

# TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SETTING THE STAGE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
I. DISSERTATION: APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....	20
1. <i>Critical Management Studies (CMS)</i> .....	20
2. <i>A multidisciplinary approach</i> .....	22
3. <i>Methodology</i> .....	23
II. DEFINITIONS AND DELIMITATIONS .....	25
1. <i>Job Performance Evaluations</i> .....	25
2. <i>Distinguishing Sex and Gender</i> .....	28
3. <i>Gender stereotypes: Descriptive and prescriptive ways of being a woman</i> .....	30
<b>PART I: LITERATURE REVIEW ON GENDER AND JOB PERFORMANCE .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 - ETAT DES LIEUX: WOMEN IN MALE DOMINATED ORGANIZATIONS AND PROFESSIONS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
I. E.U LABOR MARKET: GENDER, JOB SEGREGATION AND JOB IDENTITIES .....	41
II. PROTOTYPICAL PERFORMANCE AND FAMILY WORK NEXUS.....	47
III. TOKENISM AND THE EFFECTS OF GENDER-JOB SEGREGATION.....	51
IV. JOB PERFORMANCE AND RISKS OF GENDER BIAS .....	55
1. <i>Job Performance</i> .....	55
2. <i>Risk of bias at every stage of performance evaluations</i> .....	59
CONCLUSION.....	61
<b>CHAPTER 2 - JOB PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND GENDER STEREOTYPES.....</b>	<b>63</b>
I. GENDER STEREOTYPE CONTENT: HOW WOMEN OUGHT TO BEHAVE.....	64
II. GENDER STEREOTYPES IN EVALUATING FEMALE PERFORMANCE.....	69
1. <i>Women's Lack of fit in male-typed organizations (Heilman, 1983, 1995, 2001)</i> .....	70
2. <i>Lack of congruity theory (Eagly &amp; Karau, 2002)</i> .....	73
3. <i>Evaluative penalties and backlash: risk of counter stereotypical behavior</i> .....	75
III. EVALUATING WOMEN'S PERFORMANCE: DO THE SAME PERFORMANCE CRITERIA APPLY? .....	79
1. <i>Subtle and changing criteria</i> .....	79
2. <i>Shifting standards (Biernat, 2003)</i> .....	81
CONCLUSION.....	84
<b>CHAPTER 3 - THE PARADOX OF WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION IN MAINTAINING THE STATUS QUO .....</b>	<b>86</b>
I. SELF-LIMITING BEHAVIOR AND SELF-STEREOTYPING .....	87
II. GENDER BIAS AND FEMALE EVALUATORS .....	93
III. SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION THEORY (SJT) .....	98
IV. AMBIVALENT SEXISM .....	101
CONCLUSION.....	104
<b>PART II: ESSAYS INVESTIGATING AND ANALYZING GENDER AND JOB PERFORMANCE .....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4 - REVIEWING MERIT-BASED JOB PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS: A CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEBAT ON GENDER INEQUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE.</b>	<b>109</b>
I. CENTRALITY OF JOB PERFORMANCE .....	110

II.	SETTING MERIT-BASED PERFORMANCE CRITERIA: A GENDERED PROCESS .....	112
III.	RELEVANCE OF MERITOCRACY TO THE DEBATE ON EVALUATING JOB PERFORMANCE.....	118
IV.	REWARDING JOB PERFORMANCE .....	124
V.	MERIT EQUITY NEXUS AND THE PARADOX OF MERITOCRACY.....	127
VI.	GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	133

**CHAPTER 5- LEADING ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE (LAP): THE ROLE OF SOCIAL IDENTITY PERFORMANCE FOR FEMALE ACADEMICS .....138**

I.	EUROPEAN LEADING ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE (LAP) IN A NEW CONTEXT: THE BOLOGNA REFORMS 138	
II.	LAP- THE MERIT MYTH .....	142
III.	LAP-COGNITIVE FACTORS AND PROTOTYPICALITY .....	148
IV.	STRATEGIC FACTORS: PERFORMING SOCIAL IDENTITY AND RE-DEFINING LAP .....	153
	CONCLUSION.....	160

**CHAPTER 6 - CONFIRMING AND REPRODUCING COMMUNALITY AS A GENDER NORM: WOMEN ON BOTH ENDS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL .....165**

I.	MEN AND WOMEN’S JOB PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OUTCOMES .....	166
II.	MALE AND FEMALE EVALUATORS OF JOB PERFORMANCE.....	168
III.	INFLUENCE OF EVALUATOR’S ENDORSEMENT OF AMBIVALENT SEXISM (AS).....	170
IV.	PRESENT RESEARCH .....	173
V.	METHOD .....	174
	1. <i>Procedure</i> .....	174
	2. <i>Measures</i> .....	176
VI.	RESULTS .....	182
	1. <i>Evaluating the Performance of men and women (H1)</i> .....	182
	2. <i>Men and Women Evaluators of Job Performance (H2)</i> .....	185
	3. <i>The effect of evaluators’ ambivalent sexism beliefs on job performance (H3)</i> .....	189
	4. <i>Beliefs in ambivalent sexism as potential moderators for performance ratings (H4)</i> ....	193
VII.	DISCUSSION.....	193
	1. <i>Evaluating the Performance of Male and Female Ratees (H1)</i> .....	193
	2. <i>Female and Male Evaluators Evaluating Performance (H2)</i> .....	195
	3. <i>The effect of evaluators’ ambivalent sexism beliefs on job performance (H3)</i> .....	196
VIII.	IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS .....	197

**CHAPTER 7 - I DESERVE MORE FOR EVALUATING A WOMAN! EVIDENCE OF ELEVATED ENTITLEMENT IN JOB PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS .....204**

I.	FEMALE EVALUATOR’S DEPRESSED ENTITLEMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF JOB PERFORMANCE .....	206
II.	ELEVATED ENTITLEMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF RATING FEMALE JOB PERFORMANCE.....	208
III.	ENTITLEMENT AND BELIEFS IN AMBIVALENT SEXISM .....	212
IV.	PRESENT RESEARCH .....	214
V.	METHOD .....	215
	1. <i>Participants</i> .....	215
	2. <i>Procedure</i> .....	215
	3. <i>Measures</i> .....	216
VI.	RESULTS .....	217
	1. <i>Evaluator’s perceived entitlement in the context of job performance (H1)</i> .....	217
	2. <i>Perceived entitlement when evaluating a woman versus a man (H2)</i> .....	218
	3. <i>Moderating effects of belief in ambivalent sexism (H3)</i> .....	221
VII.	DISCUSSION.....	223
	1. <i>A Depressed entitlement effect? (H1)</i> .....	223
	2. <i>A heightened entitlement effect when assessing a woman’s job performance? (H2)</i> .....	226
VIII.	LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS .....	228

<b>CHAPTER 8 - REVISITING JOB PERFORMANCE: GENDER SUBTEXT AND THE REPRODUCTION OF GENDER INEQUALITIES .....</b>	<b>232</b>
I.    WOMEN, SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY (SET) INDUSTRY .....	233
II.   GENDER SUBTEXT .....	234
III.  METHODOLOGY .....	236
1. <i>The research organization</i> .....	236
2. <i>Research method</i> .....	238
IV.  GENERAL DISCUSSION – FINDINGS.....	242
1. <i>Accounts of the exemplary performer</i> .....	242
2. <i>The Generic He</i> .....	247
3. <i>Visibility, interpersonal skills and networking</i> .....	249
4. <i>Policing performance norms by way of the low performer</i> .....	254
5. <i>The exemplary performer: a heroic figure</i> .....	261
6. <i>Token women's experience at ITech</i> .....	265
CONCLUSION.....	274
<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>276</b>
I.    OVERVIEW.....	276
II.   MECHANISMS OF (RE)PRODUCING AND MAINTAINING GENDER INEQUALITY.....	278
1. <i>Gender stereotypes as mechanisms of maintaining inequality in organizations</i> .....	278
2. <i>Androcentric prototype as a psycho-social mechanism for maintaining status quo</i> .....	283
3. <i>Meritocracy as a mechanism of maintaining inequity</i> .....	288
4. <i>Women's role in (re)producing and maintaining inequality</i> .....	293
III.  LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES.....	299
1. <i>Qualitative methodology</i> .....	299
2. <i>Quantitative methodology</i> .....	300
IV.  PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS.....	301
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>306</b>
I.    APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT REPRESENTATION AT ITECH .....	306
II.   APPENDIX 2: REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY (ITECH) .....	308
III.  APPENDIX 3: QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE .....	309
IV.   APPENDIX 4: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN.....	312
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>316</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: HR management practices' linked to job performance evaluations. (Based on Jiang and colleagues' (2012) framework).....	27
Table 2: Percentage of male and female workers as a function of the level of feminization of the occupation in Belgium.....	43
Table 3: Summary of the taxonomy of social strategies proposed by Blanz and colleagues (1998) .....	156
Table 4: Study participants by experiment type .....	174
Table 5: Number of respondents to the ambivalent sexism scale by gender .....	176
Table 6: Correlation matrix .....	176
Table 7: Rotated component matrix (Varimax with Kaiser Normalization) including correlation values with components.....	178
Table 8: Total variance explained.....	179
Table 9:Coefficients for the regression model: Retention decision predicted by job performance ratings for the female employee .....	185
Table 10:coefficients for the regression model: Retention decision predicted by job performance ratings made by female evaluators .....	188
Table 11: Coefficients for the regression model: Overall performance predicted by ambivalent sexism subscales for the male employee sample.....	191
Table 12: Coefficients for the regression model: Interpersonal performance predicted by ambivalent sexism subscales and the gender of the employee for the male evaluator sample .....	192
Table 13: Coefficients for the regression model: retention decision predicted by ambivalent sexism and technical performance for the female evaluator sample ..	192
Table 14: Summary of hypotheses and findings of chapter 6 .....	202
Table 15: Summary of hypotheses and findings of chapter 7 .....	230
Table 16: Examples of recommendations to alleviate contributing mechanisms behind the glass ceiling .....	303

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Relaxed and intensified prescriptions (based on Prentice and Carranza, 2002) .....	67
Figure 2: Relaxed and intensified proscriptions (based on Prentice and Carranza, 2002) .....	68
Figure 3: Screen plot of eigenvalues.....	179
Figure 4: Interpersonal performance ratings by gender of the employee.....	183
Figure 5: overall performance scores given by male and female evaluators .....	186
Figure 6: Perceived entitlement (in Euro) for evaluating a male (Thomas) versus a female(Sophie) employee.....	219
Figure 7: Mechanisms explaining the persistence of the glass ceiling in male dominated organizations and occupations .....	298