

# Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Lup, Daniela (2018) Something to celebrate (or not): the differing impact of promotion to manager on the job satisfaction of women and men. *Work, Employment and Society*, 32 (2) . pp. 407-425. ISSN 0950-0170 [Article] (doi:10.1177/0950017017713932)

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/21841/>

## Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

[eprints@mdx.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@mdx.ac.uk)

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

# **Something to Celebrate (or not): The Differing Impact of Promotion to Manager on the Job Satisfaction of Women and Men**

**Daniela Lup**

Middlesex University  
The Burroughs  
London NW4 4BT, United Kingdom  
Email: [d.lup@mdx.ac.uk](mailto:d.lup@mdx.ac.uk)

## **Abstract**

The literatures on gender status stereotyping and glass ceiling have shown that women managers have more difficult job experiences than men, but whether these experiences result in lower job satisfaction is still an open question. Using fixed-effects models in a longitudinal national sample, this study examines differences in job satisfaction between women and men promoted into lower- and higher-level management, after controlling for key determinants of job satisfaction. Results indicate that promotions to management are accompanied by an increase in job satisfaction for men, but not for women and that the differing effect lasts beyond the promotion year. Moreover, following promotion, the job satisfaction of women promoted to higher-level management even starts declining. The type of promotion (internal or lateral) does not modify this effect. By clarifying the relationship between gender, promotion to managerial position and job satisfaction the study contributes to the literature on the gender gap in managerial representation.

### **Keywords:**

gender gap; glass ceiling; job satisfaction; managerial promotion; managerial representation; women managers

## **Introduction**

The existence of a persistent gap in managerial representation between men and women, especially in upper management positions, is widely documented (Catalyst 2014; Cohen et al. 2009; ONS-UK; Padavic and Reskin 2002) and exploring its causes has been an important research endeavour. While earlier explanations primarily focused on employers' hiring, training and promotion choices that more overtly favour men over women (Reskin and McBrier 2000), more recent research has increasingly focused on individuals' career choices and the contexts that affect these choices. This research has proposed that the number of women in managerial positions is lower than the number of men because more women than men tend to avoid managerial career paths characterized by high work-life interference and conflict. Indeed, sound evidence exists showing that the requirements associated with managerial jobs are likely to create higher levels of work-life interference (Schieman et al. 2009) and that women, more than men, are affected by work-family conflict (Jacobs and Gerson 2005; Martins et al. 2002).

While existing research has established that incompatibilities between work and family roles are responsible for women's career choices that contribute to the gender gap in management, other explanations have received less empirical support. For instance, research in organizational studies has long shown that job satisfaction, the "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job experiences" (Locke 1976: 1304), is a useful concept for understanding differences in career choices (Griffeth et al. 2000; Rhodes and Doering 1983). This literature proposes that differences in career choices are often reflections of differences in job satisfaction between individuals employed in similar jobs but with different job experiences, thus suggesting that the gender gap in managerial representation might be also related to gender differences in job satisfaction as a result of promotion to management. Specifically, to the extent that women promoted to management

are less satisfied with their work experiences than promoted men and to the extent that this situation persists beyond the initial promotion period, one could expect that women are less likely to further consider top managerial jobs, thus reducing the pool of female talent for upper management. Moreover, to the extent that prospective job candidates form ideas about their fit with a job based on interactions and comparison with demographically similar groups (Cable and Judge 1996; Ridgeway 1997), if women aspiring to a managerial career perceive that managerial promotions lead to lower job satisfaction they are less likely to apply for any managerial position.

The conjecture that promotion to management might have less of a positive effect on women than on men is plausible and consistent with findings from the gender status stereotypes literature showing that women in managerial positions have more difficult organizational experiences than men managers (Eagly and Karau 2002; Ridgeway 2001; Schein 2001). Furthermore, it is also consistent with the ‘glass-ceiling’ hypothesis that these difficulties increase as women move up on the hierarchical ladder (Elliott and Smith 2004; Gorman and Kmec 2009; Maume 2004). Yet, because existing studies rely almost exclusively on cross-sectional data, current research has not established a rigorous causal link between promotion to management and the job satisfaction of women and men, nor have scholars investigated whether potential gender differences exist and persist beyond the initial promotion period. Moreover, conditions around promotions, such as the status of the managerial position and the route into management (internal or external promotion) that might further affect gender differences in job satisfaction at the managerial level have been, so far, understudied.

This study more rigorously investigates gender differences in job satisfaction as a result of promotion to management by using rich longitudinal data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS). Specifically, the study expands current research by (1)

assessing within-individual effects of promotion to management on satisfaction with job experiences, thus ensuring that promotion effects are not biased by stable but unobserved individual characteristics that vary with gender; (2) assessing whether the effects of promotion into higher managerial echelon differ from promotion into lower-level management positions; (3) investigating whether the type of promotion to management, internal vs. lateral, affects the job satisfaction of women and men in management positions; (4) examining promotion effects beyond the promotion year, thus offering more insight into the evolution of job experiences and satisfaction with managerial careers.

The study finds clear evidence that promotions to both lower- and higher-level management positions are accompanied by an increase in job satisfaction for men, but not for women and that the gender gap in satisfaction lasts beyond the promotion year. The most disadvantaged are women promoted to higher-level management, whose job satisfaction starts declining in the post promotion period. By shedding new light on the relationship between gender, managerial promotion and job satisfaction this study contributes to the literature on gender representation in management by suggesting that gender variation in satisfaction with job experiences after promotion might be a reason why women tend to opt out of managerial career paths. Further contributions are discussed in detail in the concluding section.

### **Managerial Position, Gender and Job Satisfaction: Theory, Evidence and Gaps**

Organizational research on job design has consistently found a positive association between managerial positions and job satisfaction. The argument is that, compared to regular employees, managers have jobs richer in characteristics associated with job satisfaction, such as more job autonomy and authority, more opportunities to use a wider range of skills and to work on larger projects that are typically seen as more important for organizational success,

as well as higher organizational status (Hackman and Oldham 1975; 1980; Humphrey et al. 2007). Much less is known however about whether the positive impact of promotion to management is felt by women and men alike.

### *Gender and job satisfaction*

Population-based surveys, primarily in Britain and the US, have consistently found that women tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than men. A widely accepted explanation for this finding, proposed by Kanter (1976; 1977) and Clark (1996; 1997), is that, all things equal, gender differences in job satisfaction are merely the reflection of women and men working in jobs of different quality, with women traditionally in low-status positions with limited career prospects. To the extent that in the past women's jobs had been much worse than men's and because when setting their expectations women tended to compare themselves with other women and not with men (Hodson 1989) women had lower job expectations than men. Thus, if women expect less than men do from their jobs, they are likely to show higher levels of satisfaction than men, even when working in lower-status jobs. However, these results are not expected for employees on managerial career paths who have similar expectations and work in jobs with higher levels of autonomy, authority and significance.

Empirical results support this explanation. For instance, in a comprehensive cross-sectional study based on data from the first wave of the British Household Survey, Clark (1997) found that women in non-managerial positions were more satisfied with their jobs than men, but that the gender difference disappeared for those in professional and managerial positions. Similarly, in a cross-sectional analysis of a representative sample from an US state, Hodson (1989) found that both women and men enjoyed having higher levels of authority, such as hiring and supervisory duties, and that the magnitude of the impact of authority on job satisfaction did not differ by gender. Studies conducted at the organizational level have

found similar patterns. For instance, research conducted in a number of large corporations evidenced that women in managerial positions report overall levels of satisfaction comparable with male managers (Lyness and Thompson 1997; Scandura and Lankau 1997) and that, in some instances, women in management report higher job satisfaction than their male colleagues (Tsui and Gutek 1984).

Important limitations, however, make it difficult to draw firm conclusions from these studies. First, because all studies are cross-sectional, they describe the relationship between job satisfaction and gender for incumbent managers, that is, women and men already working in managerial positions. Cross-sectional evidence is problematic because it does not account for the possibility that incumbent managers are individuals on whom the managerial promotion has had a positive impact. Specifically, in cross-sectional studies, the finding that women and men managers are equally satisfied with their jobs might be due to the fact that women less satisfied with their new managerial experiences had already dropped out from the sample or that the sample is dominated by individuals with characteristics correlated with both the propensity to enter into management and the level of job satisfaction. Indeed, existing studies show that some individual traits, such as extroversion, are associated with both leadership and job satisfaction (Judge et al. 2002; Judge, Heller, Mount 2002). A related scenario is that in which promoted women who find the managerial experience difficult do not quit, but rather adjust their expectations downward over time. If this is the case, then a cross-sectional study of incumbents would still show men and women managers having comparable levels of job satisfaction; yet, if at the beginning of their managerial career women had lower levels of satisfaction than men, such an experience would deter them from seeking further promotions to higher-management positions.

Another limitation of existing studies relates to the absence of accounts regarding the status of managerial position into which women and men are promoted. Status of the position

is important because lower and upper-management positions differ in terms of work-related resources and demands. In turn, different combinations of work resources and demands affect the level of conflict between work and non-work roles and the satisfaction with these roles. For instance, the stress of high-status hypothesis (Schieman et al. 2009) proposes that those working in high-status jobs enjoy more authority and autonomy, but that, at the same time, they face higher work demands, such as higher time commitments. As a result, high-status positions are typically associated with higher work-nonwork interferences and conflicts. Using data from an US survey, Schieman et al. (2009) show that those working in managerial positions report higher level of interferences, a result confirmed by Ruppner (2013) who, analysing data from ten countries, shows that for both men and women work-family conflicts are higher for employees with supervisory duties. If the level of interference increases with the status of the job and if interference negatively affects job satisfaction, then lack of differences in job satisfaction between women and men managers documented by existing studies might be a reflection of the different positions into which they are promoted, with women less likely than men to be promoted in high-status positions.

Third, studies that compare the job satisfaction of women and men managers seldom account for work arrangements meant to alleviate work-life conflicts. Nevertheless, existing research shows that flexible work arrangements that increase employees' schedule control have a positive impact on the work-life interface by reducing work-life conflicts (Kelly et al. 2011; Russell et al. 2009) and that women, more than men, appreciate the availability of flexible benefits (Atkinson and Hall 2009; Scandura and Lankau 1997). Accounting for flexible work arrangements is important for two reasons. First, if flexible work arrangements benefit women and men differently, then gender differences in job satisfaction might be due to differences in access to these arrangements. Second, if flexible work arrangements represent a pull factor for women more than for men, then differences in job satisfaction



might be a reflection of job selection biases. Indeed, if women self-select into occupations and firms that are more likely to offer flexible work arrangements (Bender et al. 2005), then women managers might appear as satisfied as men managers.

A final limitation relates to the lack of accounts regarding the route into promotion. Existing evidence related to accession to management shows that promotion into managerial positions, especially top management, is often the result of external hiring, but that women are more likely to be promoted internally (Gorman and Kmec 2009; Lyness and Judiesch 1999; Maume 2004). Thus, if women managers are more likely to continue working in settings in which they already have some reputation for performance, while men need to adapt to the managerial job demands in a new organization, then the lack of significant differences between incumbent women and men managers might be due to differences in adaptation demands. At the limit, for women promoted internally, the level of job satisfaction might even exceed that on men, as found by Tsui and Gutek (1984). In turn, finding that the gender gap in satisfaction exists and persists regardless of the promotion route could be indicative of more widespread differences in work experiences for women and men managers.

#### *Gender status stereotypes and the job experiences of women and men managers*

Relational theories of job design have shown that work is embedded in broader systems of interpersonal interactions and relationships which heavily affect employees' experiences and their ability to carry out their jobs (Grant and Parker 2009; Humphrey et al. 2007). Given the complexity of the role requirements for managerial positions, managers' performance and, implicitly, their job satisfaction depend to a great extent on the quality of their interaction with subordinates, peers and superiors (Oldham and Hackman 2010). In the absence of support from some of these groups, a manager's performance is likely to suffer. For instance,

Moran (2005) finds that the closer and more trustworthy the relations between managers and their work contacts, the higher the managers' performance, both on routine and innovative tasks. In turn, Epitropaki and Martin (2005) show that the quality of interaction between group members and their manager depends on whether members perceive the manager's identity and behaviours as congruent with what they consider prototypical for a manager, and that the importance of the perceived prototypical fit is higher when the duration of the relation manager-group member is low. Furthermore, the support and appreciation that managers receive depends on others' perceptions of how well-connected the manager is with those in the higher echelon of the organization. For instance Kilduff and Krackhardt (1994) show that individuals seen as having high-status contacts in an organization are perceived as better performers than those seen as less connected. These findings show that the ability of new managers to carry out their job is closely tied to the quality of their interpersonal relations within the organization. Overall, relational theories then suggest that the link between managerial positions and job satisfaction might not be positive for all managers, and that managers whose jobs experiences are more difficult due to less supportive social relations are likely to be less satisfied.

Do women managers have more difficult job experiences than male managers?

Research on gender stereotypes has long shown that widespread status gender beliefs that portray women as less fit for managerial positions than men (Heilman et al. 1995; Ridgeway 2001; Schein 2001) have a negative impact on the way in which female managers experience their job. For instance, because of widespread gender beliefs that men generally occupy higher-status positions than women (Ridgeway 2001), people expect that men are to be found in leadership roles and that women are more likely to occupy subordinate roles. As a result, compared to women, men are perceived as more legitimate holders of managerial positions (Ridgeway 2001) and more people prefer men as bosses (Riffkin 2014; Powell and

Butterfield 2015). Lower perceived legitimacy of the manager has a negative impact on the quality of the interaction between followers and manager, in particular on followers' compliance with the manager's directions (Epitropaki and Martin 2005). In the absence of compliance for at least some group members, women managers will find their work more difficult and their authority diminished. These issues are more likely to appear for women just transitioning to lower-status managerial positions, when they do not have enough people management experience and have not yet established a reputation for good performance.

Another factor with detrimental effects on women managerial experiences is their limited access to support from high-status contacts (Brass 1985), in part due to women's exclusion from 'old boys clubs' (Kanter 1977; Wajcman 1998). High-status contacts are important because they facilitate access to scarce organizational resources. To the extent that women managers have fewer high-status contacts, they have less access to organizational resources than men and their performance is less likely to be acknowledged by others. Moreover, studies show that, even when women have high-status contacts in their networks, they still receive less support than men from these contacts (Ibarra 1992; McGuire 2002). As a result women need to increase their effort to acquire organizational resources that enable them to perform at the same level as men. Moreover, the realization that a woman manager does not have as much interaction with and support from high-status members of the organization as men managers could affect their performance reputation. These issues are more likely to have an immediate effect on women in lower-status managerial positions who have fewer powerful connections and need time to establish their reputation.

Building a reputation for high performance, however, is harder for women than for men because performance evaluation is often gendered. For instances, studies show that women's high performance is more likely attributed to external causes, such as luck or support from others, often from men, while men's successes are more likely attributed to

ability; conversely, women's low performance in high-stake situations is typically explained as lack of competence, while men's poor performance is attributed to external causes or bad luck (Nieva and Gutek 1980; Heilman and Haynes 2005). To increase their legitimacy women recently promoted feel under pressure to change their management style to align it more with the agentic requirements of the stereotypical manager role (Wajcman 1998). However, studies show that women who display a more agentic management style are likely to face negative "backlash" (Rudman 2001) and that the most successful women leaders are perceived as the least desired bosses (Heilman and Okimoto 2007). Such ambiguity regarding the desirable management style makes managerial job demands more severe for women than for men managers. In turn, higher job demands coupled with low control over the context from which such demands stem is known to have negative effects on job satisfaction (Karasek 1979). Overall, these studies show not only that widespread status gender stereotypes have a negative impact on the work experiences that women managers have, but also suggest that these experiences might continue during the period following the promotion. Moreover, because women in upper management positions are more likely to be viewed as violating the status gender norm (Heilman and Okimoto 2007) one would expect that their job experiences might even worsen after the initial promotion year.

### **Data and Analytical Approach**

This study investigates the conjecture that promotion to management might have a different impact on the job satisfaction of women and men using data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), a longitudinal survey of a representative sample of British households (Taylor et al. 2010). Data from waves 1999-2008 was used because it included information about all major factors known to affect job satisfaction. After 2008 the BHPS was replaced by a new survey called *Understanding Society*. Unfortunately, it was not possible to extend

the analysis presented here to the new survey because many questions of interest were not transferred or were modified and, also, many individuals in the BHPS did not transfer to the new survey. Nonetheless, the ten-year period covered by the analysis is recent enough to provide a window through which we can glean insights into how promotion to manager affects the job satisfaction of women and men in the British labour market.

The BHPS data allows for addressing limitations present in previous studies, thus providing a more rigorous empirical evidence of the relationship between gender and job satisfaction following promotion to management. First, the longitudinal nature of the data allows for implementing within-individual, fixed-effects (FE) estimation models. In contrast to cross-sectional models, which estimate changes in job satisfaction due to differences *between* individuals, FE models allow for estimating changes *within* individuals, that is changes in job satisfaction before and after an individual is promoted to manager, thus addressing the problem of unobserved heterogeneity which produces biased estimates (Allison 2009). Consequently, estimations are not contaminated by the effects of time-invariant individual characteristics such as stable work preferences, attitudes or personality. Second, the data allows to account for changes in job satisfaction due to promotion in lower and higher-status managerial positions, thus providing a better control for variation in level of autonomy, authority and impact of managerial positions. Third, the data accounts for promotion routes to be observed, that is whether the promotion is internal or external. Fourth, the data contains information about a number of aspects related to the work-life interface, such as flexible work arrangements and the number of hours spent on job as well as on homework tasks. Finally, the data includes rich information about virtually all main determinants of job satisfaction used in the literature, thus overcoming issues related to estimation biases due to omitted variables.

## Sample and Variables

The sample includes all employed individuals, excluding self-employed, aged between 16 and 65 with information on variables of interest, both full-time and part-time employees. Part-time employees were included because part-timing might be temporarily used by women who later on move into full employment and become managers. This produced a sample of 13,034 distinct individuals (52,255 observations), 6,965 female and 6,069 male. The panel is unbalanced since not all individuals have information for all waves.

*Dependent variable:* Each year, employed respondents were asked to rate their overall job satisfaction. The variable *Job Satisfaction* takes values from 1 (“completely dissatisfied”) to 7 (“completely satisfied”). A wide range of evidence shows that overall job satisfaction captures well the cognitive, relational and affective aspects of individuals’ experiences while performing their jobs (Locke 1969; Humphrey et al. 2007) and that a one-item global job satisfaction measure is as effective as a multi-item measure (Wanous et al. 1997). Given the fine-grained scale (seven-category measure) and consistent with organizational behaviour and sociological studies of job attitudes, job satisfaction was treated as continuous variable. Alternative ordered-logit analyses with job satisfaction treated categorically produced similar results.

*Independent variables:* Each year, respondents indicate whether they work in a managerial position. Further, each respondent is assigned a NS-SEC code (National Statistics Socio-Economic Class). NS-SEC assigns individuals a code based their occupation and responsibilities, including supervision, thus explicitly capturing differences in employment conditions and relations (Rose et al. 2005). The variable *Higher-Manager* takes value 1 for respondents who indicate that they work in a managerial position and who have the NS-SEC code ‘Higher Managerial’ and zero otherwise. Those who reported working in managerial position, but not a high-status one, are coded *Lower-Manager*.

*Control variables:* In addition to the variables of main interest, BHPS contains rich information regarding other individual and organizational factors that could affect job satisfaction. In line with previous studies, the following control variables were included: promotion opportunities in the organization, work hours and overtime, available flexible time benefits in the form of flexitime and reduced work week, tenure, individual work income, whether the job is permanent, fulltime employment, employer's size and sector, employee's age, whether in poor health, number of children, marital status, family income, household work hours, education, union member. Region, occupation and year dummies were included in all analyses.

#### TABLE 1 HERE

Descriptive statistics in Table 1 show that, on average, women have higher levels of overall job satisfaction than men (mean 5.50 for women, 5.29 for men). More men than women work in managerial positions. Specifically, 2.25 percent of women work in high-status managerial positions and 16.4 percent are in lower-status managerial roles, while close to 6 percent of men occupy higher-status managerial positions and 20.5 work in lower-status managerial roles. Women and men are relatively similar with respect to most socio-demographic characteristics (age, married, children, family income and education). There are, however, differences between men and women in work arrangements: considerably more men than women are employed full-time, work in the private sector and more men are employed in medium and large-size firms. Men work more hours than women, including more overtime hours, and are less likely than women to have flexible time work arrangements; however, more men than women work a reduced week. Instead, women report more hours worked in the household. The average wage for women is lower than the average wage for men and women report fewer promotion opportunities than men. Finally, more

women than men are union members. Overall, these figures are in line with national statistics and with previous studies.

## **Analyses and Findings**

Given the panel form of the data all estimations presented below are based on individual fixed-effects regression models thus allowing for a stronger causal interpretation. To enable comparison with previous studies, effects for well-researched control factors are presented first, followed by a detailed discussion of the effects central to this study.

The effects for control variables are consistent with findings from the many studies of job satisfaction (e.g. Clark 1997; Riza et al. 2016). For instance, in all models, higher wages, promotion opportunities and new jobs have a positive impact on job satisfaction, while longer organizational tenure and full-time have a negative impact. Permanent jobs increase employees' satisfaction, but more significantly for men. Access to flexitime arrangements has a positive impact on the job satisfaction for both women and men, but the effect is diminished for those who work long hours (negative coefficients for *Hours worked x Flexitime*). This result is consistent with the proposition that flexitime benefits can be a double-edged sword, as they can create more work-life interference by blurring the boundaries between work and non-work roles (Glavin and Schieman 2012).

In Table 2 column 1, the coefficients for *Higher-Manager* and *Lower-Manager* describe the effect of a change in status (from non-manager to manager) on job satisfaction for promotions into the higher and lower-level managerial position; the coefficients for the interaction terms *Female x Higher-Manager* and *Female x Lower-Manager* describe the additional change in satisfaction incurred by female managers transitioning in higher and lower-management position, respectively. The positive and significant coefficient (.132) for *Higher-Manager* shows that those promoted to high-level management positions see an



increase in their job satisfaction. Promotion into lower-level managerial positions has also a positive impact on job satisfaction (coefficient .105). The interaction coefficients between female and managerial status variables are negative, suggesting that women's increase in satisfaction is lesser than that of male managers. This is mostly supported for lower-level managerial positions, where the interaction coefficient is negative and highly statistically significant (coefficient -.139,  $p < .001$ ). A test of the additive effect of the two coefficients shows that the increase in satisfaction for women is not distinguishable from zero. For higher-status managerial positions, the interaction coefficient is negative, but does not reach the same high statistical significance level (coefficient  $-.121$ , approaching  $p < 0.1$  only), thus suggesting a less clear initial gap in satisfaction between men and women promoted in higher-level management roles.

#### TABLE 2 HERE

The results obtained so far show that the impact of a managerial position is positive for men but not for women, using as comparison category all non-promoted employees, men and women together. However, one can argue that in order to account for more specific gender differences the best comparison is between promoted and not promoted individuals of the same gender. The models presented in Table 2 (columns 2 and 3) estimate the impact of managerial positions for women and men separately. In column 2, the estimates show that, compared to women in non-managerial roles, women promoted to manager do not see an increase in job satisfaction. In contrast, men promoted to manager have higher levels of satisfaction compared to men who remain in non-managerial positions. The effect is positive and significant for promotion to upper- and lower-management levels. Taken together, the results show that managerial positions have a positive impact on men's job satisfaction, but not on women's.

A potential source of further differentiation in the quality of managerial experience is the type of promotion – internal vs. external. To investigate whether promotion effects on job satisfaction vary by type of promotion the analyses reported in columns 1-3 are repeated, including this time 2-way and 3 way interaction effects. In Table 2 columns 4-6 the coefficient of the interaction effect between management status and *New Workplace* indicates the change in satisfaction for those promoted to manager upon moving into a new organization. For about 26 percent of women and 27 percent of men promotion to management coincides with a change in workplace. The interaction effect is positive for both men and women entering higher-management in a new workplace and negative for women and men entering lower-status managerial position in a new organization, but neither coefficient is highly statistically significant. These results show that the route into management, external vs. internal promotion, does not explicitly favour either gender category.

To shed more light on the link between managerial promotion and differences in job satisfaction between women and men it is important to understand whether the gender differences unveiled by previous analyses represent a one-time change or whether they last, diminish or accentuate beyond the first promotion period. If it is indeed the case that managerial experiences are different for men and women, the expectation is that the effect would be enduring beyond the promotion year. To understand changes in job satisfaction over time the examination of within-person effects is extended in a series of models that account for changes in job satisfaction in the first and second year after the transition into a managerial position. Specifically, a series of dummy variables are created to indicate when the transition took place and to account for job satisfaction one period after the transition and for the second period, respectively.

Table 3 shows the two-period impact of promotion to management on women and men. The coefficient for the variable *Promotion First Year* captures the unique effect of promotion in the first year of becoming a manager, while *Promotion Second Year* describes the change in job satisfaction in the second period after promotion. Analyses show the effects of both promotions to higher and lower-level managerial positions. Interaction effects to account for the route into management are also included. All control variables presented in previous analysis are included, but, to economize of space, their effects are not reported.

#### TABLE 3 HERE

Table 3 column 1 shows that, for women, managerial promotion is not accompanied by an increase in satisfaction in the first promotion year. In the second year, women in high-management see a significant decrease in satisfaction (coefficient  $-.284$ ), while the job satisfaction of lower managers does not change further. In turn, the job satisfaction of men promoted into higher-management positions increases in the second year (coefficient  $.213$ ) and the satisfaction of men in lower managerial positions increases during the first and the second promotion period (coefficients  $.125$  and  $.143$  respectively). None of the interaction effects with the type of promotion achieve statistical significance, suggesting that promotion route does not have long term effects on the gender gap in satisfaction with managerial experiences.

### **Discussion and Conclusions**

The aim of this study was to address gaps in our understanding of the relationship between gender, managerial promotion and job satisfaction and thus to shed more light on processes that generate gender inequality in managerial representation. Specifically, building on insights from the gender status stereotypes and ‘glass-ceiling’ literatures, the study sought to

test whether managerial promotions are experienced differently by women and men and whether such differences vary with the managerial level, with the promotion route and over time.

Using individual fixed-effects models in a longitudinal national sample, the study finds that promotions to lower or higher-level management do not have a positive impact on women's job satisfaction, but that they do increase men's job satisfaction. Second, the study finds that for men the effect of promotion on job satisfaction remains positive and significant beyond the promotion year. Instead, job satisfaction for women promoted to lower-manager remains flat during the promotion period and in the post-promotion period, while women promoted to higher-management see a drop in their job satisfaction after the first year. This latter effect is consistent with the 'glass-ceiling' hypothesis that gender difficulties increase for upper-management positions. Finally, the type of promotion – internal or lateral – does not affect the gap in satisfaction between women and men promoted to manager. Because the fixed-effects models control for stable individual characteristics, the analyses presented in this study offer more rigorous empirical evidence that managerial positions do not have a positive impact on women's job satisfaction and that for some women managerial promotions result in lower job satisfaction, but that men do enjoy an increase in satisfaction and enjoy it beyond the promotion period. This study appears to be the first to examine the impact of promotion to management on the job satisfaction of women and men using a large longitudinal dataset with controls for key determinants of job satisfaction.

Although the BHPS provides the opportunity for a nationally representative analysis of the relationship between gender, managerial promotion and job satisfaction, one of its limitations is the lack of fine-grained information on the micro-environment in which the managers work, such as the prominence of gender status beliefs at the organizational level. While it is unlikely that the lack of such information would affect within-individual effects, a

finer-grained account of organizational environments would be useful for clarifying the link between gender attitudes and the job experiences of women and men managers. For instance, evidence exists that organizational settings in which a larger proportion of members hold gender stereotypical beliefs see more gender pay discrimination (Janssen et al. 2016). Further studies could investigate if such settings also see higher gaps in satisfaction between women and men managers, especially given that within-job pay discrimination is difficult to sustain and therefore rapidly decreasing.

The results of this study suggest a number of practical implications. A first implication relates to the attention paid by organizations to job satisfaction surveys. While most mid- and large-size organizations conduct periodic surveys to assess staff satisfaction with their jobs, attention tends to focus on managed staff and less on managers. Moreover, gender comparisons, when performed, tend to include all staff. The results of this current study suggest that organizations that aim to understand the existence or the danger of a gender gap in managerial representation should investigate gender differences in job satisfaction in greater detail, focusing on promotions to upper and lower managerial levels for women and men. A second implication relates to the typical assumptions that organizations make when crafting gender-inclusive practices, that women need primarily more work flexibility, more developmental effort and more promotion opportunities. The results of this study show that although all these factors have a positive impact on women's (and men's) job satisfaction, after controlling for these factors women managers are still worse off than their male peers. The robustness of the main results to a wide range of controls reinforces the argument increasingly made by sociologists and organizational scholars that if the 'glass ceiling' is to be shattered organizations need not only focus on removing barriers that prevent women from advancing on the managerial ladder, but also to pay close attention to the actual experiences that women have once they reach positions of authority. To the extent that

women managers have more difficult experiences than men, fewer are likely to seek further promotions.

## References

- Atkinson C and Hall L (2009) 'The role of gender in varying forms of flexible working.' *Gender, Work & Organization* 16(6): 650-666.
- Allison PD (2009) *Fixed effects regression models*. Vol. 160. SAGE publications.
- Brass DJ (1985) Men's and women's networks: A study of interaction patterns and influence in an organization. *Academy of Management Journal* 28(2): 327-343.
- Cable DM and Judge TA (1996) Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 67(3): 294-311.
- Catalyst. *2014 Catalyst Census: Women Board Directors & Catalyst Pyramid: Women in S&P 500 Companies*. New York.
- Clark AE (1997) Job satisfaction and gender: why are women so happy at work?. *Labour Economics* 4(4): 341-372.
- Cohen PN, Huffman ML and Knauer S (2009) Stalled Progress? Gender Segregation and Wage Inequality among Managers, 1980-2000. *Work and Occupations* 36(4): 318-342.
- Eagly AH and Karau SJ (2002) Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review* 109(3): 573-598.
- Elliott JR and Smith RA (2004) Race, Gender, and Workplace Power.' *American Sociological Review* 69: 365-86.
- Epitropaki O and Martin R (2005) From ideal to real: a longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader-member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(4): 659-676.
- Glavin P and Schieman S (2012) Work-family role blurring and work-family conflict: The moderating influence of job resources and job demands. *Work and Occupations*, 39(1): 71-98.
- Grant AM and Parker SK (2009) Redesigning work design theories: the rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *The Academy of Management Annals* 3(1): 317-375.
- Griffeth RW, Hom PW and Gaertner S(2000) A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management* 26(3): 463-488.
- Gorman EH and Kmec JA (2009) Hierarchical Rank and Women's Organizational Mobility: Glass Ceilings in Corporate Law Firms1. *American Journal of Sociology* 114(5): 1428-1474.
- Hackman RJ and Oldham GR (1975) Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60(2): 159-170.
- Hackman RJ and Oldham GR (1980) *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Heilman ME and Okimoto TG (2007) Why are women penalized for success at male tasks?: The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(1): 81-92.
- Heilman ME, Block CJ and Martell RF (1995) Sex stereotypes: Do they influence perceptions of managers?. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality* 10(6): 237-252.
- Heilman ME and Haynes MC (2005) No credit where credit is due: attributional

- rationalization of women's success in male-female teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(5): 905-916.
- Hodson R (1989) Gender differences in job satisfaction: Why aren't women more dissatisfied?. *Sociological Quarterly* 30(3): 385-399.
- Humphrey SE, Nahrgang JD and Morgeson FP (2007) Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: a meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(5): 1332-1356.
- Ibarra H (1992) Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37(3): 422-447.
- Jacobs JA and Gerson K (2005) *The time divide: Work, Family and Gender Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Janssen S, Tuor SN and Backes-Gellner U (2016) Social Attitudes on Gender Equality and Firms' Discriminatory Pay-Setting. *ILRR*, 69(1): 253-279.
- Kanter RM (1976) The impact of hierarchical structures on the work behavior of women and men. *Social Problems* 23(4): 415-430.
- Kanter RM (1977) *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karasek RA Jr. (1979) Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24(2): 285-308.
- Kotter JP (2010) *General Managers*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Locke EA (1969) What is job satisfaction?. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 4(4): 309-336.
- Martins LL, Eddleston KA and Veiga JF (2002) Moderators of the relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal* 45(2): 399-409.
- Maume DJ (2004) Is the glass ceiling a unique form of inequality? Evidence from a random-effects model of managerial attainment. *Work and Occupations*, 31(2): 250-274.
- McGuire GM (2002) Gender, race, and the shadow structure a study of informal networks and inequality in a work organization. *Gender & Society* 16(3): 303-322.
- Moran P (2005) Structural vs. relational embeddedness: Social capital and managerial performance. *Strategic Management Journal* 26(12): 1129-1151.
- Nieva VF, Gutek BA (1980) Sex effects on evaluation. *Academy of Management Review* 5(2): 267-276.
- Oldham GR and Hackman JR (2010) Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 31(2-3): 463-479.
- Office for National Statistics. *Labour Force Survey Employment Status by Occupation*. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/datasets/employmentbyoccupationemp04>
- Padavic I and Reskin BF (2002) *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Powell GN and Butterfield AD (2015) The preference to work for a man or a woman: A matter of sex and gender?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 86(1): 28-37.
- Reskin BF and McBrier D (2000) Why not ascription? Organizations' employment of male and female managers. *American Sociological Review* 65(2): 210-233.
- Ridgeway CL (1997) Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment. *American Sociological Review* 62(2): 218-235.
- Ridgeway CL (2001) Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 637-655.
- Riffkin R 2014, Americans Still Prefer a Male Boss to a Female Boss, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/178484/americans-prefer-male-boss-female-boss.aspx>
- Riza SD, Ganzach Y and Liu Y (forthcoming 2016) Time and Job Satisfaction A

- Longitudinal Study of the Differential Roles of Age and Tenure. *Journal of Management*
- Rhodes SR and Doering M (1983) An integrated model of career change. *Academy of Management Review* 8(4): 631-639.
- Rose D, Pevalin DJ, and O'Reilly K (2005) The National Statistics Socio-economic Classification: origins, development and use. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rudman LA and Glick P (2001) Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 743-762.
- Scandura TA and Lankau MJ (1997) Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexible work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 18(4): 377-391.
- Schein V (2001) A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 675-688.
- Schieman S, Milkie MA and Glavin, P (2009) When work interferes with life: Work-nonwork interference and the influence of work-related demands and resources. *American Sociological Review*, 74(6): 966-988.
- Taylor M Freed, Brice J, Buck N and Prentice-Lane E (2010) *British Household Panel Survey User Manual Volume A: Introduction, Technical Report and Appendices*. Colchester: University of Essex.
- Tsui AS and Gutek BA (1984) A role set analysis of gender differences in performance, affective relationships, and career success of industrial middle managers. *Academy of Management Journal* 27(3): 619-635.
- Wajcman J (1998) *Managing like a man: women and men in corporate management*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Wanous JP, Reichers AE and Hudy MJ (1997) Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*: 82(2), 247-252.



TABLE 1: Descriptive Statistics

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
Job Satisfaction	5.40 (1.23)	5.50 (1.22)	5.29 (1.24)
Higher-Manager	3.96	2.25	5.96
Lower-Manager	18.28	16.39	20.48
New Workplace	13.39	13.35	13.44
Fulltime	75.56	61.84	91.58
Tenure	4.71 (6.17)	4.46 (5.75)	5.01 (6.62)
Permanent Job	93.57	92.76	94.51
Promotion Opportunities	50.44	48.15	53.13
Hours Worked (log)	3.41 (0.58)	3.28 (0.59)	3.57 (0.54)
Flexitime	22.60	23.79	21.21
Reduced Week	1.67	1.15	2.27
Wage (log)	7.10 (0.79)	6.85 (0.79)	7.39 (0.69)
Family Income (log)	8.04 (0.55)	8.00 (0.58)	8.08 (0.52)
Large-Size Organization	21.31	18.66	24.41
Medium-Size Organization	16.97	15.82	18.32
Public Sector	35.79	45.63	24.28
Union Member	31.20	33.38	28.64
Overtime Hours (log)	0.82 (1.06)	0.66 (0.98)	1.00 (1.12)
Housework Hours (log)	1.97 (0.88)	2.36 (0.76)	1.51 (0.78)
Age	38.33 (12.41)	38.21 (12.30)	38.46 (12.53)
Number of Children	0.70 (0.96)	0.71 (0.95)	0.69 (0.98)
Married	53.85	53.14	54.68
University	19.63	19.71	19.54
Vocational	8.34	7.61	9.20
A/O level	51.75	52.71	50.62
Poor Health	4.31	4.91	3.61

Note: Standard deviation in parentheses.

TABLE 2: The Impact of Managerial Position and Gender on Job Satisfaction: Fixed-Effects Models

	<b>All Employees</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>		<b>All Employees</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>	
Higher-Manager	.132**	(.049)	.029	(.063)	.122*	(.049)	.116*	(.052)	.025	(.068)	.105*	(.052)
Lower-Manager	.105***	(.030)	-.013	(.028)	.089**	(.030)	.109***	(.031)	-.008	(.030)	.092*	(.031)
Female x Higher-Manager	-.121	(.078)					-.109	(.084)				
Female x Lower-Manager	-.139***	(.040)					-.138***	(.042)				
New Workplace	.067***	(.015)	.056**	(.021)	.082***	(.022)	.077**	(.026)	.061**	(.024)	.080**	(.026)
New Workplace x Higher-Manager							.068	(.080)	.014	(.110)	.073	(.078)
New Workplace x Lower-Manager							-.024	(.051)	-.031	(.051)	-.021	(.050)
Female x New Workplace							-.013	(.033)				
Female x New Workplace x Higher-Manager							-.057	(.135)				
Female x New Workplace x Lower-Manager							-.007	(.072)				
Wage	.071***	(.019)	.050*	(.025)	.105***	(.030)	.072***	(.019)	.050*	(.025)	.105***	(.030)
Promotion Opportunities	.275***	(.014)	.230***	(.019)	.324***	(.020)	.275***	(.014)	.230***	(.019)	.324***	(.020)
Tenure	-.024***	(.002)	-.024***	(.003)	-.024***	(.002)	-.024***	(.002)	-.024***	(.003)	-.024***	(.002)
Fulltime	-.153***	(.027)	-.112***	(.030)	-.262***	(.062)	-.153***	(.027)	-.112***	(.030)	-.262***	(.062)
Permanent Job	.092***	(.028)	.098**	(.036)	.083	(.045)	.092***	(.028)	.099**	(.036)	.083	(.045)
Hours Worked	-.009	(.018)	-.010	(.025)	.022	(.028)	-.009	(.018)	-.010	(.025)	.022	(.028)
Flexitime	.283**	(.093)	.271*	(.120)	.386*	(.155)	.284**	(.093)	.271*	(.120)	.386**	(.155)
Hours Worked x Flexitime	-.067*	(.027)	-.072*	(.036)	-.084*	(.042)	-.068*	(.027)	-.073*	(.036)	-.084*	(.043)
Reduced Week	.008	(.048)	-.130	(.077)	.102	(.060)	.008	(.048)	-.130	(.077)	.102	(.060)
Overtime	.003	(.007)	-.006	(.010)	.010	(.009)	.003	(.007)	-.006	(.010)	.010	(.009)
Housework	-.003	(.011)	-.010	(.016)	.002	(.015)	-.003	(.011)	-.010	(.016)	.002	(.015)
Family Income	.017	(.017)	-.016	(.022)	.072**	(.028)	.017	(.017)	-.016	(.022)	.072*	(.028)

TABLE 2: (continued)

	<b>All Employees</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>		<b>All Employees</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>	
Public Sector	.164***	(.024)	.172***	(.030)	.146***	(.041)	.165***	(.024)	.173***	(.030)	.146***	(.041)
Large-Size Organization	-.072***	(.019)	-.046	(.027)	-.099***	(.027)	-.072***	(.019)	-.046	(.027)	-.099***	(.027)
Medium-Size Organization	-.098***	(.024)	-.049	(.034)	-.148***	(.033)	-.097***	(.024)	-.049	(.034)	-.148***	(.033)
Union Member	-.081***	(.022)	-.062*	(.029)	-.103**	(.033)	-.082***	(.022)	-.062*	(.029)	-.104**	(.033)
Age	-.012	(.021)	.010	(.029)	-.039	(.031)	-.012	(.021)	.010	(.029)	-.039	(.031)
Age-squared	.001***	(.000)	.000**	(.000)	.001***	(.000)	.001***	(.000)	.000**	(.000)	.001***	(.000)
Number of Children	.005	(.012)	.014	(.017)	-.007	(.017)	.005	(.012)	.014	(.017)	-.007	(.017)
Married	.011	(.027)	.014	(.036)	.011	(.040)	.011	(.027)	.014	(.036)	.011	(.040)
University	-.272*	(.112)	-.047	(.159)	-.447**	(.161)	-.273*	(.112)	-.048	(.159)	-.448**	(.161)
Vocational	-.346*	(.135)	-.061	(.194)	-.595**	(.189)	-.346*	(.135)	-.062	(.194)	-.594**	(.189)
A/O level	-.093	(.100)	.087	(.144)	-.236	(.140)	-.094	(.100)	.087	(.144)	-.238	(.140)
Poor Health	-.137***	(.029)	-.181***	(.037)	-.063	(.045)	-.137***	(.029)	-.181***	(.037)	-.064	(.045)
Constant	4.301***	(.838)	3.973***	(1.132)	4.430***	(1.248)	4.302***	(.838)	3.974***	(1.132)	4.434***	(1.248)
F-statistics	21.51***		10.05***		14.88***		19.44***		9.63***		14.26***	

Note: \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001;

Regressions include region, occupation and year dummies.

Standard errors are in parentheses.

TABLE 3: The Impact of Managerial Position and Type of Promotion on Job Satisfaction in First and Second Year of the Promotion: Fixed-Effects Models

	<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>	
Higher-Manager First Year	.040	(.179)	.112	(.126)
Higher-Manager Second Year	-.284*	(.143)	.213*	(.107)
Lower-Manager First Year	.079	(.043)	.125**	(.045)
Lower-Manager Second Year	.027	(.047)	.143**	(.050)
New Workplace	.090***	(.024)	.086***	(.024)
Higher-Manager First Year x New Workplace	.052	(.250)	-.079	(.193)
Higher-Manager Second Year x New Workplace	.075	(.351)	.462	(.262)
Lower-Manager First Year x New Workplace	-.029	(.083)	.014	(.087)
Lower-Manager Second Year x New Workplace	-.212	(.130)	-.102	(.136)
Observations	21,181		18,560	
Individuals	5,084		4,488	

Note: \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001.

Regressions include all control variables that appear in other models.

Standard errors are in parentheses.