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High status in business world
Think manager, think male: Stereotypes that the media help reinforce
We trust what male leaders talk about (or information from male leaders).

What is the mechanism underlying information mistrust in women, esp. female leaders?
Gender status mismatch and trust
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Theory

1. Gender as an institution

   cf. prior studies: gender as an individual attribute.

   ★ Gender status beliefs (Thébaud 2015, Ridgeway and Correll 2004)

   → Shared beliefs about the competence of the ‘male’ category.

   • Men are more capable than women in professional settings (Ridgeway and Correll 2004).

   • Higher performance expectations for men compared to women (Foschi 1996, Foschi 2000).

   → Male gender = high status
Theory

2. Status hierarchy as an institution


→ Presumption of superior quality & great worth of the high status actors.

• High-status actors are able to attract more valued resources, which in turn enable them to produce higher quality outputs (Merton 1968).

• Social judgments involving high status is self-fulfilling (Gould 2002).
Hypotheses

A mismatch between institutional conditions
= Women occupying high-status positions
• low-status gender ≠ superior quality, great worth

→ less trust in information from these women!
Hypotheses

1. Women occupying senior positions in organizational hierarchy

- Men are often believed to be more competent and can achieve their goals without being dependent on others than their female counterparts (Song 2018, Thébaud 2015b).

H1. S/he is less likely to trust in information from a woman who is senior to him or her.
Hypotheses

2. Female employees of high-status organizations

• High-status organizations are expected to have more ability, thus, employees of these organizations enjoy status-based esteem that is bestowed by others (Podolny and Lynn 2009).

H2. S/he is less likely to trust in information from a woman whose organizational status is higher than his or her organization.
Hypotheses

3. Women who are well-connected with others

- Men are able to strategically build and use networks, and gather information and support from others (Thébaud 2015b, Thébaud 2015a, Song 2018).
- Well-connectedness in business-related networks = high network status = men’s ability

H3. S/he is less likely to trust in information from a woman whose network status is higher than him or her.
Data and methods

• Setting: The client & (sub)contractors of London underground project
Data and Methods

Online surveys:

• Nov 2014~Jan 2015 (T1), Mar 2015~May 2015 (T2).
  =276 respondents in total (42 women and 234 men).
• Final sample: 3842 ego-alter pairs
  (92 respondents and 150 alters whom respondents communicate with).
Data and Methods

✴ DV: an ego or respondent’s perceived level of trust in information from a focal alter.

✴ IVs: interaction terms

• H1: Senior alter dummy × female alter dummy
• H2: Alter’s high status organization × female alter dummy
• H3: Alter’s network status × female alter dummy

✴ Model: OLS
Gender status mismatch and trust

Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Model 1-1</th>
<th>Model 1-2</th>
<th>Model 2-1</th>
<th>Model 2-2</th>
<th>Model 3-1</th>
<th>Model 3-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st survey</td>
<td>-0.229(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.230(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.229(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.225(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.224(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.228(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.228(0.022)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragados</td>
<td>-0.277(0.024)**</td>
<td>-0.277(0.024)**</td>
<td>-0.275(0.024)**</td>
<td>-0.284(0.024)**</td>
<td>-0.283(0.024)**</td>
<td>-0.275(0.024)**</td>
<td>-0.300(0.024)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>-0.485(0.040)**</td>
<td>-0.485(0.040)**</td>
<td>-0.483(0.040)**</td>
<td>-0.487(0.040)**</td>
<td>-0.489(0.040)**</td>
<td>-0.482(0.040)**</td>
<td>-0.507(0.040)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.229(0.039)**</td>
<td>0.229(0.039)**</td>
<td>0.230(0.039)**</td>
<td>0.220(0.039)**</td>
<td>0.223(0.039)**</td>
<td>0.229(0.039)**</td>
<td>0.223(0.039)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior position</td>
<td>0.039(0.046)**</td>
<td>0.219(0.050)**</td>
<td>0.233(0.051)**</td>
<td>0.206(0.047)**</td>
<td>0.206(0.047)**</td>
<td>0.224(0.046)**</td>
<td>0.250(0.046)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent job</td>
<td>-0.064(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.065(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.063(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.064(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.062(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.062(0.022)**</td>
<td>-0.079(0.022)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of alters to communicate with Ego's degree centrality</td>
<td>0.447(0.038)**</td>
<td>0.447(0.038)**</td>
<td>0.450(0.038)**</td>
<td>0.446(0.038)**</td>
<td>0.446(0.038)**</td>
<td>0.448(0.038)**</td>
<td>0.444(0.037)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of alters' functions</td>
<td>-0.024(0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.024(0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.024(0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.023(0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.023(0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.024(0.004)**</td>
<td>-0.022(0.004)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of alters' organizations</td>
<td>-0.017(0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017(0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017(0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.018(0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.018(0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017(0.005)**</td>
<td>-0.017(0.005)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same function</td>
<td>0.127(0.026)**</td>
<td>0.127(0.026)**</td>
<td>0.126(0.026)**</td>
<td>0.130(0.026)**</td>
<td>0.130(0.026)**</td>
<td>0.131(0.026)**</td>
<td>0.126(0.026)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same organization</td>
<td>0.165(0.020)**</td>
<td>0.165(0.020)**</td>
<td>0.161(0.020)**</td>
<td>0.133(0.022)**</td>
<td>0.131(0.022)**</td>
<td>0.168(0.020)**</td>
<td>0.173(0.020)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female alter</td>
<td>0.065(0.030)**</td>
<td>0.065(0.030)**</td>
<td>0.082(0.031)**</td>
<td>0.068(0.030)**</td>
<td>0.084(0.034)**</td>
<td>0.071(0.030)**</td>
<td>0.291(0.048)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter's senior position in the organizational hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.232(0.117)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1. Female alter × senior position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter's high organizational status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Female alter × organization status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter's network status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.073(0.033)</td>
<td>0.139(0.035)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Female alter × network status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.641(0.108)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.12(0.116)***</td>
<td>2.12(0.116)***</td>
<td>2.13(0.116)***</td>
<td>2.15(0.116)***</td>
<td>2.16(0.116)***</td>
<td>2.08(0.118)***</td>
<td>2.05(0.117)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.1599</td>
<td>0.1599</td>
<td>0.1608</td>
<td>0.1621</td>
<td>0.1624</td>
<td>0.1609</td>
<td>0.1685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ logged variable

P < 0.1, *P < .05, **P < .01, ***P < .001
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H1.
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H3.
Discussion and Conclusion

• *We are less likely to trust information from a woman whose status is higher than ours.*

• *Mechanism: gender-status mismatch*
Discussion and Conclusion

Contributions to

• *literature on information transfer*: What if no one trust transferred information?

• *network studies*: Differential rewards for men and women in networks

• *collaboration*: Effects of mismatches between institutional conditions on inequality in collaboration
Discussion and Conclusion

• *Female leaders and trust*

• *Well-connected women and trust*

→ Need to weaken gender status beliefs, before asking women to take leadership roles or be better connected with others.
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THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION! ANY QUESTIONS?