model.” After a few moments of silence, she concluded, “Women have to take control, to show dominance, if they want to be taken seriously, but they have to be subtle about it” (personal communication, October 10, 2015).

Summary

This replication study focused on possible behaviors female leaders exhibit that cause their male colleagues to feel dissonance. In Ryder’s 1998 dissertation studying the same topic, her literature review served as a harbinger for her final results; that gender dissonance was real and was observed in her study’s sample. The original study called for a greater focus on these behaviors so they could be treated to ensure female leaders received the same opportunities as male leaders.

The cause for equality is hard-fought. Bales’s (1950) expectation states theory demonstrates that individuals are not necessarily judged by their contribution to the group. They can be judged by ability or by personal attribute. Society allows them to make an easy decision as to who the group feels is best for a job. Fast-forwarding a few decades, Eagly (1987) demonstrates that society determines gender characteristics and the subsequent roles assigned to each. These gender roles are so firmly entrenched in the public and private sectors that the inequality situation may never truly be resolved. Until then, males are the beneficiary of the system. They are seen as the breadwinner, the strength of the family and the power in the workplace. On the other hand, women are seen as the homemaker; weak and fragile with little chance of doing much in the workplace. If they try, they may be ostracized as they act outside of their gender role; violators of role congruity (Eagly & Wood, 2002).

With the establishment of gender roles comes an outline of their subsequent violation. Role congruity (Eagly & Carli, 2003) and expectancy violation (Burgoon & Hale, 1988) delineate not only what constitutes a violation, but also how the perpetrator may be punished for the infraction as society and its members take umbrage at the offense. A new theory in the mix, gender role strain (Pleck, 1995) outlines violations as well, though focusing on men and how they treat those in their environments. An overview of brain composition and function showed how females and males differ on a molecular level regarding cognitive function.

Female leaders and the problems that face them in those roles are legion. According to the literature, differing styles, designed by society, are the root cause; leadership styles, communication styles, lifestyles – it is about ordained vs. disdained, agency vs. communality. From these differences spring obstacles women face to advance in the workplace irrespective of the industry.

The literature surrounding concepts that compose gender dissonance has been updated to a great degree since the original 1998 study. Unfortunately very little information addressed the topic specifically. More emphasis needs to be given to how these behaviors may affect workplace dynamics. A re-invigorated focus on these inter-relational workings may provide a new facet to determine how to create and maintain a better work environment.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Overview

This replicated study was developed from a qualitative point of view using a phenomenological lens. This approach was useful to communicate the lived experiences of community college CEOs in California. This method served not only to identify, but also to interpret the perceived existences of women executives in the community college system and challenges they may have encountered when competing for CEO positions. These possible challenges, which were discussed in detail in the previous chapter, included intrinsic and extrinsic factors affecting women and their ability to be promoted to CEO. Looking inward, the research examined learned behaviors, in the human animal which may have evolved over time that may put today's women leaders at a disadvantage in the workplace (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood & Diekmann, 2000, Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008). Literature suggested that the biological compositions of, and differences in, male and female brains may provide some explanation for incongruent behaviors that cause friction between the sexes (Annis & Merron, 2014; Gurian & Annis, 2008). Looking outward, the research detailed external forces that had an effect on women and their promotion possibilities like different barriers to advancement (Ghaeus, 2015; Hoyt, Simon, & Reid, 2009; Johns, 2013).

Chapter I introduced the background, the purpose of the study, and the research questions. Chapter II reviewed literature associated with the research discussing theoretical frameworks, gender differences, and gender dissonance. Chapter III outlines the study's integuments: the protective layer of the study detailing a step-by-step approach of the dissertation that ultimately covered the "how" to replicate. To discuss

the replication in detail, the study delved into several important areas: those participating in the study, the population, the sample, the expert panel, and the researcher's background; the elements that gave definition to the study like the purpose behind the study, the research questions, instrumentation, data collection and analysis and the timeframe to completion.

Purpose Statement

The first purpose of this qualitative replication study was to discover what behaviors female administrators exhibit that may prompt male administrators with whom they work in a California community college to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance.

The second purpose of this study was to determine what impact these dissonant behaviors may have on women's potential eligibility for advancement to the position of community college CEO in California.

Research Questions

1. What behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college CEOs as prompting male administrators with whom they work in an educational environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance
2. How do selected community college CEOs feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement?

Research Design

The research questions for this qualitative study were designed and refined to gather data that conveyed detailed accounts of lived experiences pertinent to the study's

purpose. Patton (2015) tells that “qualitative inquiry contributes to our understanding of the world” (p. 3). To understand is to know. To help reach understanding, McMillan and Schumacher (2010) outlined nine key characteristics of qualitative research that Patton (2015) refined into seven contributions of qualitative inquiry:

1. Illuminating meanings
2. Studying how things work
3. Capturing stories to understand peoples’ perspectives and experiences
4. Elucidating how systems function and their consequences for people’s lives
5. Understanding context: how and why it matters
6. Identifying unanticipated consequences
7. Making case comparisons to discover important patterns and themes across cases (p. 13).

These seven contributions served as the underpinnings for this study; to guide it through the collection of human experience; to ensure the integrity of chronicled narratives and their essences, and, for the researcher, to remain aware of the inquiry process.

This study sought to ascertain the “nature of a phenomenon,” in defining “that which makes a some-‘thing’ what it is-and without which it could not be what it is” (Van Manan, 1990, p.10). Phenomenology sought to provide this understanding. Philosophical at its roots, Van Manan (1990) further detailed phenomenology’s essence stating,

Phenomenology aims at gaining a deeper understanding of the nature or meaning of our everyday experiences...Anything that presents itself to consciousness is

potentially of interest to phenomenology, whether the object is real or imagined, empirically measureable or subjectively felt...thus all we can ever know must present itself to consciousness. Whatever falls outside of consciousness therefore falls outside the bounds of our possible lived experience (p. 115).

This phenomenological method, complementing and building upon the descriptive-exploratory approach used in the original study, was employed to determine the lived experiences of community college CEOs. As the descriptive method seeks to describe "what is" (Borg & Gall, 1989, Gay 1992) and the exploratory method seeks to "find" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010), phenomenology personalizes the experience having participants share their lived realities within a phenomenon. Chandra and Sharma (2008) outline a link between the methods stating, "descriptive methods can tell us about what exists at present by determining the nature and degree of existing conditions" by the "obtaining of pertinent and precise information concerning the current status of phenomena" (p. 263). This phenomenological method served not only to identify, but also to interpret the perceived existences women executives may have experienced in the community college system and challenges they may have encountered when competing for CEO positions.

Expert Panel

An expert panel was assembled to review and refine interview questions to ensure they aligned with the study's purpose and research questions. A pool of qualified individuals was created to determine possible participants. Initially, three individuals were contacted via email to determine interest and availability. Inquiry was made until a team of three was achieved. Upon positive contact with each panel member, the

researcher communicated with each person, over email followed by a phone conversation, to discuss the details of what would be required to participate especially stressing time; an approximate length of commitment for them as well the timeline of the study for the researcher. At a minimum, each panel member had to possess at least two of the three following qualifications to be considered for the panel: published in the field of women's studies, taught women's studies, or was recognized as an expert in women's studies by colleagues.

Expert panel member Alpha has an extensive background in women's studies teaching the topic at several California State University campuses over the last 15 years. Currently this member is employed as an Assistant Provost in a government agency. Expert panel member Beta has a 30-year background in women's issues in academic leadership at the community college level as well as an expert knowledge of qualitative study methods. Currently this member is employed as an Associate Provost for Continuing Education in a government agency. Expert panel member Gamma is a subject matter expert in women's issues in the academic leadership environment and is employed as an elementary school principal. All members have contributed to women's studies literature through submission of academic works. Additionally, all members are celebrated by their colleagues as experts in the field of women's studies and are sought for their knowledge and advice.

Table 2

Expert Panel Qualifications

Panel Member	Published	Taught Women's Studies	Recognized as Expert
Alpha	Yes	Yes	Yes
Beta	Yes	No	Yes
Gamma	Yes	No	Yes

Timeframe of Study

This timeframe outlines an overview of the progression of the study:

- September 2016 – Submission of proposal to committee for approval
- October 2016 – Submission of documents to Institutional Review Board
- October 2016 – Convene expert panel
- October 2016 – Identify and contact prospective participants; send information packets
- October 2016 – Conduct field test, assess results and make adjustments
- November/December 2016 – Conduct interviews
- December 2016 – Conduct data analysis to include inter-rater coding review
- December 2016/January 2017 – Complete chapter IV
- January 2017 – Complete chapter V, gain approval for chapters I – V
- February 2017 – Conduct oral defense

Population

The California Community College system is the largest higher education entity in this nation enrolling about 2.6 million students in the collective student body (CCCCO, 2015). It is currently comprised of 113 colleges organized into 72 single-college or multiple-college districts (CCCCO, 2015). It is from these 113 schools that this study's population was derived. By definition, a population is the entirety of a group a researcher wishes to study (Patten, 2014; Salkind, 2012; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010; Williams, 2004). The population for this study consisted of Community College CEOs in California. According to community college officials, CEOs include chancellors, superintendents as well as presidents (R. Grogan & E. Ramones, personal

communication, March 19, 2016). Currently, the pool of CEOs consists of 136 individuals; about 77 men and 59 women (CCCCO, 2015). The population included participants of both sexes, a range of ages, and come from multi-ethnic, multi-cultural backgrounds. The colleges they lead are located in urban and rural areas.

Interviewing every CEO for this study was unrealistic for two reasons. With community colleges spread over the entirety of California, the amount of time and money needed for such an undertaking was excessive. Delimitations itemized in chapter I outlined the requisite qualifications to enable CEOs to participate in this study. To refresh, those are selected for the study are only CEOs who: (1) had a minimum of two years' experience as a senior community college administrator – vice president or higher, (2) were knowledgeable of women's issues in community college leadership; (3) exhibited strong verbal and non-verbal communication skills, and (4) were recognized throughout the community college arena for their continued support to mentor female community college educators were asked to participate in this study.

To stay within the study's boundaries, a target population was chosen. A target population is described as "a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 129). The target population was restricted to those who met the delimiting factors mentioned in chapter I of having a minimum of two years' experience as a senior community college administrator – vice president position or higher, were knowledgeable of women's issues in community college leadership, exhibited strong verbal and non-verbal communication skills, and were recognized throughout the community college arena for their continued support to

mentor female community college educators. This study's sample was chosen from this body of individuals.

Sample

When one cannot study every member (of a population), Roberts (2010) mentioned to find and study a suitable sample. A sample is defined as a cross-section of a population that a researcher wishes to study (Salkind, 2012; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010; Williams, 2004). As the population was 136 CEOs, the original idea for an appropriate sample size was ten percent; about 14 people. This number was set as a likely point when data would reach saturation; the point when respondents fail to provide any new insights (Patten, 2014).

The researcher used purposive criterion sampling and snowball sampling to acquire the sample for this study. The first sampling method was used due to the delimiting factors that narrowed considerably those individuals who could participate in the inquiry (Patten, 2014; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The second sampling was used to query CEOs about any fellow CEOs who may have been good sources of information. In normal circumstances, these individuals would not be reachable without the endorsement of a fellow CEO (Patten, 2014). While these sampling methods garnered the needed information for the study, because of the stringent qualifications required of the candidates, sampling methods, and the small sample size, the study could not be generalized to the population.

The sample for this study consisted of seven female and seven male administrators from northern California to the southern reaches of the Central Valley and the High Sierras; a geographical region consisting of the area from the Oregon border to

the north, the Nevada border to the east, then to the southern borders of San Luis Obispo, Kern, and Inyo counties. Prospective participants were contacted via email to determine their interest and availability. Reputational cases were used as the researcher possessed a unique opportunity to call on personal relationships to recommend, and, in some cases to notify, willing participants.

Instrumentation

The researcher had three sacrosanct duties to perform in the role of the instrument for the study: to record, to interpret, and to analyze the stories of each participant. Piantanida and Garman (2009) discussed the importance of carrying out these duties stating, “At the heart of interpretive inquiry is a researcher’s capacity for encountering, listening, understanding, and thus ‘experiencing’ the phenomenon under investigation” (p. 59). The authors went further conveying, “Rather than assuming the traditional stance of a detached and neutral observer, an interpretive inquirer, much like a tuning fork, resonates with exquisite sensitivity to the subtle vibrations of encountered experiences” (p. 59). Another author, Rollo May (1975), described the role of the researcher instrument as intimate; that one, as an interviewer, needed to be open, present in the moment, quick of mind, and receptive of the smallest details and nuances. May (1975) provided this thought on the interviewer’s role described as an artist:

The receptivity of the artist must never be confused with passivity. Receptivity is the artist’s holding him- or herself alive and open to hear what being may speak. Such receptivity requires a nimbleness, a fine-honed sensitivity in order to let one’s self be the vehicle of whatever vision may emerge...It requires a high degree of attention, as when a diver is poised on the end of the springboard, not jumping, but holding his or her muscles

in sensitive balance for the right second. It is an active listening, keyed to hear the answer, alert to see whatever can be glimpsed when the vision or words do come. It is a waiting for the birthing process to begin to move in its own organic time. It is necessary that the artist have this sense of timing, that he or she respect these periods of receptivity as part of the mystery of creativity and creation. (pp. 80-81)

Interviews were conducted based on questions and protocols from the original study. To ensure these tools remained relevant an expert panel was assembled and consulted for input. Upon receiving approval from the panel, field testing was conducted with select individuals to help further refine questions and methods prior to conducting interviews with the sample audience.

Background of Researcher

The researcher had some experience working with this topic. While enlisted in the U.S. Army, the researcher served as an Equal Opportunity Leader. In that role, he received training a decade ago in gender equality as pertained to the Armed Forces. Additionally, he was responsible for educating approximately 350 fellow soldiers in his unit about gender issues in the military to include barriers females could face that could affect their promotions.

As well, the researcher had a limited background with the study's population. For the last two years, the research received an informal education from employees who were in senior positions within the community college system about CEOs, their duties, and how some individuals conduct their day-to-day business. This information included information about situations involving some females and work-place barriers some faced in the community college system to include promotion to the CEO level.

Because of the limited contact with both the topic and the population, researcher bias was minimal. Though the researcher possessed some knowledge of the topic and the population, this information served merely as a starting point to undertake this study. The researcher endeavored to remove any bias by submitting any data entries to chair, committee or expert panel for review.

Data Collection

A series of events took place prior to receiving permission to begin data collection. The first step required chair and committee approval to submit the proposal of Chapters I – III to Quality Review. The second step took place after the review. This step required the researcher to formally defend the proposal to chair and committee. The third and last step occurred upon achieving a successful defense. The proposal's submission to the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB) capped the approval process. The IRB's examination was performed to ensure the proposal adhered to all ethical and legal guidelines prior to granting approval to collect data on human subjects.

Personal Referrals

During the researcher's time as a university student, he developed relationships with individuals who occupied senior positions of authority within the community college system. In conversations with these individuals, they pledged their support to not only provide names of prospective participants, but also the offer to communicate with the participant to vouch for the study and its worth. Their input was vital to help whittle down the pool of candidates. Additionally, as a final question, interviewees were asked, who they knew would be a good candidate to contact to participate in the study.

Mass Correspondence

Through Internet searches the researcher was able to obtain a directory of all community college CEO email addresses and phone numbers. To cast the net, the researcher sent an informative email to all on the list providing details of the study, as well as the delimiters, to gauge interest of prospective participants. The dissertation chair's contact information was also included if any person wished to verify the researcher's identity and course of study.

Selection Criteria

Those selected to participate in this study were California community college CEOs and those who have been promoted to the CEO position. Included were CEOs who met the following criteria:

- Had a minimum of two years' experience as a senior community college administrator – vice president or higher
- Knowledgeable of women's issues in community college leadership
- Exhibited strong verbal and non-verbal communication skills
- Recognized throughout the community college arena for their continued support to mentor female community college educators

Upon identification of possible participants, each person was contacted via a second email and a follow-up phone call. This correspondence allowed for a formal introduction between the researcher and the candidate. Additionally, the talks granted an opportunity to clarify any ambiguous points from previous correspondence and to schedule times and places for interviews.

Interviews

Conducting interviews allowed the researcher to gain thorough knowledge about his topic from learned individuals. These subject matter experts gained their knowledge through education and experience in the concerned field. Though the researcher possessed mostly educational information on the topic, Rubin & Rubin (2012) conveyed that, “Qualitative interviewing helps reconstruct events researchers have never experienced” (p. 3). Interviews allowed the researcher to experience participants’ experiences. The researcher’s current employment made him wholly qualified to conduct these interviews. As a hiring official in his organization, he has chaired a hiring panel or served as a panel member interviewing approximately 40 individuals. Approximately ten of those interviews were one-on-one.

14 interviews with CEOs were scheduled and conducted during the months of November and December. Five face-to-face interviews took place at the interviewees’ location of choice at the scheduled time. Nine telephonic interviews were scheduled and conducted at the each CEOs convenience. At the outset of each meeting, the researcher thanked the CEO for the time and trouble of contributing to his study. After the exchange of pleasantries, the researcher set up the room to best capture audio. The interview took on a formal tone when the researcher began the discussion with a detailed reminder of the participant’s rights, about voluntary participation and that withdrawal from the study was possible at any time. The researcher made a final point stating that the study was not about self-incrimination or self-identification in any way, only to share lived experiences. If a person wished to identify in the first person, it was their decision

to do so. A final question, “Do you wish to proceed?” was asked before beginning the interview.

The researcher reviewed the purpose statement and research questions to refresh and to clarify any obscurities. The interviews were conducted in accordance with the established protocols. Generally, each interview was finished within the allotted 45 - 60 minute timeframe. After concluding the interview questions, the researcher asked each CEO for their questions or any further clarifications. Post-interview activities included a quick reminder of participants’ rights and their ability to contact the researcher via phone or email. The researcher re-affirmed the possibility to contact the CEO for clarification should the need arise. After giving a final word of thanks, the researcher departed.

Field Test

The researcher conducted a field test to re-validate the interview questions and protocols. The researcher tested two individuals who met the study criteria and were not considered a part of the study’s final sample. This test provided the opportunity not only to hone questions, especially probes and follow-ups, but also to gauge if data in the literature review matched the stories.

Upon concluding the two tests, the data were transcribed and transmitted to the expert panel for their input. The panel’s goal was to determine if the questions were valid or needed to be changed. After making minor wording adjustments, the panel deemed the questions and the protocol fit for use.

Data Analysis

Creswell (2013) likens data analysis to a cycle of constructing and deconstructing garnered information with the goal of building a coherent story. Creswell (2013) goes

further stating that analysis does not happen in a vacuum, that analysis of one aspect of data, an interview or an artifact, may inform ongoing data collection to further refine the collection process to provide richer information. For the purpose of a qualitative study, this analysis is accomplished through the creation of data codes. Through rigorous analysis, codes are further refined into themes which help to delineate emerging patterns in the data as well as provide a richer meaning for the collected information.

Creating codes and coding data was the method used to extricate and to give meaning to information from interviews. A code, according to Saldaña (2009), is “most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (p. 3). Coding is a thought process that creates codes making sense of a jumble of information. Silver (2012) says about knowledge that people need to, “Distinguish signal from noise...” (p. 453). While his quotation refers to knowledge, it also applies to coding. A researcher must be able to parse out items that are relevant from those that are not. Thorough analysis of data is required to tease out good, meaningful codes. Through this analysis, Patton confirms this stating about his past research that, “the more I interacted with the data, the more patterns and categories began to ‘jump out’ at me” (Patton, 2015, p. 530).

Interviews were captured using two recording devices to ensure accurate collection of audio. To further assist in recording quality audio, participants were politely asked, well in advance of their appointments, to consider room acoustics when choosing their interview settings. All CEOs were happy to oblige.

Upon finishing audio transcription, data were entered into NVivo, a computer program that assists in organizing information into nodes (NVivo's term for codes). After reading and re-reading the interviews, ideas began to emerge from data that assisted answering the research questions. It was during this time, the researcher employed the conceptual framework outlined in chapter two to facilitate coding to determine commonalities with the original study as well as define any new themes or concept areas. According to DeSantis and Ugarriza (2000), a theme "brings meaning and identity to a recurrent [patterned] experience and its variant manifestations" and "captures and unifies the nature or basis of the experience into a meaningful whole" (p. 362). Likewise, Saldaña (2009) conveys that changing short, one or two word code into a sentence-long theme helps to better explain a concept. The creation of themes allowed the researcher to separate data according to frequency of appearance into the original study's conceptual areas. Based on the results, the researcher could discern if any changes were required to the conceptual areas or the categories contained therein.

Ethical Considerations

Salkind (2012) provides a cogent point when discussing the importance of conducting ethical research stating, "Individuals must be treated so that their dignity is maintained in spite of the research or the outcomes" (p. 85). The researcher reviewed questions, protocols, and other communications with the participants to ensure there could be no mis-conceptions of deception or coercion. Six elements, or protections, were considered during the entirety of the study to protect those who willingly participated.

The first element was protection from mental or physical harm (Patton, 2015; Patten, 2014; Salkind 2012, McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The researcher queried

each participant and secured from them a time and place of their choosing for the interview. To alleviate possible mental anguish, the researcher reminded participants prior to the beginning of their interviews that self-incrimination or self-identification was not the point of the study.

The second and third elements, which are closely related, were the right to privacy and the right to confidentiality (Patton, 2015; Patten, 2014; Salkind 2012, McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). All information was kept in a password protected system. The researcher re-assured participants that they would be identified in print only by sex and number (e.g. Male001, Female004). Using this method of coding ensured only the researcher would know their identities and their locations. Additionally, participants were told that audio recordings would be kept for a short time to facilitate transcription and coding then destroyed.

The fourth element was coupled with the fifth; knowledge of purpose and informed consent (Patton, 2015; Patten, 2014; Salkind 2012, McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). On multiple occasions, the researcher reviewed the purpose of the study with participants to ensure they knew not only the purpose, but also how its outcome could possibly affect the community college environment. During their interview pre-briefs, participants were reminded of what the interview entailed, how the study could help women in the community college arena, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

The sixth element consisted of a discussion with participants, post-interview, to re-inforce the study's purpose. This also provided the opportunity to inform participants

that, if they wished, the researcher would share the results of the study. During this time, the participants were re-assured of their anonymity in the study.

Validity

Said to be more important than reliability when “evaluating measures” (Patten, 2014, p. 83), validity shows if a test accurately measures the content it is intended to test (Roberts, 2010). Validity for this study was achieved through two means: the employment of an expert panel and the execution of field testing. Panel members were consulted to gather feedback on interview protocols, questions, and verification of data codes. Field testing was conducted not only to provide a dry-run for protocols and questions in a live environment, but also to gather feedback from the participant on the same.

Though construct validity is generally reserved for observations (Patten, 2014), the researcher addressed this topic because he considers part of the interview process as observing the behaviors of participants. Construct validity, defined by Salkind (2012) as “the big one” (p. 125), was determined by the rigor of the researcher from the replicated study. Construct validity was confirmed through the positive alignment of data collected and the underlying theories contained in the literature review.

Reliability

When an assessment measures the same phenomenon more than once and achieves the same outcomes, the assessment is considered to be reliable (Patten, 2014; Creswell, 2013; Salkind, 2012). To address reliability in this study, the researcher employed a two-pronged approach: submitting data to the expert panel for review and the inter-rater reliability method. Eminently qualified to view and interpret collected

data, the expert panel served as quality control and advisor for the researcher's interpretation and portrayal of data. Roberts (2010) described inter-rater reliability as "necessary when measurement involves subjective interpretation" (p. 152). A measure that shows degrees of agreement (Salkind, 2012) between two or more raters on the same subject matter, this inter-rater method established reliability by having different raters evaluate the same interview data, providing their own codes, then, in comparison, showing agreement with more than 80% of the researcher's findings. Patten (2014) mentioned that, though an official "agreement" number did not exist, the lower the percentage of agreement between raters, the more any results from the study may be called into question.

Triangulation was used to establish reliability in the study. Patton (2015) mentions that triangulation was born of individuals measuring distances of the earth along a line or lines of bearing. The military calls this skill intersection. According to Army doctrine, intersection tells a soldier where a point is located on a line of bearing (Department of Army, 2013). As a product of the military with first-hand knowledge, the researcher was taught to find intersections of lines for land navigation. While intersection shows a soldier where to go on the ground, intersection shows the researcher where to go in the study.

An important point Patton (2015) conveys about triangulation is that it is necessary for data converge on the same point consistently not that different sources produce the same data. Triangulation shows this convergence using one of four methods: data, investigator, theory, or methodological. For this study, data triangulation was achieved using interview transcripts, field test data, and data from the literature review.

Limitations

Roberts (2010) stated that limitations generally tend to outline adverse factors that confront a researcher in a study. Conversely, Price and Murnan (2004) claimed that a limitation can provide the researcher the kernel of an idea to recommend future research on the studied topic. Those opportunities for future action are discussed in chapter V. Limitations for the study and steps taken to neutralize them follow:

- Any information provided by participants was self-reported and had to be taken as truth. The purpose of the interview is to collect data, not judge (Patton, 2015). To help alleviate the possibility of mis-truths, the researcher endeavored to build rapport with each participant to encourage honest communication.
- Researcher bias was a possibility during the study. Patton (2015) neatly summed up bias stating, “Feelings are the enemy of rationality and objectivity” (p. 61). In conducting an extensive literature review, the researcher was empathetic after learning the nature of the topic and how pervasive it was in society. To counter this limitation, the researcher reflected on his thinking to avoid invidious practices during interviews.
- CEOs who participated in this study were not representative of the population due to the criteria for their selection for the study. Delimiters for this study were necessary to ensure a sample of participants had knowledge of the topic studied.
- CEOs were located throughout California. Any input provided may be biased by the area in which the individual lives.

- The opportunity to conduct field observations of CEOs to see how they interact with people was not available.
- Researcher's exposure to leadership within the community college system was sparse. Field testing and literature review aided in meeting leaders as well as learning job descriptions and duties.
- Researcher's knowledge of contemporary women's issues was limited. This challenge was solved through a rigorous literature review and discussions with the subject matter experts on the expert panel.

Summary

First, chapter III began with a justification of the study's qualitative, phenomenological direction. Within this segment, the researcher discussed the properties of phenomenology and why this methodology was the appropriate fit for this study. Second, the chapter re-visited the purpose statement and the research questions before plumbing the depths of the study's research design. Third, the researcher introduced the members of the expert panel and their qualifications. Fourth, a rudimentary timeline was provided to show an outline of future events followed by a detailed account of the study's population and sample. Fifth, the chapter outlined an in-depth discussion regarding data collection procedures and analysis. Lastly, the chapter delineated limitations to the study as well as ethical considerations.

CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS

Chapter IV presents the study's major findings. It begins with a brief overview of the chapter followed by a review of the purpose statement and the research questions. The study's methodology is re-visited briefly providing a reminder of the research design, population, sample, and participant demographic data. The presentation of findings for the research questions follows providing a picture of the study's outcomes. The chapter ends with a summarization of findings.

Overview

This chapter details the study's findings through an in-depth investigation of a series of interviews conducted with 14 community college CEOs. The goal of these information gathering sessions was two-fold. The first goal of the interviews was to record and analyze the CEOs' lived experiences as executives to determine their perceptions of male-female interactions and subsequent behaviors as a result of those interactions. The second goal of the interviews was to determine if those behaviors could affect female promotions to CEO in the community college system. Upon analysis, data from the interviews were broken down into smaller, like-themed categories to outline dissonant behaviors and their possible effect on female promotions.

Two community college administrators, who had intimate knowledge of this study's delimitations, provided the names of most of the individuals who were interviewed for this study. A third individual, who was a participant and familiar with the study's delimitations, also served as a source for a few individuals.

Purpose Statement

The first purpose of this qualitative replication study was to discover what behaviors female administrators exhibit that may prompt male administrators with whom they work in a California community college to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance.

The second purpose of this study was to determine what impact these dissonant behaviors may have on women's potential eligibility for advancement to the position of community college CEO in California.

Research Questions

1. What behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college Chief Executive Officers as prompting male administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance?
2. How do selected community college Chief Executive Officers feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement?

Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures

The research questions for this qualitative study were designed and refined to gather data that conveyed detailed accounts of lived experiences of community college CEOs. Patton (2015) tells that "qualitative inquiry contributes to our understanding of the world" (p. 3). To capture these lived experiences, phenomenology was employed as the preferred tool as it served not only to identify, but also to interpret the perceived

existences women executives experience in the community college system and challenges they encounter when competing for CEO positions.

The researcher served as the instrument for this study collecting data by means of in-depth interviews. As this was a replicated study, the original interview questions and protocols were used. Prior to the use of the aforementioned tools, the researcher convened an expert panel to evaluate and to provide suggested updates. Two individuals participated in a field test. Results were analyzed to determine if any modifications to the questions or protocols were needed. Upon receiving IRB approval, 14 individuals were interviewed either face-to-face or telephonically. Prior to their interviews, each participant received an electronic copy of their rights, a form of informed consent for their signature, and questions and protocols for their review. Upon finishing interviews, two transcripts were forwarded for evaluation for reliability. Using the inter-rater reliability method, results achieved better than 85% agreement in coding data.

Population

The population for this study consisted of Community College CEOs in California. The CEO title includes those serving as chancellor, superintendents, and/or president. The pool of CEOs consisted of 136 individuals; about 77 men and 59 women (CCCCO, 2015). The population included participants of both sexes, a range of ages, and come from multi-ethnic, multi-cultural backgrounds. The colleges they lead were located in diverse urban and rural areas.

Further restrictions were applied to the population to determine a target population, “a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the

research” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 129). The target population was restricted to those who had a minimum of two years’ experience as a senior community college administrator – vice president position or higher, were knowledgeable of women’s issues in community college leadership, exhibited strong verbal and non-verbal communication skills, and were recognized throughout the community college arena for their continued support to mentor female community college educators. This study’s sample was chosen from this body of individuals.

Sample

The researcher used purposive criterion sampling and snowball sampling to acquire the sample for this study. The first sampling method was used due to the delimiting factors while the second sampling was used to query CEOs about any fellow CEOs who may have been good sources of information. This second method accounted for four of fourteen participants.

The sample for this study consisted of eight female and six male administrators from a wide area of California, from Sacramento to San Diego. Participants were contacted via email to determine their interest and availability. Reputational cases were used as the researcher possessed a unique opportunity to call on personal relationships to recommend, and, in most cases, to notify participants. These cases accounted for six of fourteen participants. Snowball sampling accounted for four participants. Mass emails accounted for the conscription of the other four participants.

Demographic Data

For anonymity, little demographic data were collected. The identities of this study’s participants required complete discretion because of the positions they occupy in

California's institutions of learning. The sample included 14 individuals, eight female and six male, of a total 136 (CCCCO.edu, 2015) who served as community college CEOs. The total average for the number of years participants served at the executive level is 19.7. The average number of years female participants served at the executive level is 20.5, while the average number of years for males is 18.7.

Table 3

Demographic Data of Sample

Participant	Gender	Years as Executive
f001	Female	25
f002	Female	17
f003	Female	30
f004	Female	32
f005	Female	10
f006	Female	5
f007	Female	20
f008	Female	25
m001	Male	34
m002	Male	21
m003	Male	16
m004	Male	12
m005	Male	10
m006	Male	19

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The researcher conducted 14 interviews with California community college CEOs within a five week time period. All participants received the same interview pre-briefing of their rights and a reminder of the study's focus. While each participant was asked the same base questions, some individuals were asked different follow-up questions in the effort of explaining a point or concept. Upon completion of interviews, each was transcribed. After finishing the final transcription, the researcher undertook coding and analyzing the data.

Codes and themes from the original study were used as a point of departure for organizing data as they were supported by an updated literature review. The use of most codes was reinforced as the new data contained similar information as the original study. A new category was created as two areas of interest were discovered. This process was completed using the NVivo11 program. The findings are presented below by theme.

Perceived Gender Dissonant Behaviors

Focusing on research question one, *what behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college Chief Executive Officers as prompting male administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance*, the four gender dissonance concept areas were explored in-depth. The major concept areas include role confusion, communication differences, cultural differences, and women's personal power which were broken down into sub-components into which coded data were assigned. An emerging, fifth area was explored as well. Table 4 provides a review of the gender dissonance conceptual framework.

Table 4

Gender Dissonance Conceptual Framework

Gender Dissonance Concept	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance
Role Confusion	Expressions of Sexuality	<p>Women whose behavior is perceived by men as a potential source of sexual harassment by men</p> <p>Women who create sexual tension for men at work</p>
	Sex Role Socialization	<p>Women who exhibit behaviors associated with power that are incompatible with men's perceptions of the evolving female sex role</p> <p>Women who exhibit behaviors that are incompatible with men's stereotype of female work and sex roles</p>
	Differing Leadership Skills between Men and Women	<p>Women who exhibit leadership skills like collaboration, shared power, and relationship building that are incongruent to male leadership skills of command and control</p> <p>Women who demonstrate leadership skills such as collaboration, shared power, and relationship building that are viewed as more effective by their organizations than skills of command and control that some males currently use.</p>

(continued)

Gender Dissonance Concept	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance
Communication Differences	Different Conversational Styles	Women who boast
		Women who talk in an indirect manner
		Women who are perceived to talk too much
		Women who are perceived to use annoying methods of speech
	Conversational Rituals	Women who use apology
		Women who criticize others
		Women who are overly sensitive to criticism
		Women who gossip
		Women who ask others' opinions before making a decision
Cultural Differences	Women's Confrontation of the Dominant Culture	Women intrude into previously male dominated areas of work
		Women who request and receive special advantages or considerations in the work setting because they are women
	Men's Competition with Women	Women who encroach upon men's sense of entitlement, prestige, and power
		Women who gain administrative promotions that men perceive are not based solely on qualifications but on gender
Women's Personal Power	Women's Self-Confidence Issues	Women who need to prove themselves
	Women's Power Issues	Women who need to control and dominate

Role Confusion

This area outlined three categories within the major concept. The categories are expressions of sexuality, sex-role socialization, and differing leadership skills between men and women. These categories were broken down into sub-categories into which data were coded. These sub-categories, which served as themes, were discussed in greater detail within the study. Table 5 outlines behavioral situations related to role confusion as well as the number of examples and references provided by participants.

Table 5

Behaviors Related to Role Confusion that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs

Situations Related to Role Confusion in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance	Number of CEOs who Reported Behaviors			Number of References of Behaviors Reported		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Expressions of sexuality	3	0	3	9	0	9
Women whose behavior is perceived by men as a potential source of sexual harassment problems for men	0	0	0	0	0	0
Women who create sexual tension for men at work	3	0	3	9	0	9

(continued)

Situations Related to Role Confusion in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance	Number of CEOs who Reported Behaviors			Number of References of Behaviors Reported		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Sex role socialization	6	7	13 ^a	24	66	90
Women who exhibit behaviors associated with power that are incompatible with men's perceptions of the evolving female sex role	5	7	12 ^b	18	33	51
Women who exhibit behaviors that are incompatible with men's stereotype of female work and sex roles	6	6	12 ^c	6	33	39
Differing leadership skills of men and women	4	4	8	25	11	36
Women who exhibit female leadership skills that are incongruent with male leadership skills	4	4	8	25	11	36
Women who demonstrate female leadership skills that are viewed as more effective by their organizations than male leadership skills	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note. Total number of participants is 14 (females=8, males=6).

^aTotal number of participants who responded to the overall *Sex Role Socialization* category. ^bTotal number of participants who responded to the *Evolving Female Sex Role* theme. ^cTotal number of participants who responded to the *Incompatible with Men's Stereotype* theme.

Expressions of sexuality. Within this category are two themes: Potential source of sexual harassment for men and women who create sexual tension for men. While the sexual harassment theme received no feedback from this sample, the sexual tension theme received nine total comments, all from male participants. Table 6 provides a

breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings.

Feminine appearance was a point of contention. Participant m001 expressed his frustration on multiple occasions stating, "There are times when I'll see a female administrator and think...WRONG, not appropriate." He opined further sharing, "If somebody is wearing something that's too tight or if their cleavage is too exposed, you know, how do I deal with that? Should I tell this female administrator about her appropriateness of dress?"

Participant m005 provided a candid story about a social situation he observed inappropriate behavior involving a female supervisor and a male subordinate,

When she would get a little drunk, (she would) come up and rub the shoulders of this male subordinate. The situation was exacerbated because the male's wife was standing there. He kept trying to squirm away, sort of laugh about it and sort of trying to playfully slap away her hands (to get her) to stop doing it. She took it as a come on. Finally, he stepped out, looked at her and said (her behavior) wasn't appropriate and left the party.

Participant m005 finished with another example of perceived inappropriate behavior. He reminisced about what he considered egregious behavior,

I was president at the time (when) a male (administrator) filed a Title IX discrimination act against female superior for unwanted sexual advances. I lived through it. He claimed that during a meeting, she sat next to him and rubbed the side of his leg. When he said no, she retaliated by moving his office...that was his claim.

Erchull and Liss (2013) provide in their study that females may use their sexuality as an empowerment tool over men feeling it gives females an advantage despite discomfort or possible outcomes such as the Title IX complaint mentioned in the previous example.

Table 6

Women who Create Sexual Tension for Men at Work

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Feminine appearance	Discomfort, anger, frustration	2	0
Inappropriate/questionable dress	Discomfort, anger, frustration	4	0
Inappropriate behavior	Annoyance, confusion, anger, fear	3	0

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=3 (males=3, females=0).

Sex role socialization. Within this category are two themes: Evolution of the female sex role and conflict with men's stereotypes and the female work and sex role. These two themes received the most comments than any other section of the study. Tables 7 and 8 provide a breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings.

Within the *Evolution of the Female Role* theme, three female behaviors were noted. The behavior that registered the most entries was women's leading or commanding style. Twelve participants, seven females and five males, conveyed in most of the 55 comments provided how women have come to embody traditionally male leadership characteristics, a concept known as role incongruity (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005). This phenomenon was noticed and detailed in the observations that follow.

Of the females, participant f008 recounted not just the female's incongruent behavior, but also the result of that behavior when she stated, "(In a general administrator's meeting) I've had some very aggressive, competitive females, who, it seemed, the more aggressive they were, the more dismissive their (male) peers were toward them." Participant f001 mentioned that some male leadership, "Had issues working with women, especially strong women who were very linear and logical in the way that they worked." Speaking about a female colleague, f001 recalled, "I think she's had struggles and difficulties because she doesn't fit the M.O. (modus operandi) of being female." Participant f004 added a similar story telling, "The female's (way of) leading did not fit well with the men...she let them know that she was in charge and they had to do what she said." Participant f003 provided her example about men's perceptions declaring, "I have seen males react to female leaders with a sexual moniker, "Well, she must be a lesbian' ...They equate toughness with maleness."

The male participants provided examples of their own. Participant m002 shared his workplace observations providing,

Women (administrators) can only be *so* ambitious and *so* assertive and at the point where they really start to advocate for themselves and really start to push the envelope and show that they want that promotion, that they want to be in charge, there's this line that's crossed that goes from she's a 'go-getter' to she's 'difficult' or language that's more colorful than that. I think that that is something that men still struggle with...They struggle with female power.

Participant m004, who shook his head disparagingly while speaking about his observation, added,

The stronger the female leader, a female who is authoritative, controlling, (who is) less soft in her approach, the more she is mocked...at times men are relentless...since it's a woman, they (males) are much more critical...women who are authoritative, directing, strong or outspoken...males have nice, negative terms for them and seem to frown upon female leadership that embodies those terms.

Participant m003 contributed his observations with a measure of incredulity in his voice discussing a situation with former colleagues,

(The male administrator) talked about her (female administrator) ineffectiveness as a leader...saying that she tended to be dominant, tended to be overly assertive, not listen to the individuals who were requesting various types of services and felt that was inappropriate for her role because she had been selected specifically to be 'supportive.'

Eagly and Karau (2002) explain the cause of these findings as males reacting to females acting too much like their male colleagues as well as male's perceptions that women leaders are not as able leaders as men (Eagly & Carli, 2003). These female behaviors create confusion with their male coworkers and put females at a disadvantage to attain positions of greater authority.

Six participants listed assessment as a point of contention. It was reported that some men not only took exception to receiving a female's input for improvement, but also became belligerent at the prospect of such an idea. Participant m001 started the dialog about males' resistance during evaluation providing his observation,

(I think) there's a bit of naiveté among female administrators that it's so simple and obvious everybody should want to do (what they recommend), and it's not the

case with male administrators...it's like the females want the males to do something different, so males ask 'Tell me why you want me to do that, tell me why it's not working and who are you to tell me that what I've been doing has not been working well and why should I just adopt this?'

Others contributed the same type of sentiment. Participant m004 mentioned, "Females giving advice...males just don't take it seriously." Participant f007 gave a more vivid accounting, "The female administrator had to have somebody else there during the (counseling) session. The male called her a raging bitch, said who are you to tell me how I'm doing?" Participant f006 rounded out the comments stating that it is a "lack of professional courtesy."

Five individuals listed females' directness with males as an area of interest. One female participant mentioned, "(A female CEO's) personal style did not fit well with the men. She let them know that she was in charge and they had to do what she said." Participant m006 put this behavior simply as, "(The female) was very direct (with him) and he didn't like it...his reaction seemed like he was just disgusted by her." Participant m003 provided her personal account, "I confronted him (male supervisor) about it (a possible illegal action) and stated I wasn't comfortable carrying that (action) out. (In a sarcastic tone), he basically told me to do it anyway." Researchers Annis and Grey (2013) convey that men do not like to be challenged, to have their maleness questioned.

Table 7

Evolution of the Female Sex Role

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Evaluation, assessment	Anger, frustration, resentment, uneasiness	6	5
Confrontation, directness	Anger, resentment, uneasiness	4	7
Commanding, leading	Anger, dismissal, resentment	8	21

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=12 (males=5, females=7).

The *Male Stereotype Conflict* theme garnered 39 responses over three content areas. Thirteen participants conveyed in their responses that female leaders who step outside the expected sex role stereotype risk alienating their male co-workers. The behaviors mentioned were assertiveness, being decisive, and defiant; those behaviors that are associated with the male leadership style (Baker, 2014; Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Participant f007 shared the story of a colleague stating, “She was chastised for her assertiveness during an evaluation. She was told during the counseling that she needed to be nicer and more “lady-like.” F007 elaborated further saying, “(The male) thought what he was saying was ok, that he was trying to help her out...Isn’t that shocking?”

Participant f001 reinforced this view stating, “Assertiveness is a kind of behavior from a woman that is sometimes seen as a very negative thing...abrasive” and that “if they behaved the same as a male, it was off-putting to the men.” Participant f004 contributed her input about a female colleague conveying, “The men didn’t want to work with her because she didn’t act like a woman. She wasn’t collaborative, didn’t ask for ideas, didn’t care about her people. No one wanted to work with her...” Participant f008

finished adding her contribution, “They (the males) saw her (the female administrator) as too aggressive, too sarcastic, and no fun.”

The male contributors echoed this sentiment. Participant m004 disclosed, “One female CEO who was an interim and applied for the job exhibited certain behaviors that violated gender expectations. Those behaviors were discussed and she was passed over for the job.” Participant m002 provided a similar experience, “Two female executives I worked for were extremely competent and extremely strong-willed. I’m not sure males worked well with them because of it. It caused annoyance.” Participant m006 relayed his observations stating,

The female administrator was very confident, almost aggressive in how she worked and the males had issue with that. She was very direct and they didn’t like it...Very strong women can be perceived somewhat negatively and it can be the cause of frustration...people get irritated.

The violation of these gender role expectations the participants describe in their interviews is documented in existing literature as role incongruity. Researchers Eagly and Diekmann (2005), Eagly and Carli (2003), and Eagly and Karau (2002) provided the foundations of the role congruity concept that supports the validity of participants’ observations.

A minor point three individuals conveyed was that males looked down upon females who acted inappropriately in a social setting whether a female was just “letting her hair down” and being herself after hours or if she were enjoying an alcoholic beverage. Participant f001 stated, “I’ve seen reactions where men were put-off by women who might be more aggressive or different outside the workplace in using

(colorful) language, (telling) a joke, or consuming alcohol.” Participant f004 mentioned, “When a female drinks and drinks too much, I’ve witnessed it come back and haunt her. The higher up she was in the organization, the more of a problem it caused.” A common phase repeated between all three respondents was, “if the person were a male, no one would have had a second thought about it.”

Table 8

Conflict with Men’s Stereotypes and the Female Work and Sex Role

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Assertive, decisive, competitive	Confusion, anger, frustration, resentment	6	28
Inappropriate social behaviors	Confusion, disgust	0	5

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=12 (males=6, females=6).

Differing leadership skills between men and women. Within this category are two themes: Women whose feminine leadership style is perceived as more effective and women who exhibit traditional female leadership characteristics. Table 9 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females’ perceived behaviors as well as males’ resultant feelings.

Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) mentioned leading with emotion as a female leadership trait. This particular quality was noted by over half of respondents as a factor that could cause dissonance between males and females. Six females and four males provided 26 separate entries on how emotion and the discussion of feelings may affect female leaders in a work setting. Participant f001 mentioned emotion and its synonyms 11 times summing up the perception of female leadership with emotion as ultimately

negative conveying that when “a female becomes too emotional in a conversation, the male wants to end that conversation and doesn’t want to hear her opinion because of that...he becomes uncomfortable.” Participant m006 reinforces this view sharing this story,

A male supervisor got into a heated discussion with (a female subordinate) about a topic and she cried. She lost it a little bit and she cried. That created a reaction in the room. You could tell the supervisor really kind of pulled back. I think it make him very uncomfortable.

Participant m002 finished with his assessment that the use of emotion conjures “perceptions that women aren’t serious or capable or strong enough” to lead.

Two areas receiving fewer comments were collaboration and empathy. Collaboration was characterized as a necessary tool by the female respondents, but not one always well received. They conveyed that they thought some males felt collaboration impeded the flow of business. A male respondent alluded to this in his contribution, “Women...are collaborative about moving forward versus being correct or incorrect which is generally what I get from men.” Participant f003 stated, “When I see female bosses communicate with male subordinates, I see them go the extra mile to be as objective, as equal as they could possibly be...sometimes it’s not well received”

A general feeling among female respondents was that empathy was a concept not readily accepted by males. Participant f001 clarified her position stating, “A female starts talking about personalities involved and the best approaches to deal with each. The male doesn’t want to talk about that, he just wants to get an answer.” She elaborated further stating, “(Males) see it as a weakness when a female tries to explain (feelings) or

they have negative reactions because a female tries to explain how people might be feeling.” Three male participants conveyed that there was a perception among males that the extra time and effort required to discuss affective aspects of issues was “unnecessary,” “a waste of time,” and “irritating” which tended to cause frustration and annoyance in men. A female respondent summed up stating, “In general, men are uncomfortable when it comes to the affective aspects of the job.” Eagly and Karau (2002) provide evidence in their research that this behavior occurs naturally, that it falls within society’s gender norms to which those in the community college environment are exposed.

Table 9

Women who Exhibit Traditionally Female Leadership Characteristics

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Emotional, passionate, feelings	Confusion, anger, avoidance, dismissal, frustration, resentment	6	16
Empathy	Frustration, dismissal	1	10
Collaborative, communal	Annoyance, confusion, resistance	1	6

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=9 (males=4, females=5).

Communication Differences

This area outlined two categories within the major concept. The categories are different conversational styles and different conversational rituals. These categories, shown in Table 10, were broken down into sub-categories into which data were coded. These sub-categories, which served as themes, were discussed in greater detail within the study.

Table 10

Behaviors Related to Communication Differences that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs

Situations Related to Communication Differences in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance	Number of CEOs who Reported Behaviors			Number of References of Behaviors Reported		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Different Conversational Styles	0	4	4 ^a	0	13	13
Women who boast	0	2	2 ^b	0	2	2
Women who use indirect speech	0	2	2 ^c	0	2	2
Women who talk too much	0	3	3 ^d	0	9	9
Different Conversational Rituals	2	5	7 ^e	4	14	18
Women who criticize	2	1	3 ^f	2	1	3
Women who are overly sensitive to criticism	1	5	6 ^g	2	13	15

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=9 (females=7, males=2).

^aTotal number of participants who responded to the overall *Conversational Styles* category. ^bTotal number of participants who responded to the *Boasting* theme. ^cTotal number of participants who responded to the *Indirect Speech* theme. ^dTotal number of participants who responded to the *Talk Too Much* theme. ^eTotal number of participants who responded to the overall *Conversational Rituals* category. ^fTotal number of participants who responded to the *Criticize* theme. ^gTotal number of participants who responded to the *Overly Sensitive to Criticism* theme.

Different conversational styles. Within this category are three themes: Women who boast, women who use indirect speech, and women who talk too much. Only one theme in this category gathered more than two responses. Two themes from the original study received no responses and were not included in the findings. Table 11 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings.

Three participants conveyed that women who talk too much may be a turn-off. One male respondent said, “All she wants to do is *talk*.” A female participant declared, “Males are more brief...(there is) probably frustration when females try to carry on too long to explain something.” The same female conveyed that, “Sometimes females like to talk out loud to think and I think that males find that to be really annoying to listen to.”

Women who use indirect speech was noted as an area of annoyance and frustration for males. Participant f001 mentioned a woman who talked “all around the edges” was not regarded as a good communicator to her people. Another female participant added, “There was a female supervisor I knew who thought on a different level...she tended to speak so quickly and concisely that her male subordinates feared asking for explanation as they felt it would lessen their standing in her eyes.”

Boasting received a few comments from three participants. The general idea of boasting was provided by a male participant that it was “perceived as arrogant” and a female participant as “not well-received by males.” Participant f001 mentioned that, “While this behavior is considered a negative for females...females need to proclaim their accomplishments to be ‘noticed.’ Without doing this, promotion to higher levels would be much more difficult...though it’s usually to our detriment.” Carli (2006) supports these findings claiming that how women communicate with their male colleagues must be measured and relevant, if not, they risk incongruity.

Table 11

Different Conversational Styles

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Women who boast	Irritation, frustration, resentment	0	2
Women who use indirect speech	Annoyance, frustration, confusion	0	2
Women who talk too much	Annoyance, frustration, dismissal, resentment	0	9

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=4 (males=0, females=4).

Different conversational rituals. Within this category are two themes: Women who criticize and women who are overly sensitive to criticism. There were three themes from the original study that received no responses. Table 12 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings.

One male participant took the time to provide an in-depth comment about female criticism. He shared,

The training was about Title IX gender equity. The presentation included every bad example you could think of. It was the reaction of more than one man in the room of, "What are we here for...just to be beat up with all the negative things men do instead of providing us with actual helpful situations that would help us diagnose situations and react appropriately?" They attributed the training to this senior woman manager's attempt, in their opinion, to knock down the alpha male egos. That's the way they took it.

It is worth noting that the male had a look of disdain on his face during the telling this story. It appeared to the researcher conducting the interview that dissonance occurred in

his telling the story. Another male participant, with a look of amusement on his face, told of a female's criticism of the males in her organization's hierarchy saying, "The males always like to make the rules on how the game is played, then we females get to figure out how to interpret those rules."

Four female participants label defensive behavior resulting from criticism as one that may cause dissonance. All mention situations in which a female has been questioned on a project or a decision she had made and become emotional rising to defend her position. Participant f002 summed up the point remarking, "When a female tries to defend or tries to justify or argue her case, I have seen men often say, 'Well don't get defensive about it...'" Participant f003 added, "It's happened to me, it's happened to my female subordinates, it's happened to my female colleagues." Another female stated, "I've seen a few times where females have gotten courageous and tried to approach a subject, but when challenged, used phrases like "I didn't put in a lot of time," you misunderstood," or "that wasn't my intent." Participant f005 finished with her response stating, "What was difficult was having to...come back again and again and again before I could get a decision made in my favor." Carli (2006) and Eagly and Karau (2002) convey in their research that women have to be more competent than men to be heard and when their competence is questioned, they must be prepared to defend.

Table 12

Different Conversational Rituals

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Women who criticize	Anger, discomfort, demeaned	2	1
Women who are overly sensitive to criticism	Confusion, annoyance, avoidance, anxiety, retreat	2	13

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=4 (males=0, females=4).

Cultural Differences

This area outlined two categories within the major concept. The categories are women's confrontation of the dominant culture and women's competition with men. These categories, as shown in Table 13, were broken down into sub-categories into which data were coded. These sub-categories, which served as themes, were discussed in greater detail within the study.

Women's confrontation of the dominant culture. Within this category are two themes: Women who intrude into previously male dominated areas and women who request and receive special advantages or considerations in the work setting because they are women. There were three themes from the original study that received no responses. Table 14 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings.

Table 13

Behaviors Related to Cultural Differences that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs

Situations Related to Cultural Differences in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance	Number of CEOs who Reported Behaviors			Number of References of Behaviors Reported		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Women's Confrontation of the Dominant Culture	3	2	5 ^a	3	4	7
Women intrude into previously male dominated areas	1	1	2 ^b	1	3	4
Women who request and receive special advantages or considerations in the work setting because they are women	2	1	3 ^c	2	1	3
Women Who Encroach Upon Men's Sense of Entitlement, Prestige, and Power	3	8	11 ^d	5	14	19
Women who are pushy	1	2	3 ^e	1	3	4
Women who are perceived to be a threat	3	7	10 ^f	3	11	14
Women who are perceived as receiving undeserved promotions	2	0	2 ^g	2	0	2

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=12 (females=8, males=4).

^aTotal number of participants who responded to the overall *Confrontation* category. ^bTotal number of participants who responded to the *Intrusion* theme. ^cTotal number of participants who responded to the *Special Advantages* theme. ^dTotal number of participants who responded to the *Encroach* category. ^eTotal number of participants who responded to the overall *Pushy* theme. ^fTotal number of participants who responded to the *Perceived Threat* theme. ^gTotal number of participants who responded to the *Underserved Promotions* theme.

One female and one male commented on this intrusion concept. Both individuals mentioned social settings as the point of contention. Participant f003 remarked that any female, “speaking to the good old boys club risks a lot.” If she “talks sports, she had better be able to “throw down some statistics and get into the nitty-gritty” otherwise “the males won’t take her seriously.” Participant m004 augmented this statement saying, “Females are taken less seriously, less listened to, almost mocked at times (in these situations).”

Participant m005 provided the sole comment for female specific special considerations. The consideration was maternity leave for a subordinate. The participant conveyed that after much conversation with the female and some shaming, the male supervisor made it clear to her that, “This situation was very clearly a hassle that she was pregnant and was going to be gone for a while.”

Table 14

Women’s Confrontation of the Dominant Culture

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Women intrude into previously male dominated areas	Confusion, frustration, resentment	1	3
Women who request and receive special advantages or considerations in the work setting because they are women	Irritation, resentment	2	1

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=4 (males=0, females=4).

Women’s competition with men. Within this category are two themes: Women who encroach upon men’s sense of entitlement, prestige, and power and women who gain

administrative promotions that men perceive are not based solely on qualifications but on gender. Table 15 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings. Behaviors are broken into three areas.

Eleven participants commented on perceived threat. Women were not just seen as people who were jeopardizing male entitlement, but were also jeopardizing the male way of life. Participant f007 conveyed this with her detailing of nominating females for leadership positions within her institute, "There are certain male supervisors who have *never* gone with a female nominee when filling a leadership position. They have *always* gone with a male. Participant m005 shared a situation where a male introduced his subordinate female in a particular way stating, "I want you to welcome her to the floor...she's not really as smart as the rest of us, but she's just a girl so we'll give her a break." Shortly after the introduction, the female resigned from her position eliminating any threat she posed to her supervisor. Participant f001 told that,

A female administrator competed for CEO job at a school she worked for, but didn't get it...it went to a male. Despite the disappointment in not getting the job she pledged to help the incoming person. Even though he got the job and she was helpful to him, I feel like he still felt threatened by her.

Participant f007 conveyed her observation,

I have seen assertive male supervisors to female subordinates using casual settings to intimidate the female, to mitigate any challenge, saying, 'I'm coming after you...I didn't want you taking the position you're in and now I'm going to bury you in it.' It's happened only to women and it's happened numerous times.

Also included in the threat theme was a phenomenon of male administrators overtalking female administrators either to finish her thought or provide his own. Participant f007 said, “Talking over...males over talk females and won’t do it to males. The male will overtalk the female or intervene...they will minimize, trivialize what females are saying...the same thing from a man would be considered great.” Participant f002 stated, “I’ve seen men overtalk women (on multiple occasions).”

Three individuals discussed the annoyance females cause when they force or attempt to force males to move on with conversations or meeting proceedings. They are seen as pushy or insistent. Participant f001 said of a female, “I think she really wanted to discuss more of the details to get some answers to move forward on an initiative, but he didn’t want to...it caused an issue.” The result was his irritation not only with her, but also with the rest of the group. Participant m006 remembered an experience when a male supervisor and female subordinate got into an argument during a public presentation about a data point. “She wanted to discuss it, but he shut down. Their relationship wasn’t the same after that.”

Two participants relayed observations about undeserved promotions. Participant m003 stated candidly, “A particular woman who had moved up in the organization was characterized as using her gender with influential males to get ahead.” The other participant did not provide concrete evidence, but only alluded to female promotion stating that they did not have the proper qualifications or were inexperienced. One of the participants shared the allusion, “(The male administrator) said who are you to tell me? You don’t know...you just got that job for whatever...”

DeBoer (2004) and Gurian and Annis (2008) support these data in their research. They inform that males are competitive and territorial and to intrude into their domain risks hardship. Oakley (2000) added that when females become part of that dynamic, a part of the male “world,” it is seen as a threat.

Table 15

Women’s Competition with Men

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Women Who Encroach Upon Men’s Sense of Entitlement, Prestige, and Power		4	14
Pushy, insistent	Annoyance, frustration, impatience	1	3
Threat	Fear, anger, humiliation	3	11
Women who gain administrative promotions that men perceive are not based solely on qualifications but on gender	Irritation, resentment, frustration	2	0

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=11 (males=3, females=8).

Women’s Personal Power

This area outlined two categories within the major concept. The categories are women’s self-confidence issues and women’s personal power. These categories, as shown in Table 16, were broken down into sub-categories into which data were coded. These sub-categories, which served as themes, were discussed in greater detail within the study.

Table 16

Behaviors Related to Women's Personal Power that Females Administrators Exhibit that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance as Reported by Community College CEOs

Situations Related to Women's Personal Power in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that Prompt Males to Exhibit Gender Dissonance	Number of CEOs who Reported Behaviors			Number of References of Behaviors Reported		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Self-Confidence Issues	3	2	5	4	9	13
Excessive or over-preparation/overcompensate	1	1	2	1	8	9
Resistance to "women's" administrative tasks	2	1	3	3	1	4
Power Issues	5	2	7	6	2	8
Controlling	2	1	3	2	1	3
Motherly, sisterly	3	1	4	4	1	5

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=8 (males=4, females=4).

^aTotal number of participants who responded to the overall *Self-Confidence* category.

^bTotal number of participants who responded to the *Over-preparation* theme. ^cTotal number of participants who responded to the *Resistance* theme. ^dTotal number of participants who responded to the *Power* category. ^eTotal number of participants who responded to the overall *Controlling* theme. ^fTotal number of participants who responded to the *Motherly* theme.

Women's self-confidence issues. Within this category is one theme, women who need to prove themselves. Table 17 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings. Behaviors are broken into two areas.

Two females and one male mention that females' excessive attention to detail and over-preparation cause challenges with their male colleagues. Participant f005 mentioned, "Women *have* to be better prepared than men. It may cause irritation with them, but that's the only way women are seen as a valid participant in a conversation."

She continued, “despite anything, it’s about preparedness,” “females have to be able to articulate,” and “you have to have a stronger level of preparation, evidence-based preparation...to prove a certain level of competence in order to be competitive.” The sole male shared his observation about a female subordinate administrator,

I’ve witnessed women who are trying to prove they belong and get really aggressive in a meeting especially if they are a new administrator. I had to pull one of my female subordinates aside and ask her what problem she was having. After some tears, she said she was trying to overcompensate because she had worked her way through the ranks. She was now a peer to her former boss and he didn’t respect her. She was looked at as ‘the little girl who grew up.’ Because of this she was trying to over compensate by being louder, more prepared and more educated about what was going on. What was happening though was she was pushing her colleagues away.

Sandberg (2013) and the female participant shared two sides of this area conveying the idea that women have to be better prepared to be heard, but can also see how they get portrayed as a “know-it-all.”

A small number of participants discussed women’s reactions to being asked to perform “secretary” tasks. One female detailed a story, “A group of males asked the sole female to go get coffee for the group. The female hesitated, was brow-beaten, then finally acquiesced to the request.” Both male participants provided, “I’m not sure why, but females in a group were always expected to take the minutes or perform other administrative tasks that kept them from being a full participant in the group’s activities,

no matter how few females were in the room. The men were never asked...that doesn't seem fair."

Table 17

Self-Confidence Issues – Women who Need to Prove Themselves

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Excessive/over-preparation	Irritation, dismissal	1	8
Resistance to "women's admin tasks	Confusion, frustration, annoyance	3	1

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=4 (males=3, females=1).

Women's power issues. Within this category is one theme, women who need to control and dominate. Table 18 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females' perceived behaviors as well as males' resultant feelings. Behaviors are broken into two areas.

The two female respondents discussed situations where, "Females had taken on a motherly or sisterly role with their colleagues...it caused confusion in the men." The male contributor detailed a story where the female "took extraordinary steps to accommodate" requests providing "excessive amounts of time" for workers to finish their tasks. This special consideration frustrated one male because in his perception, "There was no productivity going on."

Two males provided scathing comments about females' need to control. Participant m001 mentioned a female he hired. He stated, "One of the females was enamored with the power and it's worked to her detriment." The other male provided a short statement about a female supervisor discussing her proclivity toward power stating,

“She has stepped all over this senior male leader. It damaged his relationship with his subordinate.

Table 18

Power Issues – Women who Need to Control and Dominate

Behaviors Exhibited by Females	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Number of References	
		Males	Females
Motherly, sisterly	Confusion, frustration	4	1
Controlling	Annoyance, anger	2	1

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=4 (males=3, females=1).

Evolution of gender interaction. Within this new category is one theme, males not wanting to offend women. Table 19 provides a breakdown of keywords that describe females’ perceived behaviors as well as males’ resultant feelings. Behaviors are broken into two areas.

Lack of access to feedback emerged as a new challenge. Six participants provided their observations. Of the group, one female provided her opinion on why males do not share feedback stating, “I think that Title IX and other legislation that’s come out has something to do with it. It scares people to death to not say or do anything.” A male contributor shared his view saying, “There’s an unwillingness on the part of men to engage in heated dialog with women at work so it tends not to happen. It’s as if they feel it’s inappropriate.” Another male mentioned, “(There’s) sort of a fear of a man offending a woman telling her she’s being too dominant.” The general mindset of the group was that men simply do not want to take any unnecessary risks to offend their female colleagues. Participant m001 summed up this point stating, “The (male)

supervisor sometimes thinks that she wants to be doing something else, but won't address it for fear of offending.”

A male and a female commented that men are now becoming too inclusive not knowing where the “line of appropriateness” is drawn. The female provided a first person account of her inclusion into the good old boys club. They expected her to be one of them. She recounted, “There’s kind of an old boys network and I’ve had experience with bosses thinking I can just fit into that...there was an expectation I could be one of the guys...but I wasn’t.” The male contributor discussed male banter saying, “I’ve seen male supervisors making sexist jokes and then trying to qualify them by saying (to the female), ‘You’re one of us.’” Both alluded to the fact that men end up confused with hurt feelings because they do not know how to be appropriate. Participant m005 provided a final observation about a male trying to be complimentary to his female colleague but falling short and offending her, “At my previous institution, one of the male administrators kept talking at length about a female administrator’s shoes to the point where it made her very uncomfortable. He thought he was being complimentary...”

Table 19

Evolution of Gender Interaction

Theme	Behaviors Exhibited by Males	Male Dissonant Behaviors	Number of References	
			Males	Females
Males not wanting to offend	Lack of feedback/constructive criticism	Fear, frustration, annoyance	4	2
	Too inclusive, overstep limits	Confusion, uneasiness, fear	2	2

Note. Number of CEOs reporting behaviors, n=7 (males=5, females=2).

Effects of Dissonant Behaviors

Focusing on research question two, how do selected community college CEOs feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement, all 14 participants were in agreement that perceived behaviors could contribute to non-selection. The point of their departure from one another was at which particular point in the process the behaviors would have an effect. Each participant provided an outlook. Aggregated comments appear in Table 20.

Participant f001 detailed her vision that embodied a traditional female role, I think that anytime a female is not assertive, not immediately decisive, that a female considers peoples' feelings and emotions, has empathy for people...those kinds of things can be considered negative especially in the role of CEO because the idea is that a CEO is supposed to be very strategic, very linear, very "bottom-lined," focused on those types of things.

Participant f002 provided an insight that concurs with f001. She conveyed that, "Often times we hire those who are like us...that's kind of human nature." Leading with a traditional female style does not help if males are the hiring committee. If males comprise a majority of the hiring boards, females may continue to lag in promotions.

Participants f003, f004 and, f005 registered the same comments, "Women have to prepare more than males to be able to compete...to overcome any weakness can be very difficult for a woman." In the effort to come out ahead, this extra preparation stands in contrast to the self-confidence issue of being over-prepared. Being over-prepared invites this idea of "Miss Know-It-All" for the male hiring panel.

All of the male participants stated, in some form, that females need to be agentic in their behavior to be successful, but measured in their employment of traditionally male leadership methods. They mentioned that when women are assertive, decisive, and strong, they may get a positive reaction from some people and a negative reaction from others to include hiring boards. Discussing the negative perceptions, participant m006 stated, “One of the things I’ve seen is very strong women can be perceived somewhat negatively,” while participant m005 quipped, “I still think there are some outdated roles...I think women also struggle with trying to manage all those roles as well.” Participant m004 gave an example, “A female CEO exhibited certain behaviors that violated gender expectations, those behaviors we discussed, and she was passed over for the job.”

Table 20

Specific Behaviors that Community College CEOs Perceive are Likely to Limit a Woman’s Potential Eligibility for Advancement to a CEO Position

Participant	Behavior Mentioned by Participant
F001	I think any time a female is not assertive, not immediately decisive, that she considers peoples’ feelings and emotions...has empathy...these may hinder promotion Being too assertive is seen as negative
F002	A female needs to be seen as competent, assertive...that she can be decisive in the position and isn’t afraid to make tough decisions
F003	A female has to act like a male to compete with the males. Those on the hiring board tend to hire what they know...white males
F004	If she’s not professional she won’t make it. If she’s not prepared, she won’t make it.

(continued)

Participant	Behavior Mentioned by Participant
F005	If they don't prepare, if they don't communicate, if they show weakness...all these may end her plans to advance
F006	I don't think in this day and age in California something like this would occur. Our colleges are equal opportunity
F007	Not showing feeling or emotion is a big part, not being prepared or incompetence will take her out of the running
F008	Anytime a female is seen as too aggressive, too restrictive or sarcastic...competitive
M001	Women who aren't collaborative, who can't show their accomplishments or depth of experience
M002	The perception that women aren't serious, or capable or strong enough to lead...that they are too emotional
M003	Domineering behavior, inflexible
M004	A strong female leader who is authoritative, controlling and less soft
M005	Women are expected to manage all things for all people Being too aggressive, over or underprepared, isn't put together well
M006	Aggressive, very strong, very direct women

Note. Number of participants is 14.

Findings Related to Research Question One

This section was dedicated to answer research question one: What behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college Chief Executive Officers as prompting male administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance? Findings 1 – 10 provided the substance to answer research question one. In their detailing, these findings outlined behaviors females exhibit that could lead to dissonant behaviors in males.

Finding 1: Expressions of Sexuality

The findings of this section showed that male CEOs were more attuned to perceived sexual behaviors that may cause gender dissonance than their female counterparts. Half of the males interviewed reported having issues with and negative feelings about being put in awkward situations. The lack of female responses may indicate that men are more willing to discuss these behaviors and the effects they have on their employees.

Based on the evidence provided, women's behavior that expresses their sexuality caused men to feel dissonant feelings; angry at having to make an uncomfortable decision, discomfort and frustration in dealing with stressful work and social situations. These findings indicate that female administrators who express their sexuality in the workplace can cause male administrators to experience gender dissonance.

Finding 2: Evolution of the Female Role

The findings in this section suggest that both female and male administrators are attuned to the challenges females face in leadership positions in a changing work environment through their adoption of a more direct, more aggressive leadership style. Seven females and five males confirmed that female leaders were challenged by males in all aspects of work, from making every day decisions to providing feedback on employee evaluations. They provided examples of male reactions to female leadership that ranged between mild dissension to outright hostility.

Based on this evidence, women leaders caused men to experience dissonant feelings. Male administrators continue to have challenges with seeing women in leadership roles especially those at senior levels. Evidence shows that some still continue

to possess the mindset that males lead. In their efforts to act as an effective leader in the workplace and to keep up with the organization's operational tempo, females have caused anger, frustration, resentment, and uneasiness in some of their male co-workers.

Finding 3: Conflict with Men's Stereotypes and the Female Work and Sex Role

The findings of this section suggest that women leaders are willing to take charge and lead, to step outside of society's expectations of a woman in the workplace, but at a risk of causing dissonance with her male co-workers. Four male administrators shared that, in their experiences, they noticed women who were "go-getters," as opposed to more of a milquetoast-type of leader, were not well received by their male co-workers. As one respondent mentioned, "Women can only be *so* ambitious."

The findings also show that males want women to behave in two different ways, as what they think defines a leader and as what they think defines a woman. More than half of the responses for this section focused on females embodying "male, agentic" leadership characteristics when they led. Those same responses generally provided a negative view of their leadership styles demonizing the females for their use. Responses described these women as too difficult, too direct, too unpleasant. At the same time, these responses showed that male administrators lament those female leaders who act too soft, too indecisive, too feeling, and too inclusive. Based on this evidence, women who acted outside of their assigned work and sex role caused dissonance to occur in men.

Finding 4: Differing Leadership Skills Between Men and Women

Findings of this section show that females' leadership was viewed as over emotional, with too much passion, and focused too much on the affective aspect of human relations. The males discussed the male's negative viewpoints of such

characteristics and the negative feelings associated with them. Five female administrators were even more vocal echoing some of the male stance. Females described multiple instances when, as women showed any type of emotion or passion in a workplace setting, most were immediately met by negative responses from males exacerbating situations. Based on the evidence shown, females caused males to experience dissonant feelings.

Finding 5: Different Conversational Styles

A section with fewer responses, the findings in this area showed that females use some methods of communication males do not find useful. A quarter of the females interviewed mentioned that males considered females who boasted arrogant or not well liked. Additionally, two females mentioned that women's use of indirect speech caused annoyance and frustration with males. Three of the study's respondents expressed the frustration men feel when women talk out loud to think or talk too much. Based on these observations, and the evidence provided, females caused males to feel dissonance using these conversational styles.

Finding 6: Different Conversational Rituals

The findings for this section show that giving and receiving criticism is a part of the female leaders work life, both giving. The findings also show that females may have difficulty in dispensing or accepting this type of feedback. Eighteen total references were made to criticism with six females listing defensiveness as the number one female behavior exhibited regarding a sensitivity to criticism. Males experienced a gambit of dissonant feelings surrounding the criticism topic like anger, discomfort, frustration,

confusion, annoyance, avoidance, anxiety, and retreat. Based on the evidence provided, females' exhibition of these behaviors caused males to experience dissonant feelings.

Finding 7: Confrontation of the Dominant Culture

Findings in this section show that females' want of inclusion as well as expectation of special accommodations has a negative effect on males. One male respondent shared his observation that a female informing her supervisor that she needed maternity leave was clearly too much for him to handle. Additionally, a female's desire to be a part of the crowd is a source of consternation in males. These requests cause men to exhibit anger, confusion, frustration, and resentment. Based on these observations, females who exhibit these types of behaviors cause men to experience dissonance.

Finding 8: Encroaching on Men's Sense of Entitlement, Prestige, or Power

Findings in this section show that females who upset male privilege has a negative effect on men. Three individuals detailed how females who are described as pushy annoy and irritate men. Two participants shared their experiences of males who perceived that some females received promotions not based on merit, but on their gender. The male behaviors the participants associated with these promotions was irritation and resentment.

The final theme was the perceived threat. Seven females and three males detailed how some females and their behaviors were seen as threatening the male, such as defiance, doubt in their leadership, and non-compliance. They also listed some of the reactions of some of the males. This perceived threat caused fear, anger, humiliation, irritation, and humiliation. Based on these observations, females exhibiting these behaviors cause men to experience dissonance.

Finding 9: Women's Personal Power

Findings in this section showed that women still need to prove themselves in the workplace as well as show they are in control. One female provided eight responses that women had to be extra prepared to compete with men never minding the irritation and dismissal it caused in their male colleagues. Another observation upon which three participants expounded was women's resistance to executing duties considered traditionally "female." Feedback shared detailed males who felt confusion and annoyance for those females exhibiting a resistant attitude.

Findings in this section were few, but showed that women were looked at negatively when they took on controlling or motherly behavior. One male participant conveyed his story about a controlling female leader with vitriol... "She stepped all over him." Two females discussed the female "motherly" aspect as causing confusion in men. Based on these observations, females exhibiting these behaviors cause men to experience dissonance.

Finding 10: Evolution of Gender Interaction

Findings in this section showed that men have a hard time relating to women. As feedback shows, current legislation makes people afraid to provide any information that can be perceived negatively. Because of this, two males and two females reported that some women lack important substantive feedback from their male colleagues. These constraints on men make them feel fear, frustration, and annoyance

In the effort to be inclusive and be more equal, males have begun to include females in various events. Findings show that this may not be a good idea as females reported that the males are going too far, that they do not know the limits. One male

provided his story talking about a male who started out complimenting a pair of shoes and ended up offending the wearer and making an entire room sit in discomfort. The lack of knowledge for men makes them feel confusion, uneasiness, and fear.

Findings Related to Research Question Two

This section was dedicated to answer research question two: *How do selected community college Chief Executive Officers feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement?* Finding 11 provided the substance to answer research question two. In its detailing, the finding outlined behaviors females exhibit that participants felt could limit females' ability to be promoted to senior levels.

Finding 11: Effects on Future Employment

Findings in this section show the results of the group of 14 participants. Seven of the female and all the male participants felt that not only was it likely that the exhibition of certain behaviors could constrain a female's chances for promotion, but they could also keep her out of the eligibility pool altogether. One respondent provided a different view on the process.

Four females conveyed that women candidates needed to show agentic leadership qualities, to act like a male to be able to compete. One female said the candidate can be seen as too assertive and needed to model female leadership characteristics. Two females listed a lack of preparation and a lack of professionalism as a problem. One participant thought that this type of thing no longer occurred in California.

Five male participants provided answers that were in opposition to the answers the four females supplied. The males stated emphatically that females needed to refrain

from exhibiting agentic qualities if they wanted to be considered for promotion. A lone participant echoed the four females stating that a woman needed to be strong to be considered otherwise she will not get a look from the hiring committee.

Summary

Starting with the role confusion concept, the study focused on three areas: Expressions of sexuality, sex-role socialization and differing leadership styles between men and women. In the first area, the data showed that while sexual harassment was not an area of focus, there was tension caused between females and males through what was perceived as inappropriate dress and behavior on the part of females. Observations provided instances of these behaviors and the discomfort felt by males.

In the second area, sex-role socialization, data provided a glimpse into views on the evolution of the female sex role and the conflict between men's stereotypes and the female work-sex role. These two areas provided the most feedback of any part of the study. The evolution section provided comments on how females were perceived as leaders, their leadership styles, their methods of operation, and their demeanor. The conflict section provided an overview of the female's use of male leadership traits; how much they acted like men. All of these behaviors were reviewed and were determined to have the capacity to contribute to dissonance.

The final area showcased women being women. The area also showed how adhering to a female style could be to their detriment. Female leadership characteristics were reviewed and were examined to see what dissonance could occur from those methods being more effective than male characteristics.

Communication differences, the next major concept, contained two content areas that were reviewed. Differing conversational styles was first area. It looked at the effects of how women talk: Too much, indirectly, or boasting. Observations provided data highlighting instances where dissonance occurred due to these reasons. Differing conversational rituals was the second area. This area focused on the effects of giving and receiving criticism and the part they played in causing dissonance.

Cultural differences, the third area, contained two content areas as well. Women's confrontation of the dominant culture provided a glimpse into how women's intrusion into male social areas caused confusion and frustration in males due to females' entry into a culture that was traditionally male dominated. The second area revealed tensions from perceived advantages females received because they are women. Women's competition with men not only presented data showing how threatening women are perceived, but also how the threat of a woman is handled. This section also provided a glance at the perception of females' underserved promotions and the dissonance they can cause.

The final section, women's personal power detailed the self-confidence issues as well as personal power issues. Data in this section recorded women's reactions to inappropriate requests from males as well as males' reactions to females' need to over-prepare. Females' need to dominate was also visited and data were provided to show how this need may cause dissonance. A new section was added to the original framework that highlighted males' behaviors like an unwillingness to provide candid feedback, to be too inclusive with their female colleagues and to show a child-like defiance.

The chapter finished with an examination of the second research question. The investigation reviewed the effects of those dissonant behaviors that participants felt would impede a female's potential promotion to the CEO level. This question elicited reflective responses from participants. Each provided a thoughtful, and sometimes emotional, answer to help illustrate a picture of what a female administrator may face when applying for a CEO position. Looking at responses from each individual, clues emerged as to what behaviors may be an impediment to future promotion.

CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

“There must be a beginning of any great matter, but the continuing unto the end until it be thoroughly finished yields the true glory.”

- Sir Francis Drake

Chapter V is the culmination of work executed in earlier sections. The chapter links theory and literature developed in chapter II to the results revealed in chapter IV. In this chapter, major findings are re-visited connecting them to their research questions. Following the findings, the researcher provides opinion as to any unexpected findings in the study, conclusions about the findings, implications for action for community college hiring practices, and recommendations for further research. The chapter closes with a soliloquy discussing final thoughts about the journey to enlightenment.

Purpose Statement

The first purpose of this qualitative replication study was to discover what behaviors female administrators exhibit that may prompt male administrators with whom they work in a California community college to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance.

The second purpose of this study was to determine what impact these dissonant behaviors may have on women’s potential eligibility for advancement to the position of community college CEO in California.

Research Questions

1. What behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college Chief Executive Officers as prompting male

administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance?

2. How do selected community college Chief Executive Officers feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement?

Methods

The research questions for this qualitative study gathered data that conveyed detailed accounts of lived experiences of community college CEOs. To capture these lived experiences, phenomenology was employed as the preferred tool. This method served to identify and to interpret the perceived existences women executives experience in the community college system and challenges they encounter when competing for CEO positions.

The researcher served as the instrument for this study collecting data by means of in-depth interviews. As this was a replicated study, the original interview questions and protocols were used. Interviews consisted of four questions. Interview questions 1 – 3 contained six scenarios for those interviewed to consider. Fourteen CEOs were interviewed either face-to-face or telephonically. Each individual received an electronic copy of their rights as a participant, a form of informed consent for their signature, and questions and protocols for their review prior to their interviews.

Population

The population for this study consisted of Community College CEOs in California include chancellors, superintendents, and presidents. The pool of CEOs consisted of 136 individuals; about 77 men and 59 women (CCCCO, 2015). The

population included participants of both sexes, from a range of ages, and come from multi-ethnic, multi-cultural backgrounds. The colleges they lead were located in urban and rural areas throughout the state.

Sample

The researcher used purposive criterion sampling and snowball sampling to acquire the sample for this study. The first sampling method was used due to the delimiting factors while the second sampling was used to query CEOs about any fellow CEOs who may have been good sources of information. This second method accounted for four of fourteen participants.

The sample for this study consisted of eight female and six male administrators from a wide area of California, from north of Sacramento to the north of San Diego. Participants were contacted via email to determine their interest and availability. Reputational cases were used as the researcher possessed a unique opportunity to call on personal relationships to recommend, and, in most cases, to notify participants. These cases accounted for six of fourteen participants. Mass emails accounted for the conscription of the other four participants.

Major Findings

This qualitative, phenomenological study produced data gathered from interviews that formed the foundation of the study's key findings. These findings served to reveal what behaviors exhibited by female administrators were perceived by selected community college CEOs as prompting male administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance. The findings also divulged how selected community college CEOs felt

dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators may impact women's eligibility for advancement to the CEO position.

Summary of Findings Related to Research Question One

This section highlights findings to answer research question one: *What behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college Chief Executive Officers as prompting male administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance?* They showcased behaviors females exhibit that could lead to dissonant behaviors in males. Further, findings provided the information from which to draw conclusions.

Finding 1: Role Confusion - Expressions of Sexuality

About 20% of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were feminine appearance, inappropriate dress, and inappropriate behavior. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting discomfort, annoyance, frustration, anger, and fear.

Finding 2: Role Confusion - Evolution of the Female Role

More than 85% of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were commanding/demanding, confrontation, and judging/evaluation/assessment. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting resentment, frustration, anger, uneasiness, and dismissal.

Finding 3: Role Confusion - Conflict with Men's Stereotypes and the Female Work and Sex Role

More than 85% of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were being assertive, decisive, and competitive, as well as acting inappropriately in social situations. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting resentment, frustration, anger, confusion, and disgust.

Finding 4: Role Confusion - Differing Leadership Skills Between Men and Women

About two-thirds of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were showing emotion, passion, empathy, and being over collaborative. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting avoidance, annoyance, resentment, resistance, frustration, anger, confusion, and dismissal.

Finding 5: Communication Differences - Different Conversational Styles

About 30% of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were boasting, talking too much, and using indirect speech. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting anger, discomfort, demeaned, annoyance, avoidance, confusion, anxiety, and retreat.

Finding 6: Communication Differences - Different Conversational Rituals

Half of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were criticism and sensitivity to receiving criticism. Those who shared instances when

dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting avoidance, annoyance, resentment, resistance, frustration, anger, confusion, and dismissal.

Finding 7: Cultural Differences - Confrontation of the Dominant Culture

About 35% of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were intrusion into male dominated areas and requesting or receiving special advantages because of gender. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting irritation, frustration, and confusion.

Finding 8: Cultural Differences - Encroaching on Men's Sense of Entitlement, Prestige, or Power

About 80% of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females were being pushy or insistent, actions that males perceive as a threat, and undeserved promotions. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting irritation, frustration, annoyance, impatience, fear, anger, humiliation, resentment, and confusion.

Finding 9: Women's Personal Power

About 60% of the study's participants classified various female behaviors as causing dissonant feelings in male co-workers. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females who had self-confidence issues were excessive/over-preparation or overcompensation and women's resistance to assuming administrative tasks. Dissonant female behaviors exhibited by females who had power issues were being controlling or

motherly. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting irritation, dismissal, frustration, confusion, annoyance, and anger.

Finding 10: Evolution of Gender Interaction

Half of the study's participants classified various male dissonant behaviors caused by other factors that affect relations with their female co-workers. Results of these behaviors were a lack of feedback or constructive criticism and males being too inclusive with females or overstepping boundaries. Those who shared instances when dissonance occurred identified males as exhibiting annoyance, frustration, fear, confusion, and uneasiness.

Summary of Findings Related to Research Question Two

This section highlights findings to answer research question two: *How do selected community college Chief Executive Officers feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement?* They showcased behaviors females exhibit that participants felt could limit females' ability to be promoted to senior levels. Further, the finding provided the information from which to draw a conclusion.

Finding 11: Effects on Future Employment

About 95% of the study's participants conveyed that female promotions could be impacted by dissonant behaviors. Four females and one male participant mentioned that a female leader lessens her chances at receiving a promotion if she employs female leadership characteristics like emotion and empathy. Five males and one female participant provided an opposing view stating females are at a disadvantage when they employ male leadership characteristics. Two female participants said lack of preparation

would hinder promotion. One female participant stated that this type of thing is unlikely to happen.

Unexpected Findings

There were two areas of interest that yielded unexpected results: Sexual harassment in the workplace and differences in communication. A robust amount of information on sexual harassment in the workplace and its effects was included in the literature review. To highlight this workplace phenomenon, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's 2015 data on sexual harassment cases were included. There was an expectation that a quarter of the CEOs experienced some kind of sexual harassment scenario in their schools. Findings show that none of the CEOs reported behaviors that could be considered as sexual harassment. A possible explanation for a lack of these occurrences may be found in a response from a participant, "I think that Title IX and other legislation that's come out has something to do with it. It scares people to death to not say or do anything."

A majority of participants claimed that they had no issues with general communication. In reviewing the original study, there were nine situations listed where dissonance occurred. In this study, not only did the number of situations shrink to five, but also the number of responses given for those five areas was few. Given the amount of information included in the literature review on the nine situations, as well as the addition of new areas like uptalk and vocal fry, it is unusual that the results did not garner more responses discussing challenges in communication.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were surmised based on the study's findings:

Conclusion 1: Male Administrators Become Frustrated and Lose Respect for Women Leaders When Presented with Any Form of Sexuality in the Workplace

The male participants in this study provided first person accounts of their experiences dealing with female sexuality. During interviews, the males made no effort to cover their discomfort. Each male told his story with disdain in his voice. Males want females to know the limits and, according to them, to dress and act appropriately to avoid uncomfortable situations. Ultimately this spares the males the embarrassment of having to talk to a female about her dress or conduct. In her research, Annis (2013) concluded that these days men feel as though their actions are under scrutiny making them hesitant to address such personal, intimate issues and in doing so cause inequality in the workplace.

Conclusion 2: Women Leaders Continue to Experience a No-Win Situation and Need to Increase Their Emotional and Political Intelligence Awareness of This Situation as They Navigate New Leadership Roles Predominately Held by Males

Findings show that males want females to take on a dual persona: to be strong, assertive leaders while showing soft, communal, nurturing sides that speak to their femininity. Combining findings from three areas, data revealed males did not react well to females' expression of emotion, passion, or communality in the workplace. Interviews told of some males' reactions as leaving the room to escape the discomfort of female emotion. However, some of these same males fall back on old stereotypes stating that no one wants to follow a woman who does not act like a woman. Evidence appears to show

that while women continue to evolve to meet the challenges of the modern workplace, men's concept of the woman leader has lagged behind and contributed to men experiencing dissonant feelings. Herrera, Duncan, Green and Skaggs (2012) support this conclusion stating in their research that women will continue to face this double bind until mindsets change. Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) contribute that women have to be more deliberate and more strategic when filling leadership positions.

Conclusion 3: While Over the Past Decade Communication Clashes Between Men and Women Have Improved, Women who Criticize Men are at Risk of Alienating Men in the Workplace

Findings reveal that respondents in this study conveyed the idea that communication between the sexes has improved over time. Comparing the findings of this study and the original study, this appears to be true. Females did cause some dissonant feelings to occur in men, but only a fraction of those instances reported in the original. Less than a quarter of participants listed boasting, indirect speech, and talking too much as points of contention. It is worth mentioning that these factors were seen as minor points and not seen as major infractions.

The female relationship to criticism was the stand out element in these findings. Males did not like to be criticized by female leaders and were more likely to challenge females' leadership authority in these situations. Even more vociferous were the participants who discussed females' sensitivity to receiving criticism. The cause and effect of this item was certain to cause dissonant feelings in men. "Stop being defensive," "You don't have to be defensive," and "Why are you crying?" were all phrases associated with a male response to a female reacting to criticism or feedback. In

their research, Annis and Gray (2013) support this conclusion relaying instances of males telling female supervisors it was not their place to criticize their duty performances. Additionally, the researchers also conveyed that many of the male participants they interviewed expressed an uneasiness with counseling or providing feedback to females. They did not feel comfortable in a situation where they felt their subordinates would cry.

Conclusion 4: Despite Improvement, Some Males Still Perceive Females as Imposters in the Workplace who Threaten the Males' Way of Life

Findings show that, in general, conditions continue to improve with female inclusion into the male-dominated workplace culture. While some males are more accepting of their female colleagues, others see women as threatening, trying to obtain special favor, or receiving undeserved promotions. Findings revealed that women still suffer abuse when asking for maternity leave or consideration for similar occasions. Findings also revealed that females continue to suffer because they are seen as a threat to men's power. As evidence, one female participant shared a situation she observed. During the exchange, the male supervisor said to the female subordinate, "I'm coming after you...I didn't want you taking the position you're in and now I'm going to bury you in it." Finally, there are some males who perceive that some females are promoted without merit. All these situations cause dissonance in men and make the work environment contentious. DeBoer (2004) and Gurian and Annis (2008) support this conclusion stating simply that men do not like to compete against women.

Conclusion 5: Internal Struggles with Personal Power Continue to Haunt Female Leaders

Findings showed that females still struggle with internal barriers. Although two participants mentioned over-preparation, one of them repeated preparedness eight times during her interview. She also mentioned that her male colleagues sometimes became short with her becoming annoyed because she “knew it all.” Females discuss preparation as a means to be on the same level as their male colleagues. The males see over-preparation as distracting and annoying whereas they view females who are too controlling with anger and distaste. Males viewed authoritarian women as a person with whom they would not care to work. Annis and Gray (2013) provide support to this conclusion stating that women who have to be the keeper of all knowledge and know more was a source of contention in the workplace.

Conclusion 6: Unintended Consequences Emerge as a Result of Equality Measures

Findings revealed that the evolution of gender relations with the accompanying legislation and training had some side effects. Because of rules and regulations in place, males are less likely to give candid feedback or constructive criticism for fear of crossing an unknown line, offending a female colleague, and getting in trouble. It is the same unknown line that gets males in trouble when trying to include women in various events. In general, men do not have the ability to determine where to draw a line of appropriateness. They may seek to treat all equally, but in doing so forget the individual and her preferences. While not caused by females, males experience dissonant feelings because of these factors. The Daily Telegraph (2015) published poll results that support

this conclusion. The statistics showed that about 9500 participants that felt men would not provide adequate feedback to females for fear of any fallout.

Conclusion 7: Females Need to be Aware of Gender Dissonance in the Workplace that May Have an Effect on Promotion Outcomes as a Way to Increase Their Opportunities to Advance to Top Positions of Leadership in Community Colleges

Findings showed that behaviors females exhibit can cause dissonance in males and have an effect on females' ability to be competitive for selection to CEO positions. In evaluating women for these positions, four female and three male participants stated that women needed to embody male leadership characteristics to gain access to top level positions. They stated that women had to show strength, determination, and decisiveness to be seen as a good leader and a good candidate for the CEO position. What these participants see as strengths in females, four other respondents said had the potential to cause dissonant feelings in males.

Whatever the situation in which females find themselves, they need to be savvy enough to assess the situation and determine how to approach a particular group to side-step any possibility of gender dissonance. If females are unable to adapt, they will continue to lag in promotions to the CEO level. Sutton (2015) and Sandberg (2013) convey that women will no doubt face issues, but need to be aware of their surroundings to assess how to best approach any problems.

These seven conclusions provide evidence that those areas listed in the problem statement, like barriers to promotion and gender role incongruity, are as present today as 20 years ago. That these problem factors still exist lends importance to the study's

significance. These conclusions detail the need for this and future studies to further educate future generations to combat workplace inequality.

Implications for Action

Based on the findings and conclusions from this study and an extensive review of the literature, the following implications for action are recommended for the community college system, State Chancellors office, the colleges and women seeking positions of leadership in the community college arena. The goals of these implications are to educate about how men and women are different (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007) and how to move forward providing a better future between men and women in the workplace.

1. Create an awareness of gender dissonance and how it occurs. Schools can accomplish this by providing an initial mandatory information session at each college to acquaint staff and faculty with gender dissonance and how it affects female progression in the workplace. Break-out sessions by gender would be required to allow women to share and provide strategies with one another on how to lessen dissonant-causing behaviors. This time will also allow men to share experiences and devise strategies to handle situations to preempt dissonant feelings.
2. Schools follow up initial information sessions with semi-annual information sessions to reinforce the commitment to promote awareness to prevent the phenomenon.
3. Actively incorporate gender dissonance into its annual training on Equal Opportunity highlighting the implications of discriminatory practices.

4. Create a team or teams to travel to campuses to provide workshops on gender dissonance to raise awareness of its impact on hiring practices, promotions, consideration for tenure, and overall gender relations in the workplace.
5. Create and publish reasonable guidelines to provide mediation in situations where gender dissonance occurs to assist women who fall victim to dissonance.
6. Provide workshops on resolving conflict between men and women in a positive way. Channeling conflict positively would help build teams rather than tearing them apart and reduce dissonance men may feel toward women.
7. Provide widest distribution of a reasonable dress code for its employees. Through mutual understanding, all employees will know organizational expectations.
8. Provide a third party to assist addressing sensitive topics to the opposite sex. Male respondents from this study indicated that men experience dissonance when addressing sensitive topics, like appropriate dress, to their female colleagues. A third party may help alleviate these feelings.
9. Present the results of this study at conferences and symposia for the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) and the Community College League of California (CCLC) to inform members of each organization about gender dissonance, about how it affects women, about how it affects women who

seek promotion to positions of increasing authority, and about how to manage its occurrence from the male and female sides.

10. Community college women's organizations like the American Association for Women in Community Colleges (AAWCC) and American Association of University Women (AAUW) provide women with information on gender dissonance specifically highlighting what behaviors females exhibit that may cause dissonance in males. In educating women on these elements, they may find alternate means through which to communicate with their male colleagues without causing dissonance and bettering their chances of being promoted.
11. Recruiting agencies educate their recruiters on gender dissonance to lessen the likelihood of its occurrence when searching for qualified candidates.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the study's findings, further research is recommended in the following areas to bring more clarity to this gender dissonance topic:

1. A replication study that uses the same population, but with a different sample. With a population of about 140 administrators, providing a broader view within the same group would provide better clarity of gender dissonance in the community college arena.
2. A replication study that considers generational differences among the CEOs. Interview responses for this study indicated that the younger CEOs reported fewer instances of dissonance in the workplace. Considering the mindset of each generation could determine if these dissonant behaviors would remain or fade out with the retirement of older CEOs.

3. A replication study that considers geographical differences of the schools or districts the CEOs lead. Interview responses for this study revealed a geographical dividing line in the state. Based on this dividing line, a CEO's answer was likely to divulge how much, if any, dissonance occurred.
4. A replication study that considers four year institutions. With an organizational structure in place similar to community colleges, it would be interesting to see how these institutions, typically with a larger student body and more staff and faculty, compare to their community college siblings.
5. A replication study that re-visits the population from the original study of superintendents encompassing a wider area of California. A generation has passed since the original study. During this time many superintendents have retired, school districts have been re-drawn, and newer leaders with new ways of thinking have taken command.
6. A replication study that focuses on the business community. As mentioned in the original study, a majority of the literature from this study came from the business world. Conducting this study would not only serve to inform business leaders of dissonance, but the study would also provide a side-by-side comparison of business vs. education.

A Comparative Look at the Original Study

In Dr. M. Ryder's original 1998 study, she researched gender dissonance in the K-12 superintendent population in southern California. This study was the first of its kind using an exploratory approach to shed light on how this dissonance phenomenon affected female-male interactions and relationships. Behaviors were diagnosed according to three

content areas: Role confusion, communication differences, and cultural differences. By study's end, Dr. Ryder found a fourth content area, women's personal power.

Within these content areas she found that there were specific behaviors women exhibited that caused men to exhibit harsh feelings or reactions. She detailed responses from her sample of male administrators feeling anger, resentment, frustration, confusion, and other negative sentiments due to some action performed by a female administrator. The actions included female dress, methods of speech, intrusion into the male domain, as well as internal barriers women encounter to name a few. Based on these and other data, Dr. Ryder was able to see what effects these dissonant behaviors may have on females' potential promotion to superintendent.

This study and her study were mostly similar in form and substance. This study, using a phenomenological approach, looked at the same behaviors men and women exhibit in the same three main content areas. The fourth area was investigated as well. By study's end, the researcher found what may be another content area, evolution of gender interaction. Though this study took place 18 years after the original study, similar answers were provided for the same content areas. Dr. Ryder's answers are as valid today as they were in 1998.

Though the findings and conclusions of both studies are similar in tone, there were two key differences overall. The volume of answers received on the current study was smaller even though the researcher used the original protocols and questions. There were three reasons for this based on the researcher's investigation: A participant had no example to provide, a lack of preparation for the interview, or the participant's need to speed along the interview to finish quickly. The other difference was the concentration

of answers. While Dr. Ryder's sample provided input over all four content areas fairly evenly, this study witnessed a concentration of answers in role confusion and one of the themes in cultural differences. Because of this, it led the researcher to conclude that gender communication has improved in the workplace since the original study.

Concluding Remarks and Reflections

On its own, the community college system is complex and requires a great deal of time and patience to understand. As well, gender relations and interactions between men and women are complex, often fraught with peril and also take a great deal of time and patience to understand. With this study, I married these two complex elements and attempted to discern how one affected the other. I studied this topic for two reasons: It was interesting to me, but more importantly, I could look at myself and see that I was an offender...I made snap judgments about women for no valid reason. I made decisions about females for no valid reason. I wanted to find out why.

As I began a journey of discovery through the literature, I learned that women want to be known and noticed for being themselves as much as men want to be known and noticed for being themselves. Surely the story would not be that simple. As I set out talking to my sample, I found that it was that simple. It was the purest simplicity I could hope to investigate...Know me for who I am. Though hours of interviews, I found that phrase was difficult. Both sexes detailed stories, some fantastic and unbelievable, that told of negativity, malice, and scorn...the dissonance experience. After cobbling together my findings and digging into the conclusions, I found that, while some gender situations were still not so good, many others had improved. I look to see it improve in the future.

I am thankful to have taken this journey and I know my life is better for it.

REFERENCES

- Afifi, W. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (2000). The impact of violations on uncertainty and the consequences for attractiveness. *Human Communication Research*, 26(2), 203.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2010). An investigation of female and male constructs of leadership and empowerment. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 25(8), 640-648.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2014). *2014 Fact sheet* [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu>
- American Psychological Association. (2011a). Answers to your questions about transgender people, gender identity, and gender expression. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/topics/lgbt/transgender.aspx>
- American Psychological Association. (2011b). Definition of terms: Sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/resources/sexuality-definitions.pdf>
- Anderson, R., Klofstad, C., Mayew, W., & Venkatachalam, M. (2014). Vocal fry may undermine the success of young women in the labor market. *PLOS ONE*, 9(5), 1-8.
- Annis, B. (2010). *Same words, different language: An updated guide for improved gender intelligence at work* (2nd ed.). Alpharetta, GA: Barbara Annis & Associates, Inc.
- Annis, B., & Gray, J. (2013). *Work with me: The 8 blind spots between men and women in business*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Annis, B., & Merron, K. (2014). *Gender intelligence: Breakthrough strategies for increasing diversity and improving your bottom line*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Arnould-Taylor, W. E. (1998). *A textbook of anatomy and physiology*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.
- Baird, J. Jr. (1976). Sex differences in group communication. A review of relevant research. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 62, 179-192.
- Baker, C. (2014). Stereotyping and women's roles in leadership positions. *Industrial & Commercial Training*, 46(6), 332-337.
- Bales, R. F. (1950). A set of categories for the analysis of small group interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 15(2), 257-263.
- Ballenger, J. (2010). Women's access to higher education leadership: Cultural and structural barriers. *Forum on Public Policy Online*, 2010(5), 1-20.
- Bao, A., & Swaab, D. (2011). Review: Sexual differentiation of the human brain: Relation to gender identity, sexual orientation and neuropsychiatric disorders. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology*, 32, 214-226.
- Basham, M., & Mathur, R. (2010). Dynamic development in community college administration: Theories, applications, and implications. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 149, 25-32.
- Begley, S. (2015). This woman was the first female general in the U.S. armed forces. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/3916073/anna-mae-hays-female-general/>

- Benenson, J., Markovits, H., Thompson, M., & Wrangham, R. (2011). Under threat of social exclusion, females exclude more than males. *Psychological Science*, 22(4), 538-544.
- Berenbaum, S., & Beltz, A. (2011). Sexual differentiation of human behavior: Effects of prenatal and pubertal organizational hormones. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology*, (2), 183.
- Berger, J., Cohen, B., & Zelditch, M. (1972). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 37(3), 241-255.
- Berger, J., & Fisek, M. (1974). A generalization of the theory of status characteristics and expectation states. In J. Berber, T. Connor, & M. Fisek (Eds.), *Expectation states theory: A theoretical research program* (Chapter 6). Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, C.E. (2000). Separation/individuation, parental attachment, and male gender role conflict: Attitudes toward the feminine and the fragile masculine self. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 1, 126–132.
- Borg, W., & Gall, M. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Borstein, R. (2008). Women and the college presidency. In J. Glazer-Raymo (Ed.), *Unfinished Agendas: New and continuing gender challenges in higher education* (Chapter 7). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.
- Bowles, H.R., & Babcock, L. (2012). How can women escape the compensation negotiation dilemma? Relational accounts are one answer. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37, 80–96.

- Briles, J. (1996). *Gender Traps: Conquering confrontophobia, toxic bosses, & other landmines at work*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Briles, J. (1999). *Woman to woman 2000: Becoming sabotage savvy in the new millennium*. Far Hills, NJ: New Horizon Press.
- Burgoon, J., & Hale, J. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs*, 55(1), 58.
- Burgoon, J. & Walther, J. (1990), Nonverbal expectancies and the evaluative consequences of violations. *Human Communication Research*, 17, 232–265.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations, and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 12(1-2), 30-48.
- Burgoon, J. K. (2009). Expectancy violations theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication*.
- Burke, S., & Collins, K. M. (2001). Gender differences in leadership styles and management skills. *Women in Management Review*, 16(5), 244.
- California Community College Chancellor's Office. (2015). *Faculty and staff demographics* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://datamart.cccco.edu/Faculty-Staff/Staff_Demo.aspx
- Campbell, S., Mueller, K., & Souza, J. M. (2010). Shared Leadership Experiences of Women Community College Presidents. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, 8(1), 19-32.
- Carli, L. (2006). Gender issues in workplace groups: Effects of gender and communication style on social influence. *Gender and communication at work*, 69-83.

- Catalyst. (2014). *Feeling Different: Being the “other” in US workplaces*. New York: Catalyst, January 16, 2014.
- Catalyst. (2016a). *Statistical Overview Of Women In The Workforce*. New York: Catalyst, April 6, 2016.
- Catalyst. (2016b). *Women CEOs of the S&P 500*. New York: Catalyst, July 1, 2016.
- CBS News (2016, July 26). “Hillary Clinton appears in video at DNC.” [You Tube].
Project: Report. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ee1p7bBF4uQ>
- Center for American Progress. (2014). *The women’s leadership gap: Women’s leadership by the numbers*. Washington DC: J. Warner.
- Chandra, S. & Sharma, R. (2007). *Research in education*. New Delhi, India: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) LTD.
- Chesler, P. (2002). *Woman's Inhumanity to Woman* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: Lawrence Hill Books.
- Chin, J. L. (2012). Women and leadership: Transforming visions and current contexts. *Forum on Public Policy Online*, 2011(2).
- Claus, V. A., Callahan, J., & Sandlin, J. R. (2013). Culture and leadership: women in nonprofit and for-profit leadership positions within the European Union. *Human Resource Development International*, 16(3), 330.
- Coder, L., & Spiller, M. S. (2013). Leadership education and gender roles: Think manager, think '?'. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*(2), 21.
- Congressional Research Service (2010). *Membership of the 111th congress: A profile*. Retrieved from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40086.pdf>

Congressional Research Service. (2012). *Membership of the 112th congress: A profile*.

Retrieved from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41647.pdf>

Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2013). Above the glass ceiling: When are women and racial/ethnic minorities promoted to CEO? *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(7), 1080.

Correll, S. & Ridgeway, C. (2003) Expectation states theory. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Chapter 2). New York, NY: Plenum.

Counter, R. (2016). The case for...being cool with uptalk? *Canadian Business*, 89(3), 16.

Creswell, J. (2013). *Research Designs: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cundiff, N. L., & Komarraju, M. (2008). Gender differences in ethnocultural empathy and attitudes toward men and women in authority. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, (1), 5.

DeBeauvoir, S. (1949). *The second sex*. New York, NY: Vintage.

DeBoer, K. (2004). *Gender and competition: How men and women approach work and play differently*. Monterey, CA: Coaches Choice.

Department of the Army. (2013). *Map reading and land navigation* (TC 3-25.26).

Washington, DC: Author.

Department of Defense. (2010). *DoD personnel and procurement statistics*. Retrieved from www.defense.gov

DeSantis, L. & Ugarriza, D. N. (2000). The concept of theme as used in qualitative nursing research. *Western Journal of Nursing Research* 22(3), 351-72.

- Diekman, A., Johnston, A., & Loescher, A. (2013). Something old, something new: Evidence of self-accommodation to gendered social change. *Sex Roles, 68*(9/10), 550-561.
- Eagly, A. H. (1983). Gender and social influence: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist, 38*(9), 971-981.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 459-474.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*(1), 1-12.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003a). Finding gender advantage and disadvantage: Systematic research integration is the solution. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 851-859.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003b). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 807-834.
- 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., & Diekman, A. B. (2005). What is the problem? Prejudice as an attitude-in-context. In J. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 19-35). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 233-256.

- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. (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).
- Erchull, M. & Liss, M. (2013). Exploring the concept of perceived female sexual empowerment: Development and validation of the sex is power scale. *Gender Issues*, 30, 39-53.
- Farley, S., Timme, D., & Hart, J. (2010). On coffee talk and break-room chatter: Perceptions of women who gossip in the workplace. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(4), 1-8.
- Festing, M., Knappert, L., & Kornau, A. (2015). Gender-specific preferences in global performance management: An empirical study of male and female managers in a multinational context. *Human Resource Management*, 54(1), 55-79.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Foust-Cummings, H., Dinolfo, S. & Kohler, J. (2011). *Sponsoring women to success*. New York: Catalyst, 2011.
- Friedman, S. (2015). Still a “stalled revolution”? Work/family experiences, hegemonic masculinity, and moving toward gender equality. *Sociology Compass*, 9/2, 140-155.

- Fumagalli, M., Ferrucci, R., Mameli, F., Marceglia, S., Mrakic-Sposta, S., Zago, S., & Priori, A. (2010). Gender-related differences in moral judgments. *Cognitive Processing, 11*(3), 219-226.
- Furst, S. A., & Reeves, M. (2008). Queens of the hill: Creative destruction and the emergence of executive leadership of women. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 372-384.
- Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55*(1/2), 51-61.
- Gardner, S. (2015). Choice theory: Gender roles and identity. *International Journal of Choice Theory & Reality Therapy, 35*(1), 31-36.
- Gay, L. (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Gheaus, A. (2015). Three cheers for the token woman! *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 32*(2), 163.
- Gill, K., & Jones, S. J. (2013). Fitting in: Community college female executive leaders share their experiences--a study in west Texas. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 6*(1), 48-70.
- Gillespie, A. (2006). *Becoming Other: From Social Interaction to Self-Reflection*. Information Age Publishing.
- Glick, P., Chrislock, K., Petersik, K., Vijay, M., & Turek, A. (2008). Does cleavage work at work? Men, but not women, falsely believe cleavage sells a weak product. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 326-335.

- Grogan, M., & Shakeshaft, C. (2011). *Women and educational leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grove, R. & Montgomery, P. (2000). Women and the leadership paradigm: Bridging the gap.
- Gurian, M., & Annis, B. (2008). *Leadership and the sexes: Using gender science to create success in business*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hackman, M. & Johnson, C. (2013) *Leadership: A communication perspective*. 6th ed. Waveland Press, Inc. Long Grove, IL.
- Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2008). The road to the glass cliff: Differences in the perceived suitability of men and women for leadership positions in succeeding and failing organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 530-546.
- Haveman, H., & Beresford, L. If you're so smart, why aren't you the boss? Explaining the persistent vertical gender gap in management. *The Annals of American Academy*, 639, 114-130.
- 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(1), 81-92.
- Herrera, R., Duncan, P. A., Green, M. T., & Skaggs, S. L. (2012). The effect of gender on leadership and culture. *Global Business & Organizational Excellence*, 31(2), 37.
- Hewlett, S. (2013). The right way to find a career sponsor. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/09/the-right-way-to-find-a-career-sponsor>

- Hewlett, S., Marshall, M., & Sherbin, L. (2011). The relationship you need to get right. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2011/10/the-relationship-you-need-to-get-right>
- Hoffman, J. (2013, December 23). Overturning the myth of valley girl speak. [Web log post] Well. Retrieved from <http://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/12/23/overturning-the-myth-of-valley-girl-speak/>
- Hofstede, G. (1998). Attitudes, Values and Organizational Culture: Disentangling the Concepts. *Organization Studies*, 19(3), 477-493.
- Hoyt, C. L., Simon, S., & Reid, L. (2009). Choosing the best (wo)man for the job: The effects of mortality salience, sex, and gender stereotypes on leader evaluations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 233-246.
- Hunt-Earle, K. (2012). Falling over a glass cliff: A study of the recruitment of women to leadership roles in troubled enterprises. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*(5), 44.
- Ibarra, H., Carter, N., & Silva, C. (2010). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2010/09/why-men-still-get-more-promotions-than-women>
- Ingahalikar, M., Smith, A., Parker, D., Satterthwaite, T., Elliott, M., Ruparel, K., Hakonarson, H., Gur, R., Gur, R., & Verma, R. (2013). Sex differences in the structural connectome of the human brain. *PNAS* 11(2), 823-828
- Jamieson, K. (1995). *Beyond the double bind: Women and Leadership*. Oxford University Press, New York.

- Johns, M. (2013). Breaking the glass ceiling: Structural, cultural, and organizational barriers preventing women from achieving senior and executive positions. *Perspectives in Health Information Management*, 1-11 11p.
- Johnson, S., Murphy, S., Zewdie, S., & Reichard, R. (2008). The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 106, 39-60.
- Jones, S. J., & Palmer, E. M. (2011). Glass ceilings and catfights: Career barriers for professional women in academia. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 31(1), 189.
- Jonsen, K., Maznevski, M., & Schneider, S. (2010). Gender differences in leadership – believing is seeing: Implications for managing diversity. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 29(6). 549-572.
- Knight, H. J. (2011). Race, gender, and the college presidency. *On Campus with Women*, 40.
- Konrath, S., Au, J., & Ramsey, L. R. (2012). Cultural differences in face-ism: Male politicians have bigger heads in more gender-equal cultures. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(4), 476-487.
- Kovala, I. (2014). For college presidents, the interview never ends. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 60.
- Kret, M.E. (2011). "A review on sex differences in processing emotional signals." *Neuropsychologia Review*.50: 1211–1221.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 45-80.
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.chapman.edu/stable/4166707>

- Latu, I. M., Schmid Mast, M., Lammers, J., Bombari, D., & Department of Social, P. (2013). Successful female leaders empower women's behavior in leadership tasks.
- Leo, L., Reid, R., Geldenhuys, M., & Gobind, J. (2014). The inferences of gender in workplace bullying: A conceptual analysis. *Gender and Behaviour* (1), 6059.
- Levant, R. F. (2011). Research in the psychology of men and masculinity using the gender role strain paradigm as a framework. *American Psychologist*, 66(8), 765-776.
- Litosseliti, L. (2006). *Gender & language: Theory and practice*. Hachette, United Kingdom: Hodder Education.
- Liu, W. M., Rochlen, A., & Mohr, J. J. (2005). Real and ideal gender-role conflict: Exploring psychological distress among men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6(2), 137-148.
- Liu, J., Zubieta, J., & Heitzig, M. (2011). Sex differences in anterior cingulate cortex activation during impulse inhibition and behavioral correlates. *Psychiatry Research*, 201(1), 54-62.
- Lively, K. (2000). More elite universities hire female provosts, creating new pool for presidential openings. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46 (41), A33.
Retrieved March 22, 2016, from www.chronicle.com
- Livingstone, D. W., Pollock, K., & Raykov, M. (2016). Family binds and glass ceilings: Women managers' promotion limits in a 'Knowledge Economy'. *Critical Sociology (Sage Publications, Ltd.)*, 42(1), 145.
- Maranto, C. L., & Griffin, A. E. C. (2011). The antecedents of a 'chilly climate' for women faculty in higher education. *Human Relations*, 64(2), 139-159.

- May, R. (1975). *The courage to create*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Meacham, M. (2014). A review of the equality movement: Problems and directions for Both Sexes. *Gender Issues*, 31(2), 83.
- Muñoz, M. (2010). In their own words and by the numbers: A mixed-methods study of Latina community college presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 34(1-2), 153-174.
- Musil, C. M. (2011). The higher education leadership gap: three-quarters just say no. *On Campus with Women*, 40.
- Nielsen, V. (2014). Differences in male and female employees' personal tributes? Myth or a reasonable assumption: Even within professions? *Gender Issues*, 31(3/4), 163.
- Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEOs, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27, 321-334.
- Office of the Historian, History, Art & Archives, U.S. House of Representatives. (2007). *Women in Congress, 1917–2006*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Parker, A. (2010, November 5). 2010 faltered as a new 'year of the woman' in politics. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/06/us/politics/06women.html>

- Patten, M. (2014). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials* (9th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.
- Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *Women and leadership*. Washington DC: Pew Research Center, January 14, 2015.
- Piantanida, M. & Garman, N. (2009). *The qualitative dissertation: A guide for students and faculty* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Pleck, J. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *A New Psychology of Men* (Chapter 1). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Powell, G. (2011). The gender and leadership wars. *Organizational Dynamics*, 40, 1-9.
- Price, J. & Murnan, J. (2004). Research limitations and the necessity of reporting them. *American Journal of Health Education* 35, 66-67.
- Rhee, K. S., & Sigler, T. H. (2015). Untangling the relationship between gender and leadership. *Gender in Management : An International Journal*, 30(2), 109-134.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2001), Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 637–655.
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2000). Limiting inequality through interaction: The end(s) of gender. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(1), 110-120.
- Ridgeway, C., & Correll, S. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations, *Gender & Society*, 18(4), 510-531.

- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2006). Consensus and the creation of status beliefs. *Social Forces (University of North Carolina Press)*, 85(1), 431-453.
- Roberts, C. (2010). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Robinson, D. & Schwartz, J. (2004). Relationship between gender role conflict and attitudes toward women and African Americans. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 5, 65–71.
- Rosener, J. B. (1995). *America's competitive secret: Utilizing women as a management strategy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, H. & Rubin, I. (2012). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Los Angeles, CA.: Sage.
- 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.
- Ryan, M. & Haslam, S. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management*, 16(2), 81-90.
- Ryan, M. & Haslam, S., Hersby, M., & Bongirone, R. (2011). Think crisis? Think female: The glass cliff and contextual variation in the thinkn manager think male stereotype. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 470-484.

- Ryder, M. (1998). The impact of male gender dissonance on women's potential eligibility for advancement to the position of superintendent (Order No. 9913991). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304485759).
- Ryder, M., & Briles, J. (2003). *The sex factor: Breaking the unwritten codes that sabotage personal and professional lives*. Far Hills, NJ: New Horizon Press.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Salkind, N. (2012). *Exploring research* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- 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.
- Seidel, E., Silani, G., Metzler, H., Thaler, H., Lamm, C., Gur, R., Kryspin-Exner, I., Habel, U., & Derntl, B. (2013). The impact of social exclusion vs. inclusion on subjective and hormonal reactions in females and males. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 38, 2925-2932.
- Silver, N. (2012). *The signal and the noise: Why so many predictions fail – but some don't*. New York, NY: Penguin Books. Retrieved from <https://www.fastcompany.com/3009258/most-creative-people-2013/1-nate-silver>

- Smith, J. & Huntoon, M. (2014). Women's bragging rights: Overcoming modesty norms to facilitate women's self-promotion: *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(4), 447-459.
- Smith, P., Caputi, P., & Crittenden, N. (2012). A maze of metaphors around glass ceilings. *Gender in Management*, 27(7), 436.
- Steyn, G. M., & Parsaloi, M. W. (2014). Moving towards gender equality : the case of female head teachers in Kenya. *Gender and Behaviour*, (1), 5980.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2013). Education Policies for Gender Equity: Probing into State Responses. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21(65), 1-28.
- Sutton, H. (2015). Overcome challenges to cultivate female leaders on your campus. *Dean and Provost*, (4), 8.
- Tang, C., Eaves, E., Ng, J., Carpenter, D., Mai, X., Schroeder, D., Condon, C., Colom, R., & Haier, R. (2010). Brain networks for working memory and factors of intelligence assessed in males and females with fMRI and DTI. *Intelligence* 38, 293-303.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York, NY: Quill.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender & discourse*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1995). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men at work*. New York, NY: Quill.
- Thomas-Hunt, M. C., & Phillips, K. W. (2004). When what you know is not enough: Expertise and gender dynamics in task groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12), 1585-1598.

- United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). *Women in the Labor Force: A databook* [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov>
- United States Census Bureau. (2010). *Age and sex composition: 2010* [Data file]. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-03.pdf>
- United States Department of Education. (2014). *Bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees conferred by postsecondary institutions, by sex of student and discipline division: 2013-14*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_318.30.asp
- United States Department of Labor. (1995). *A solid investment: Making full use of the nation's human capital: Recommendations of the federal glass ceiling commission*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2016). *Charges Alleging Sexual Harassment: FY 2010 - FY 2015* [Data file]. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/sexual_harassment_new.cfm
- Van Manan, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Vecchio, R. P. (2002). Leadership and gender advantage. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 643-671.
- Vinkenburg, C. J., van Engen, M. L., Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2011). An exploration of stereotypical beliefs about leadership styles: Is transformational leadership a route to women's promotion? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 10-21.

- Wade, J.C., & Brittan-Powell, C. (2001). Men's attitudes toward race and gender equity: The importance of masculinity ideology, gender-related traits, and reference group identity dependence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 2, 42–50.
- Wienclaw, R. A. (2015a). *Gender and Economic Inequality*: Salem Press.
- Wienclaw, R. A. (2015b). *Gender Roles*: Salem Press.
- Williams, C. L. (1992). The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the 'Female' Professions, 253.
- Williams, P. (2004). *Interactive statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, Inc.
- Wolf, N. (2015). Young women give up the vocal fry and reclaim your strong female voice; What's heartbreaking about the trend for destructive speech patterns is that yours is the most transformational generation –you're disowning your power. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com>
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2015). Two Traditions of Research on Gender Identity. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 73(11-12), 461-473.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Synthesis Matrix

Elements of Gender Dissonance	Gender Theory	Role confusion	Communication	Cultural differences	Women's personal power	Internal barriers	External barriers	Human physiology
Afifi & Burgoon (2000)	X		X			X	X	
Alimo-Metcalf (2010)		X		X				
Anderson, Klofstad, Mayew & Venkatachalam (2014)			X					
Annis & Merron (2014)	X	X	X	X			X	X
Annis & Gray (2013)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Annis (2010)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
APA.org (2011)	X							X
Arnould-Taylor (1998)	X							X
Baird (1976)			X			X	X	
Baker (2014)	X	X	X				X	
Bales (1950)	X							
Ballenger (2010)				X		X	X	
Bao & Swaab (2011)		X						X
Benenson, Markovits, Thompson, & Wrangham, (2011)					X	X		
Berenbaum & Beltz (2011)		X	X					X
Berger & Fisek (1974)	X						X	
Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch (1972)	X	X					X	
Blazina & Watkins, (2000)	X							
Bowles & Babcock (2012)	X	X	X	X			X	
Briles (2000)		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Briles (1996)		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Burgoon & Hale (1988)	X		X				X	
Burgoon & Walther (1990)	X		X				X	
Burgoon (1993)	X		X				X	
Burke & Collins (2001)		X						
Campbell, Mueller & Souza (2010)		X	X	X		X	X	
Catalyst (2014)		X	X				X	
Catalyst (2016)		X	X				X	
CCCCO.edu (2015)				X				
Chesler (2002)		X		X			X	
Chin (2012)		X					X	

Elements of Gender Dissonance	Gender Theory	Role confusion	Communication	Cultural differences	Women's personal power	Internal barriers	External barriers	Human physiology
Claus, Callahan & Sandlin (2013)		X		X				
Clinton (2016)				X	X		X	
Coder & Spiller (2013)	X			X		X	X	
Cook & Glass (2013)								
Correll & Ridgeway (2003)	X						X	
Counter (2016)			X					
DeBoer (2004)				X	X			
Diekman, Johnston, & Loeschner (2013)	X	X						
Eagly (1983)	X	X					X	
Eagly (1987)	X	X					X	
Eagly (2005)	X	X					X	
Eagly (2007)	X	X					X	
Eagly & Carli (2003)	X	X					X	
Eagly & Carli (2007)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Eagly & Diekman (2005)	X	X					X	
Eagly & Johnson (1990)	X	X					X	
Eagly & Karau (2002)	X	X					X	
Eagly & Wood (2002)	X	X					X	
Eagly, Wood, & Diekman (2000)	X	X					X	
ed.gov (2014)	X							
EEOC.gov (2016)						X	X	
Farley, Timme, & Hart (2010)		X	X	X				
Festing, Knappert, & Kornau (2013)				X		X	X	
Festinger (1957)	X							
Foust-Cummings, Dinolfo, & Kohler (2011)		X		X		X	X	
Fumagalli, Ferruci, Mameli, Marceglia, Mrakic-Sposta, et al, Priori (2009)			X					X
Furst & Reeves (2008)		X	X	X			X	
Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra (2006)	X	X					X	
Gardner (2015)	X						X	
Gentry, Booyesen, Hannum, Weber (2010)		X	X			X	X	
Gheaus (2015)						X	X	
Gigerenzer, Galesic, Garcia (2014)		X	X		X			
Gill & Jones (2013)		X		X		X	X	
Gillespie (2006)	X						X	
Glass Ceiling Commission, (1995)							X	
Glick, Chrislock, Petersik, Vijay, & Turek (2008)		X						
Grogan & Shakeshaft (2011)		X	X	X	X	X	X	

Elements of Gender Dissonance	Gender Theory	Role confusion	Communication	Cultural differences	Women's personal power	Internal barriers	External barriers	Human physiology
Grogan (2015)			X	X	X	X	X	
Grogan (2016)			X	X	X	X	X	
Grove & Montgomery (2000)		X		X	X	X	X	
Gurian & Annis, (2008)		X	X					X
Hackman & Johnson (2013)			X					
Haslam & Ryan (2005)	X				X		X	
Haslam & Ryan (2008)	X				X		X	
Haveman & Beresford (2012)				X		X	X	
Heilman & Okimoto (2007)	X	X				X	X	
Herrera, Duncan, Green and Skaggs (2012)		X	X	X				
Hewlett (2013)		X		X		X	X	
Hewlett, Marshall, & Sherbin (2011)		X		X		X	X	
Hoffman (2013)			X					
Hoffman (2015)			X					
Hofstede (1998)	X	X				X	X	
Hunt-Earle (2012)				X			X	
Ibarra, Carter, & Silva (2010)				X	X	X	X	
Ingalhalikar, Smith, Parker, Satterthwaite, Elliott, Ruparel, Hakonarson, Gur, Gur & Verma (2013)	X		X					X
Jamieson (1995)				X			X	
Johns (2013)				X		X	X	
Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie & Reichard (2008)	X	X					X	
Jones & Palmer (2011)		X		X			X	
Jonsen, Maznevski, & Schneider (2010)				X			X	
Knight (2014)							X	
Konrath, Au, & Ramsey (2012)				X			X	
Kovala (2014)				X			X	
Kret (2011)								X
Lakoff (1973)			X					
Latu, Mast, Lammers, & Bombari (2013)				X			X	
Leo, Reid, Geldenhuys, & Gobind (2014)					X	X		
Levant (2011)	X		X					
Litosseliti (2006)			X	X	X	X	X	
Liu, Rochlan, & Mohr (2005)	X		X					
Liu, Zubieta, & Heitzig (2011)	X		X					X
Maranto & Griffin (2011)		X	X	X		X	X	
Meacham (2014)	X	X					X	
Musil (2011)		X		X		X	X	

Elements of Gender Dissonance	Gender Theory	Role confusion	Communication	Cultural differences	Women's personal power	Internal barriers	External barriers	Human physiology
Nielsen (2014)		X		X			X	
Oakley (2000)		X	X	X	X		X	
Pew Research (2015)				X			X	
Pleck (1995)	X							
Powell (2011)		X		X		X	X	
Ramones (2015)			X	X	X	X	X	
Ramones (2016)			X	X	X	X	X	
Rhee & Sigler (2015)	X							X
Ridgeway (2001)	X						X	
Robinson & Schwartz (2004)	X		X					
Rosner (1995)		X	X	X		X	X	
Rudman & Glick (1999)	X						X	
Ryan, Haslam, Hersby, & Bongiorno (2011)	X			X			X	
Ryder & Briles (2003)		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ryder (1998)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Sandberg (2013)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Schein (1973)	X			X			X	
Schein (1975)	X			X			X	
Seidel, Silani, Metzler, Thaler, Lamm, Gur, Kryspin-Exner, Habel, & Derntl (2013)		X		X		X		
Smith & Huntoon (2014)	X						X	
Smith, Caputi, & Crittenden (2012)		X		X			X	
Steyn & Parsaloi (2014)		X	X		X	X		
Stromquist (2013)			X	X			X	
Sutton (2015)					X	X	X	
Tang, Eaves, Ng, Carpenter, Mai, Schroeder, Condon, Colom, & Haier (2010)	X							X
Tannen (1990)			X			X	X	
Tannen (1994)			X			X	X	
Tannen (1995)		X	X				X	
Thomas-Hunt & Phillips (2004)	X						X	
Vecchio (2002)	X						X	
Vinkenbergh, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt (2011)		X					X	
Wade & Brittan-Powell (2001)	X		X					
Warner (2014)				X			X	
Wienclaw (2015)				X			X	
Williams (1992)		X		X			X	

Elements of Gender Dissonance	Gender Theory	Role confusion	Communication	Cultural differences	Women's personal power	Internal barriers	External barriers	Human physiology
Wolf (2015)			X					
Wood & Eagly (2015)	X	X	X					X

APPENDIX B

Invitation to Participate as Expert Panel Member

STUDY: Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College President

Dear Expert Panelist:

This email is to formally invite you to participate in a phenomenological research study as a professional expert. As you know I am doctoral candidate in the Organizational Leadership Doctoral program at Brandman University. I am getting ready to begin the next stage of my dissertation which will lead to conducting my research. I am currently working under the supervision of Dr. Marilou Ryder on the challenges of gender behaviors in the workplace and any correlation to women's potential eligibility for advancement to the position of community college CEO.

What is the purpose of this research study?

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to explore workplace conduct of female leaders that may trigger dissonant behaviors in males in the California community college environment and how it may affect their chances for promotion.

What will your involvement in this study mean?

As a professional expert, your involvement will encompass reviewing and critiquing the research instruments that have been designed to answer specific research questions. To prevent researcher bias, and to ensure the safety of all participants, I would like for you scrutinize each of the interview questions, and provide feedback with ways to improve the instrument.

If you have any questions regarding this phenomenological research study, please do not hesitate to contact me at 831-241-8604 or by email at sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu. You can also contact my dissertation chairperson Dr. Marilou Ryder at 760-900-0556 or by email at ryder@brandman.edu.

Thank you very much for your interest and assistance in this phenomenological study.

All the best,
Sam Garzaniti

APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol – Interviewer's Copy

Participant: _____

Date: _____

College: _____

INTERVIEWER SAYS:

Thank you very much for taking the time to discuss with me your perceptions about the working relationships between male and female administrators in the educational environment. Please know that all answers will be held in strictest confidence and any comments you make will in no way be associated with your name or the school you represent.

The majority of working relationships between men and women administrators is positive and productive. This study concentrates on those few relationships between men and women that may result in friction or an uneasy reaction.

The purpose of this interview is to identify female administrator behaviors which may prompt male administrators to express behaviors associated with gender dissonance. Gender dissonance is the conscious or subconscious discomfort or incongruity that men and women feel when they work together.

It would be useful if you could share some behavioral examples of gender dissonance experienced by male administrators with whom you have worked during your career. It is also important for you to identify female administrator behaviors which may prompt male administrators to express these dissonant behaviors. For the purpose of this study, I am not interested in factors that cause women to experience dissonance. This interview will concentrate on three different working relationships between male and female administrators within three contexts:

1. Male administrators who supervise female administrators
2. Male administrators who work together as peers
3. Female administrators who supervise male administrators

There are three things I will focus on in this interview. First, I am most interested in your descriptions of specific situations and behaviors that prompt men to feel gender dissonance; those behaviors exhibited by females that cause men to express dissonant behaviors. If these examples do not fit into these relationships, that's all right. I am interested in hearing the specific examples, but in particular the behaviors you have observed. Second, it is also important to explore why you think these behaviors may have occurred as they relate to gender differences between men and women. Please note that I am also not looking for dissonant behaviors that were prompted by difference in style, age, experience, or personality; for example, two administrators who bring different

competence levels to a position because of the experience or age. These differences may cause the male or female to exhibit dissonant behaviors, but they are not gender related. While these differences may cause dissonance between men and women and may be very interesting, they are outside the scope of this study. Last, at the conclusion of this interview, I will ask you to identify which of the behaviors you have mentioned you feel may impede or serve as a barrier to women's eligibility for promotion to CEO position in a community college. Research suggests that many factors can limit a woman's eligibility to be included in the pool for promotion.

Please let me remind you that your participation is completely voluntary and will greatly strengthen the study. If at any time you feel uncomfortable or would like to end the interview or not respond to a question, please let me know. Your information will be kept confidential and your name will be changed to protect your identity. In addition, I have provided a copy of the questions that I will ask for your reference; however, I may have follow-up questions if clarity is needed. The duration of this interview will take approximately 60 to 90 minutes. Do you have any questions about the interview process?

CONSENT FORM:

The document I am providing is an informed consent form. It explains much of the information I have shared as well as outlines the benefits and risks of your participation. Please take a moment to read through the form and sign showing your consent. [Interviewee to sign the consent form (see Appendix E)].

INTERVIEWER SAYS:

As we get started, I would like to record this interview for transcribing purposes and so that I can access it at a later time. I would like to be able to accurately represent your experiences, and at no time will your names be shared. Again, I will make sure that your confidentiality is kept at all times. Do I have your permission to continue with this interview and record it? [Obtain permission and turn on recording devices] Do you have any questions before we begin?

PROTOCOL QUESTIONS:

Let's begin.

1. There are a number of different working relationships among men and women in the educational work setting. The first one I would like to discuss is the relationship in which a male administrator has the occasion to supervise a female administrator; for example a male CEO supervising a female vice president. How would you describe any situations during your career in which you observed a male administrator expressing a negative or uneasy reaction to something a female did while:
 - a. In a cabinet or general administrators meeting
 - b. At a conference or professional staff development situation

- c. Involved in a social situation
 - d. A one-on-one meeting such as an evaluation or improvement conference
 - e. Working on a project
 - f. Communicating with one another
2. As you reflect back on your career as an administrator, please think about times when you have observed male and female administrators working together as peers; for example two presidents or two vice presidents. How would you describe any situations throughout your career in which you have observed a male administrator expressing a negative or uneasy reaction to something that a female did while:
- a. In a cabinet or general administrators meeting
 - b. At a conference or professional staff development situation
 - c. Involved in a social situation
 - d. A one-on-one meeting such as an evaluation or improvement conference
 - e. Working on a project
 - f. Communicating with one another
3. Many women have been promoted to positions of greater authority in community colleges. As you reflect back on your own experiences, what details can you recall of any instances when a female administrator supervised a male administrator? Recalling these experiences, in what situations throughout your career have you observed a male administrator expressing a negative or uneasy reaction to something that a female did while:
- a. In a cabinet or general administrators meeting
 - b. At a conference or professional staff development situation
 - c. Involved in a social situation
 - d. A one-on-one meeting such as an evaluation or improvement conference
 - e. Working on a project together
 - f. Communicating with one another

General Prompts to be Used in Connection with Each Question

- 1. What did the female administrator do to elicit this behavior?
- 2. What did the male administrator do when reacting to this particular behavior?
- 3. What do you think prompted the male to do that?
 - a. Was it a personal issue on the part of the male or was it prompted by gender differences?
- 4. What makes you think this behavior was gender-related?
 - a. Could you elaborate?
- 5. What is another example of this kind of behavior?

4. An increasing number of female administrators possess the credentials, experience, and demonstrated skills to advance to the role of CEO. However, some critical factors exist that may impede or limit a woman's chances to be included in that pool of those who are eligible to be considered for a CEO position. One or more of these behaviors exhibited by females that you just described may be one of these limitations.

During our interview, you identified a number of behaviors exhibited by female administrators that prompt male administrators to express behaviors associated with gender dissonance. (REPEAT SEVERAL THAT EACH PERSON HAS IDENTIFIED). How do you feel these behaviors that prompt males to experience gender dissonance may limit a woman's chances to be included in the eligibility pool to be considered for a CEO position? If so, could you comment on what impact these behaviors exhibited by female administrators that prompt males to experience gender dissonance may have on women's advancement to a CEO position?

Potential Follow-Up Question(s):

1. Are there any final comments you would like to make before we conclude?

CLOSING STATEMENT:

These are all the questions I have for you at this time. Thank you very much for your time today and your willingness to allow me to interview you for my dissertation. If you would like a copy of my research at the conclusion of my study, I will be happy to provide that for you. Please accept this as a small token of my appreciation for your participation.

APPENDIX D

Interview Protocol – Interviewee's Copy

Participant: _____

Date: _____

College: _____

Thank you very much for taking the time to discuss with me your perceptions about the working relationships between male and female administrators in the educational environment. Please know that all answers will be held in strictest confidence and any comments you make will in no way be associated with your name or the school you represent.

The majority of working relationships between men and women administrators is positive and productive. This study concentrates on those few relationships between men and women that may result in friction or an uneasy reaction.

The purpose of this interview is to identify female administrator behaviors which may prompt male administrators to express behaviors associated with gender dissonance. Gender dissonance is the conscious or subconscious discomfort or incongruity that men and women can feel when they work together.

Please consider the questions below for our interview. When we meet, it would be useful if you could share some behavioral examples of gender dissonance experienced by male administrators with whom you have worked during your career. In addition, sharing your observations and the identification of some of the behaviors that female administrators exhibit that may prompt male administrators to experience gender dissonance would be very helpful to the study.
Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. There are a number of different working relationships among men and women in the educational work setting. The first one I would like to discuss is the relationship in which a male administrator has the occasion to supervise a female administrator; for example a male CEO supervising a female vice president. Can you recall any situations throughout your career in which you have observed a male administrator expressing a negative or uneasy reaction to something a female did while:
 - a. In a cabinet or general administrators meeting
 - b. At a conference or professional staff development situation
 - c. Involved in a social situation
 - d. A one-on-one meeting such as an evaluation or improvement conference
 - e. Working on a project
 - f. Communicating with one another

2. As you reflect back on your career as an administrator, think about times when you have observed male and female administrators working together as peers; for example two presidents or two vice presidents. Can you recall any situations throughout your career in which you have observed a male administrator expressing a negative or uneasy reaction to something that a female did while:
 - a. In a cabinet or general administrators meeting
 - b. At a conference or professional staff development situation
 - c. Involved in a social situation
 - d. A one-on-one meeting such as an evaluation or improvement conference
 - e. Working on a project
 - f. Communicating with one another

3. Many women have been promoted to positions of greater authority in community colleges. As you reflect back on your own experiences, can you recall any instances when a female administrator supervised a male administrator? Do any of these experiences bring to mind any situations throughout your career in which you have observed a male administrator expressing a negative or uneasy reaction to something that a female did while:
 - a. In a cabinet or general administrators meeting
 - b. At a conference or professional staff development situation
 - c. Involved in a social situation
 - d. A one-on-one meeting such as an evaluation or improvement conference
 - e. Working on a project together
 - f. Communicating with one another

General Prompts to be Used in Connection with Each Question

1. Was there something the female administrator did that elicited this behavior?
 2. What did the male administrator do when reacting to this particular behavior?
 3. What do you think prompted the male to do that?
 - a. Was it a personal issue on the part of the male or was it prompted by gender differences?
 4. What makes you think this behavior was gender-related?
 5. Can you elaborate?
 6. Can you give me another example of this kind of behavior?
-
4. There are many factors which may impact women's advancement to a position of leadership in education. The research suggests that some of these factors or barriers include women's lack of aspiration or lack of confidence. Other barriers include external constraints such as lack of mobility, lack of role models, lack of mentors or sponsors, or marriage and family responsibilities. This study, however, does not focus on these barriers.

An increasing number of female administrators possess the credentials, experience, and demonstrated skills to advance to the role of CEO. However, some critical factors exist that may impede or limit a woman's chances to be included in that pool of those who are eligible to be considered for a CEO

position. One or more of these behaviors exhibited by females that you just described may be one of these limitations.

During our interview, you identified a number of behaviors exhibited by female administrators that prompt male administrators to express behaviors associated with gender dissonance. (REPEAT SEVERAL THAT EACH PERSON HAS IDENTIFIED). Do you feel that it is possible that any of these behaviors that prompt males to experience gender dissonance may limit a woman's chances to be included in the eligibility pool to be considered for a CEO position? If so, could you comment on what impact these behaviors exhibited by female administrators that prompt males to experience gender dissonance may have on women's advancement to a CEO position?

Are there any final comments you would like to make before we conclude?

Thank you very much for your time and thoughtful consideration of the questions asked in this interview. I appreciate your generous spirit and attitude.

APPENDIX E

Informed Consent Form

DATE: 09/14/16

INFORMATION ABOUT: The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: Sam Garzaniti M.S.

PURPOSE OF STUDY: The purpose of this phenomenological study was to discover what behaviors female administrators exhibit that may prompt male administrators with whom they work in a California community college to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance and to discover any impact these dissonant behaviors may have on women's potential eligibility for advancement to the position of community college CEO.

This study will fill the gap in the research by using a qualitative analysis to gain a better understanding of how behaviors between the genders affect a workplace relationship. As a product of this qualitative study, it is the hope that this research will provide an increased awareness of how individuals can recognize dissonant behaviors to render them inert.

By participating in this study I agree to participate in a one-on-one interview with the researcher. The interview will last between one and one and a half hours. Completion of the interview will take place in October and November 2016.

I understand that:

- a) There are minimal risks associated with participating in this research.
 - i. I understand that the Investigator will protect my confidentiality by storing any research materials collected during the interview process in a locked file drawer in which only the researcher has access to.
- b) The possible benefit of this study to me is that my input may help add to the research regarding how behaviors between the genders affect a workplace relationship. The findings will be available to me at the conclusion of the study.
- c) I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation in this study.

- d) Any questions I have concerning my participation in this study will be answered by Sam Garzaniti. He can be reached by email at sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu or by phone at 831-241-8604.
- e) I understand that the interview will be audio recorded. The recordings will be available only to the researcher, and will be used to capture the interview dialogue and to ensure the accuracy of the information collected during the interview. Upon completion of the study all transcripts and notes taken by the researcher during the interview will be shredded.

My participation in this research study is voluntary. I understand that I may refuse to participate in or I may withdraw from this study at any time without negative consequences. Also, the investigator may stop the interview at any time. I also understand that no information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of data is to be changed I will be so informed and my consent obtained. I understand that if I have any questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may write or call the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, at 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA 92618 Telephone (949) 341-7641.

I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this form and the Research participant's Bill of Rights. I have read the above and understand it and hereby consent to the procedure(s) set forth.

Signature of Participant or Responsible Party

Date

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

APPENDIX F

Invitation to Participate in Study

Dear Colleagues,

My name is Sam Garzaniti and I am currently a doctoral candidate at Brandman University in the organizational leadership program. I am conducting a study that explores behaviors between the genders affect a workplace relationship. This study will fill the gap in the research by using a qualitative analysis to gain a better picture of how behaviors between the genders affect a workplace relationship. As a product of this qualitative study, it is the hope that this research will provide an increased awareness of how individuals can recognize dissonant behaviors to render them inert.

I have these criteria to participate in this study:

1. Participant has minimum experience of two years as a senior community college administrator – vice president or higher
2. Participant is knowledgeable of women's issues in community college leadership
3. Participant exhibits strong verbal and non-verbal communication skills
4. Participant has been recognized in the community college arena for continued support to mentor female community college educators

In addition to obtaining your information from the Community College Directory, your name was recommended to me by Rita Grogan as someone who fulfills the above criteria and would be interesting in seeing the results of this study. If you meet the above criteria, I would appreciate your participation in this study. To participate, please contact me at 831-241-8604 (cell) or by email at sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu so that we can schedule a time for an interview that meets your schedule. The survey should take no more than an hour and a half of your time to complete.

Additional details of the study are provided in the attached Description of the Study.

If you have any questions about this study, please e-mail me at sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu or call my dissertation supervisor, Dr. Marilou Ryder, at 760-900-0556 or by email at ryder@ brandman.edu.

I very much appreciate your time and consideration in participating in this study.

Kind regards,

Sam Garzaniti
Doctoral Candidate, Organizational Leadership Program
Brandman University

APPENDIX G

Description of Study Attachment

Description of the Study

What is this project studying?

This study is called “The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women’s Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer.” This study will explore how behaviors between the male and female leaders affect workplace relationships and the potential for female’s advancement.

What would I do if I participate?

You will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview with the researcher regarding your perceptions and experiences with service learning.

Can I quit if I become uncomfortable?

Yes, absolutely. Your participation is completely voluntary. The researcher and the Brandman University Institutional Review Board have reviewed the interview questions and think you can answer them comfortably. You can also stop answering or skip any questions at any time. Participating is your choice. However, we do appreciate any help you are able to provide.

How long will my participation take?

The interview should take no more than an hour and half.

How are you protecting privacy?

The researcher will protect all participants confidentiality by storing any research materials collected during the interview process in a locked file drawer in which only the researcher has access to. All findings in the study will be reported in the aggregate and participants will not be personally identifiable.

How will I benefit from participating in this study?

Besides providing the study with valuable information, you are also contributing to research on a national, intellectual movement that is seeking to assist in achieving equal treatment in build support for service learning and civic engagement across disciplines in higher education.

How can I participate in this study?

You can participate by contacting the researcher to schedule a time to share your perceptions and experiences with service learning.

I have some questions about this study. Who can I ask?

1. If you have any questions about this research study, you can contact Sam Garzaniti through email at sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu.

2. You may also contact Dr. Marilou Ryder, who is supervising this study, at 760-900-0556 or by email at [ryder@ brandman.edu](mailto:ryder@brandman.edu).
3. Brandman University also has a Board, the Institutional Review Board, which protects the rights of people who participate in research. You may contact the coordinator, Jose Carlos Trujillo, with questions by email at buirb@brandman.edu.

APPENDIX H

Conceptual Framework Classifying Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance

Gender Dissonance Concept	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature
Role Confusion	Expressions of Sexuality	Women whose behavior is perceived by men as a potential source of sexual harassment	Annis, 2013; eeoc.gov, 2016; telegraph.co.uk, 2015
		Women who create sexual tension for men at work	Annis, 2013; Glick, Chrislock, Petersik, Vijay, & Turek 2008
	Sex Role Socialization	Women who exhibit behaviors associated with power that are incompatible with men's perceptions of the evolving female sex role	Annis, 2013; Maranto & Griffin 2011; Eagly & Carli 2003; Eagly & Carli 2007; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra 2006
		Women who exhibit behaviors that are incompatible with men's stereotype of female work and sex roles	Annis, 2013; Maranto & Griffin 2011; Eagly & Carli 2003; Eagly & Carli 2007; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra 2006
	Differing Leadership Skills between Men and Women	Women who exhibit leadership skills like collaboration, shared power, and relationship building that are incongruent to male leadership skills of command and control	Annis, 2013; Claus, Callahan & Sandlin 2013; Diekman, Johnston, & Loescher 2013; Eagly & Carli 2007; Gill & Jones 2013; Herrera, Duncan, Green and Skaggs 2012
		Women who demonstrate leadership skills such as collaboration, shared power, and relationship building that are viewed as more effective by their organizations than skills of command and control that some males currently use.	Annis, 2013; Claus, Callahan & Sandlin 2013; Diekman, Johnston, & Loescher 2013; Eagly & Carli 2007; Gill & Jones 2013

Gender Dissonance Concept	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature
Communication Differences	Different Conversational Styles	Women who boast	Annis & Gray, 2013; Smith & Huntoon 2014; Briles, 1996
		Women who talk in an indirect manner	Annis & Gray, 2013; Annis & Merron, 2014; Sandberg, 2013; Tannen, 1994
		Women who are perceived to talk too much	Annis & Gray, 2013; Gurian & Annis 2008; Sandberg, 2013
		Women who are perceived to use annoying methods of speech	Hoffman, 2013; Hoffman, 2015; Wolf, 2015
	Conversational Rituals	Women who use apology	Annis & Gray, 2013; Briles, 2000; Gurian & Annis 2008; Tannen, 1990
		Women who criticize others	Annis & Gray, 2013; Annis & Merron, 2014; Sandberg, 2013;
		Women who are overly sensitive to criticism	Annis & Gray, 2013; Gurian & Annis 2008; Sandberg, 2013
		Women who gossip	Annis & Gray, 2013; Annis & Merron, 2014; Farley, Timme, & Hart, 2010; Tannen, 1990
		Women who ask others' opinions before making a decision	Alimo-Metcalf, 2010; Annis, 2010; Annis & Gray, 2013; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011 Gurian & Annis 2008

Gender Dissonance Concept	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature
Cultural Differences	Women's Confrontation of the Dominant Culture	Women intrude into previously male dominated areas of work	Maranto & Griffin 2011; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Grogan & Shakeshaft 2011; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Sandberg, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2007
		Women who request and receive special advantages or considerations in the work setting because they are women	Jones & Palmer 2011; Litosseliti 2006; Sandberg, 2013; Stromquist 2013; Vinkenbergh, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt (2011
	Men's Competition with Women	Women who encroach upon men's sense of entitlement, prestige, and power	Maranto & Griffin 2011; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Sandberg, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2007
		Women who gain administrative promotions that men perceive are not based solely on qualifications but on gender	Maranto & Griffin 2011; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Sandberg, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Annis, 2010

Gender Dissonance Concept	Dissonance Category	Situations in Which Females Exhibit Behaviors that May Prompt Males to Exhibit Behaviors Associated with Gender Dissonance	Supporting Literature
Women's Personal Power	Women's Self-Confidence Issues	Women who need to prove themselves	DeBoer, 2004; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Ramones, 2016; Sandberg, 2013
	Women's Power Issues	Women who need to control and dominate	DeBoer, 2004; Grogan, 2015; Grogan, 2016; Gurian & Annis, 2008; Litosseliti 2006; Ramones, 2016; Sandberg, 2013

APPENDIX I

Alignment Table

Research Questions	Sources of Data	Analytical Technique
Research Question 1: What behaviors exhibited by female administrators are perceived by selected community college Chief Executive Officers as prompting male administrators with whom they work in a community college environment to demonstrate behaviors associated with gender dissonance?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with community college leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Questionnaire
Research Question 2: How do selected community college Chief Executive Officers feel dissonant behaviors exhibited by female administrators impact women's eligibility for advancement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with community college leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview Questionnaire

APPENDIX J

Permission to Use an Existing Instrument

DATE: 09/17/16

Dear Dr. Ryder,

I am a doctoral student from Brandman University writing my dissertation tentatively titled, "The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women's Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer" under your direction.

I would like your permission to reproduce your instrument and protocols in my replicative research study. I would like to use and print your instrument under the following conditions:

1. I will use this instrument and protocol only for my research study and will not sell or use it with any compensated or curriculum development activities.
2. I will include the copyright statement on all copies of the instrument.
3. I will send my research study and one copy of reports, articles, and the like that make use of instrument data promptly to your attention.

If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by signing one copy of this letter and returning it to me via email to sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu.

Sincerely,

Sam Garzaniti
Doctoral Candidate

I approve the use of instrument and protocols for this study as indicated above.



Signature

9-17-2016

Date

APPENDIX K

Permission to Reproduce Tables/Charts/Figures

DATE: 09/17/16

Dear Dr. Ryder,

I am a doctoral student from Brandman University writing my dissertation tentatively titled, “The Impact of Male Gender Dissonance on Women’s Potential Eligibility for Advancement to the Position of Community College Chief Executive Officer” under your direction.

I would like your permission to reproduce figures from:

Ryder, M. (1998). *The impact of male gender dissonance on women’s potential eligibility for advancement to the position of superintendent*. (Order No. 9913991). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304485759).

Specifically, I am requesting permission to reprint the gender dissonance conceptual framework in parts or in total:

Figure 3: Conceptual framework used to classify behaviors exhibited by females that may prompt males to exhibit behaviors associated with gender dissonance for the concept: role confusion on page 120.

Figure 4: Conceptual framework used to classify behaviors exhibited by females that may prompt males to exhibit behaviors associated with gender dissonance for the concept: communication differences on page 121.

Figure 5: Conceptual framework used to classify behaviors exhibited by females that may prompt males to exhibit behaviors associated with gender dissonance for the concept: cultural differences on page 122.

Figure, Appendix D: Conceptual framework used to classify behaviors exhibited by females that may prompt males to exhibit behaviors associated with gender dissonance for the concept: women’s personal power on page 258.

I am requesting non-exclusive rights in all languages. These rights will in no way restrict publication of your material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. If you do not control these rights in their entirety, please inform me of the proper agency to contact.

Below is a release form for your convenience. If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by signing one copy of this letter and returning it to me via email to sgarzani@mail.brandman.edu.

Sincerely,

Sam Garzaniti
Doctoral Candidate

I grant permission requested on the terms stated in this letter. Credit line to be used if different from above:

Agreed to and accepted:



Signature

6-30-2016

Date

APPENDIX L

Appointment Calendar

Identifier	Date	Time	Docs sent?*	Informed Consent received	Thank you sent	Transcription complete	Years served as executive
m001	10 Nov	8:30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	30+
f001	10 Nov	3:30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	22
m002	15 Nov	2:30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	20+
f002	30 Nov	11:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	25
f003	3 Dec	12:30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	17
m003	5 Dec	9:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	16
m004	5 Dec	2:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	12
m005	6 Dec	1:30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
f004	8 Dec	2:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	30
f005	12 Dec	2:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	32
m006	15 Dec	9:30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	19
f006	16 Dec	10:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
f007	20 Dec	11:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
f008	20 Dec	3:00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	20

*Includes informed consent, participant's rights, protocol, and questions