

**Self-Promotion and Gender  
in the Workplace**

By

Kathleen Waterous

In partial Fullfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

**Master of Arts**

In

**The Department of Psychology**

State University of New York  
New Paltz, New York

**November 2007**

## **Notice: Signature Page Not Included**

This thesis has been signed and approved by the appropriate parties.

The signature page has been removed from this digital version for privacy reasons.

The signature page is maintained as part of the official version of the thesis in print that is kept in Special Collections of Sojourner Truth Library at SUNY New Paltz.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Acknowledgements.....	iii
II.	Abstract.....	iv
III.	Introduction.....	1
	Workplace gender disparities.....	3
	Gender roles.....	3
	Impression management.....	4
	Self-promotion in the workplace.....	4
	Self-promotion and the patriarchal support system.....	7
IV.	Method.....	9
	Participants.....	9
	Procedure.....	9
	Measures.....	10
V.	Results.....	10
	Quantitative analysis.....	11
	Table 1.....	11
	Table 2.....	12
	Qualitative analysis.....	13
	Table 3.....	15
	Table 4.....	17
	Table 5.....	17
VI.	Discussion.....	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

VII.	References.....	23
VIII.	Appendix A.....	27
IX.	Appendix B.....	29

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks go out to my committee, Maryalice Citera, Melanie Hill, and Mat Jeckerbyrne for making this paper happen.

Thanks go out to all those who participated in the survey and Frank Spada, my life partner, for his help coding and for his continued moral support.

Special thanks to Christopher Waterous for averting technical disaster.

And last, but not least, my thanks to my father, Herbert Waterous for his encouragement and support.

## **Abstract**

Gender role attitudes are blamed for problems women have self-promoting in the workplace. This study examines the differences in the perceptions between men and women on self-promotion. It was expected that men would find it easier and more comfortable than women. Forty-five participants, twenty-three women and twenty-two men were interviewed in a survey that contained close-ended and open-ended items. The survey was designed to assess themes surrounding what would prompt a person to use self-promotion and their relative comfort in doing so. Findings of the study did not support the expectation that men would find it easier and more comfortable. For the majority of the survey, women reported being able to self-promote as easily as men. When asked what they thought self-promotion was, women and men differed in their definitions. Men tended to use a direct style highlighting and showcasing what they were currently doing to obtain benefits while women tended to perceive self-promotion with an inward slant. The women felt that self-promotion was bettering themselves and gaining more confidence. The results overall were not consistent with gender role expectancies for women and men, yet the qualitative results indicate some interesting avenues for future investigations.

## **Self Promotion and Gender in the Workplace**

### **Introduction**

This study examined the problems women have using self-promotion in the workplace. According to gender-role theory (Eagly, 1987), women are supposed to advocate for others, not themselves. Due to workplace norms however, individuals who showcase their accomplishments and talents tend to receive higher rewards. As a result of the discrepancy between gender role expectancies and workplace norms, women face inequities in pay and promotion. Several theories have suggested that our culture's prescribed gender-roles and associated attitudes are at the heart of these inequities, so that even the significant strides women have made in the work force are still not enough to allow real equality in pay and promotion. This research examined how the perceptions of women and men differ about self-promotion.

### **Workplace Gender Disparities**

Gender gaps in salary have existed throughout history and have been well documented. Much research supports the findings of pay inequities between men and women that not only exist today, but have grown rather than lessened. Current data from the bureau of Labor Statistics supports previous evidence that the median weekly pay of full-time working women was 75 percent of the median weekly pay for men (Gibelman, 2003). In January 2004, a report by the American Association of University Professors director of research, John Curtis reported differences in the salaries of academics to a committee established in response to a mandate by congress with a focus on four-year colleges and universities. The data from the report forms the basis for "The Annual

Report on the Economic Status of the Profession” which is published each year in the March-April issue of *Academe*. The data for the 2004 issue concluded that within each rank and institutional type, women earned less than men. When all ranks and institutional types were combined, women earn an average of 80 percent of men. Tieman, (2003) likewise reported on the pay gap between men and women health care executives in the United States and determined that more men than women occupied executive positions and that women earn 19% less than men. The report also confirmed that this gap had grown in recent years rather than diminished. In addition, these examples of pay inequities and discrimination can be generalized to other occupations across the board.

Researchers continue to seek and understand the dynamics behind the continued inequities women face in pay and promotion. Wade, (2003) reported that researchers have identified individual difference factors and structural factors that influence career development and inevitably, these inequities. But even women who are successful and have advanced education, experience, and confidence fall prey to pay and promotion disparities.

In order to comprehend and amend these gender disparities in the workplace, researchers need to examine our culture’s gender-role attitudes more closely with an emphasis on the norms of the workplace and how employees navigate through the system. Critical elements for finalizing job offers, accepting promotions and thus determining pay is the ability to promote oneself and learn the art of negotiation (Wade, 1996). Babcock and Laschever, (2003) wrote that the reason women have had trouble promoting themselves is because they are socialized through earliest play and the toys

they are given to play with, toward other care and domestic chores, whereas boys learn from their toys and experiences to move freely through the world and advocate for themselves as individuals. As a result, women learn early not to ask for too much and when they do ask, they feel more anxiety in the negotiation, and negotiation is an important part of self-promotion. In fact, (Babcock, Gelfand, & Lai 2006) found that women reported greater anxiety than men about negotiation and were less likely than men to even perceive situations as negotiable. According to (Eagly, 1987), society rewards and reinforces different types of behavior from men and women and sound bites such as “it pays to ask” and “the squeaky wheel gets the grease” may not be conventional wisdom for women (Babcock et al. 2006). In other words, according to (Eagly, 1987) it is not always good advice for women to act more like men in order to receive equal pay and privileges. Self-promotion is an important part of being the squeaky wheel that gets the grease which is identified as a male trait (Rudman, 1998).

### **Gender roles**

Gender roles are socially and culturally defined prescriptions and beliefs about the behavior and emotions of men and women. As Eagly (1987) suggested, gender roles are closely linked to gender stereotypes. Stereotypes are over generalized beliefs about people based on their perceived membership in one of many social categories. Gender stereotypes are contained in society’s expected gender roles and vary on many levels such as; traits, roles, behaviors, physical characteristics, and occupations (Deaux and LaFrance, 1998). An example would be men being perceived as more likely to be aggressive and competitive and women being perceived as more likely to be passive and cooperative. Gender roles can affect men and women especially when they are judged on

how well they conform to those roles. Prejudice can arise when men and women do not behave consistently with gender roles.

### **Impression Management**

Erving Goffman, (1966) believed that when an individual appears before others he/she will have many motives for trying to control the impression they form of him/her.

Impression is the perception one individual has of another. The impression is formed by an individual but can be shaped or manipulated by the person who the impression is about. Goffman, (1966) believed that there are two kinds of communication; expressions given and expressions given off, which is a dramaturgical model of human life in which people in everyday life are actors on a stage and the audience consists of those persons who observe what others are doing. The parts are the roles that people play and the dialog consists of ritualized conversational exchanges, or impression management.

Today's workplace requires certain kinds of impression management techniques that easily contribute to role inconsistencies for women. One of the most important impression management techniques in the workplace is self-promotion (Rudman, 1998).

### **Self-promotion in the workplace**

In order to participate effectively in the labor force, women have had to alter their self-presentational styles. Iedema and Poppe, (1994) showed that according to the self-presentation or impression management theory, men and women used self-presentational strategies to avoid disapproval. According to this theory, people disassociate themselves with negative actions and outcomes and engage in strategies that associate themselves with positive ones. One positive strategy that can be used to enhance one's image in a competitive situation is that of self-promotion. Self-promotion, according to Rudman,

(1998) is designed to increase one's attractiveness and status while pointing proudly to one's accomplishments. To do this, one should speak directly about one's talents and abilities and make internal versus external attributions for achievements. Self-promotion is an important tactic for any potential employee, male or female. According to MacDonald, (2002) identifying and showcasing your strengths should be a key part of your professional advancement strategy.

A large part of self-promotion is the ability to negotiate (Wade, 2001). Stuhlmacher, Citera, and Willis, (2007) reported that women on average experience negotiation differently than men having difficulty in doing so. Research by Lauterback and Weiner, (1996) suggested that women are less likely to use negotiation in upward influence attempts, or the ability to use self-promotion to get ahead than men. More importantly, Stuhlmacher, (1999) examined in a meta-analysis that women negotiated significantly lower outcomes in the workplace than men. Women's difficulties in their ability to self-promote and negotiate are part of the gender gaps in salary and status that have existed throughout history, and have been so well documented (Curtis 2004, Tieman 2003, Wade 1996).

Rudman, (1998) found that self-promotion as an impression management strategy poses special problems for women. Self-promoting women challenge our gender role attitudes because women have historically been perceived as less competent and competitive than men (Rudman, 1998). In addition, women who behave assertively and confidently are not as accepted and run a higher risk of social resistance compared to men who behave the same way (Carli, 1990 et al., 1995, Eagly et al., 1992, Rudman. 1998) Despite its importance, self-promotion can create social reprisal for the women who use

it. Self-promotion requires assertiveness and confidence which are typically seen as agentic male traits whereas supportive relationship oriented behavior is expected from women (Stuhlmacher et al., 2007). Showcasing one's abilities to further one's career is not consistent with expected gender attitudes about females.

While women in the U.S. have entered in larger proportions into the labor market and are experiencing less gender segregation, women have had to identify more with masculine personality traits in order to communicate effectively (Spence & Buckner, 2000). Two distinct dimensions of the masculine stereotype were found by Rudman and Glick, (2001): dominance and competence. Rudman and Glick, (2001) further argued that the traits and behaviors associated with competence carry less of a contradiction for the norms of feminine behavior than the very masculine behaviors of dominance. Women can be seen as competent, but when they appear dominant they are subject to prejudice.

Society has come to view today's women as more masculine in their behaviors than women of the past (Cejka & Eagley, 1999). Even still, women are expected to fulfill feminine roles that include niceness, warmth, kindness, and sensitivity to the needs of others, which identifies their subordinate status in society and cannot be compatible with all aspects of masculine personality traits (Rudman & Glick, 2001). While women who do project competence in a stereotypical masculine way run the higher risk of social reprisal, women can project their competence and be as influential as men if they soften their behavior with feminine niceness (Carli et al., 1995).

Janoff-Bulman and Wade (1996) also explored women's difficulties in advocating for themselves. The difficulties that were examined included the cost associated with female

self-promotion and the contradiction that occurs between women being liked and women being influential. Women who act like men are subject to prejudice for their behavior (Rudman & Glick, 2001). For instance, women who behave assertively are considered “pushy or bitchy” whereas assertiveness is a desired trait for men (Rudman, 1998). When women present themselves more modestly than men do however, they tend to have their competence undermined which can be viewed as a deficiency (Babcock et al., 2006). This is particularly true for women who self-promote in a stereotypically masculine way (Rudman, 1998). The catch-22 is that when women try and overcome this “deficiency” by acting in a more masculine self-promoting way, they are perceived as lacking in social competence and therefore not as hireable or likeable (Babcock et al., 2006). For these reasons, women are less likely to try and self-promote. In addition, research on gender leadership by Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky, (1992) found that female leaders who attempted to establish authority in traditionally masculine ways such as; an authoritative or directive manner were judged more harshly than men. Eagly and Johnson, (1990) suggested that women have tended to develop a more participative leadership style which is perhaps more correspondent with gender roles, which may be more effective for them than the traditionally male leadership styles (Eagly et al., 2003). Prescriptive sex stereotypes stem from men’s higher status as compared to women within society (Babcock et al., 2006).

### **Self-promotion and the patriarchal support system**

Another way in which men have a “leg up” on being able to self-promote more effectively is that of the patriarchal support system that many women are not privy to. A study conducted by Bagihole and Goode, (2001) examined gender differences in

academic careers and raised the issue of self-promotion. Self-promotion is still used for academic achievement for those in senior positions. Thirty-seven members of an academic staff were interviewed to obtain information regarding the influence gender had on academic careers. The study found that self-promotion played an important role in their academic success. More than that, men make a conscious effort to engage in self-promotion through their connections and their social networks. Women on the other hand, were not admitted to this support system. It was seen as a weakness for women to need or want to set up their own system. The authors concluded that women need to come up with strategies that can harness feminist ideas to support and work for them, creating their own networks. This study suggested that men and women perceive self-promotion very differently. Women used their own merit to obtain positions and benefits whereas men used their patriarchal support systems. It is common place for men to self-promote and use social networks to do so.

Self-promotion is an impression management tactic that has become essential for inclusion into the labor force and part of today's professionalism. Women are now an integral part of the labor force but face social reprisal when they use self-promotion (Rudman, 1998). For example, one woman claimed that a job that she applied for was given to a man even though he was less qualified and experienced. When she tried to self-promote to obtain the job she was told that he was hired because "he had a family to support."

There are various explanations for this double-edged sword. The most prominent theory is that modesty is the desired, accepted and expected gender role for women (Rudman, 1998). Self-promotion contradicts this gender norm of modesty for women.

The social reprisals that women experience are negative views, especially from other women when they try and self-promote. Negative reactions and classification are apparent for women who use favorable self-presentational styles (Rudman, 1998).

Although attitudes about gender discrimination are changing, gender attitudes still have deeply embedded roots. Women are faced with the difficult dilemma of walking a fine line between social role expectations that dictate women should be modest, and workplace norms that require they self-promote to get ahead. Women's reluctance as compared to men, to self-promote and negotiate may be an important area of exploration for the unequal distribution of resources such as compensation within organizations. The focus of this research was to explore the perceptions of what it means to self-promote, specifically what would it take for a person to self-promote? What does self-promotion mean to the individual? And how comfortable is it for them? The general predictions are that men will self-promote more often and more easily than women.

## **Method**

### Participants and procedures

Forty-five people, (23 women and 22 men) between the ages of eighteen and sixty-five employed in various occupations and work settings participated in this study. Participants were recruited by the interviewer, based on the criteria that they worked full time, starting with people she knew personally and snowballing out from there. The interviewer would always ask a participant if they knew anyone that would be willing to participate in the study and asked to have the person contact the interviewer. Participants represented a broad spectrum of respondents including: farrier, attorney, salesperson,

business owner, television writer/producer, maintenance mechanic, nurse and food service worker.

The participants were interviewed to assess their tendencies to engage in self-promotion, their definition of self-promotion, and their relative comfort with self-promotion. The interview protocol contained both open-ended and close-ended questions and took approximately 20 minutes to complete and no longer than 45 minutes (See Appendix A for a copy). The researcher also recorded the individuals' occupation and gender (See Appendix B for a copy).

### **Measures**

The interview survey contained nine close-ended items that focused on whether participants advocated for themselves on the job, felt that hard work alone should speak for itself, had benefited from self-promotion at work, felt that self-promotion would affect how others viewed them, and their comfort level with promoting themselves at work.

Participants were asked to rate each of the nine items on a five-point Likert-type scale indicating how much they agreed or disagreed with the statements. For scoring purposes, all items were scored such that high scores indicated positive views of self-promotion. In addition, all participants were asked to respond to four scenarios that involved situations where self-promotion would be useful. The participants were read the scenario and asked for their reactions. Finally, participants were asked to describe what self-promotion meant to them and whether it was easy or difficult.

### **Results**

Quantitative survey items

For the quantitative data analysis, items were scored so that a higher number on the agreement scale indicated a more positive view towards self-promotion. A principal components factor analysis using varimax rotation was conducted with the nine quantitative items. Using the criterion of selecting factors with eigen values over one and an analysis of the Scree plot, three factors were identified. (See Table 1 for factor loadings).

Table 1

Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation and Reliability.

Component	Image	Comfort	Notice
Disliked	<b>.744</b>	.193	-.241
Benefit <sup>a</sup>	<b>.649</b>	.348	.266
Embarrass	<b>.610</b>	-.054	.322
Notstyle	<b>.602</b>	-.191	.098
Nopromote	<b>.571</b>	.384	.319
Advocate <sup>a</sup>	-.013	<b>.829</b>	-.201
Comfort <sup>a</sup>	.070	<b>.728</b>	.228
Verbalize <sup>a</sup>	.010	.134	<b>.856</b>
Hardwork	.334	-.100	<b>.482</b>

<sup>a</sup> reverse scored.

Factor one, image, focused on whether or not self-promotion was consistent with the person's own image of him or herself. The coefficient alpha for this factor was .68. It included: the peoples' beliefs that they would feel disliked for promoting themselves, self-promoting not being consistent with their style, being embarrassed to talk about

oneself, and benefiting from self-promotion. Factor two, comfort, focused on beliefs about whether individuals could advocate for themselves and how comfortable they felt in promoting themselves at work. The coefficient alpha for this factor was .53. The third factor, notice, focused on whether individuals felt they could verbalize their talents and abilities when they needed to. The coefficient alpha for this factor was .24.

These three factors were used to examine self-promotion perceptions. A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted using image, comfort, and notice as the dependent variables. Gender of the participant (male, female) was included as the between groups variable. The results showed a significant gender effect overall ( $T^2(3, 41) = 3.29, p = .03$ ). Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations for the three dependent variables by gender. (See Table 2 for means, standard deviations, F, and significance).

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

Component	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	sig.
Image	Female	3.71	.42	5.08	.029
	Male	3.29	.80		
Comfort	Female	4.17	.38	5.63	.022
	Male	3.83	.55		
Notice	Female	4.01	.49	2.31	.136
	Male	3.10	.72		

The univariate analysis of variance for each dependent variable was examined. For image, there was a significant difference between males and females ( $F(1, 43) = 5.08, p = .03$ ). Females ( $M = 3.41, SD = .47$ ) reported more favorable responses than males ( $M = 3.29, SD = .80$ ). With women indicating that self-promotion was more consistent with their image than men. This result is opposite of the expectation that women would have trouble self-promoting and would be afraid of being treated negatively for doing so.

For comfort, there was a significant difference between males and females ( $F(1, 43) = 5.63, p = .02$ ). Women ( $M = 4.17, SD = .38$ ) reported being more comfortable with self-promotion and more willing to advocate for themselves than men ( $M = 3.83, SD = .56$ ). This again was contrary to the expectation that women would be more uncomfortable with self-promotion.

For notice, no significant difference was found between males and females ( $F(1, 43) = 2.31, p = .14$ ). Women ( $M = 3.44, SD = .78$ ) and men ( $M = 3.10, SD = .72$ ) reported similar feelings about whether hard work would be noticed and their confidence, that they could verbalize their talents and abilities when they needed to. This was also not consistent with the expectation that more men would be more inclined to verbalize talents and abilities than women.

For the qualitative questions on the survey, the transcribed data were coded for recurring themes. Two researchers independently coded the data and the inter-rater reliability was 96%.

The responses to the four scenarios were coded on two dimensions: 1) Behavior, how active/passive the reaction was and 2) Emotion, whether there was a positive, neutral or negative reaction. Behavior responses were coded as active or passive. Active responses

included: speaking up about the situation, looking for another position, asking for a raise. Passive responses included: doing nothing, sitting back and seeing what happens, hoping someone would notice. Emotional reactions were coded as positive, negative or neutral. For the first three scenarios there were no positive emotions associated, only negative or neutral. For scenario four, participants indicated that they would take pride in their work even if no one noticed. This was coded as a positive emotion. Negative emotions included reactions such as: angry, upset, disappointed, unfair, resentful, etc. No explicit statement of emotion or matter of fact attitude was coded as a neutral emotion.

Chi-square analysis of the percentage of males and females coded active versus passive revealed no significant differences for any of the four scenarios. (See Table 3 for the percentages and chi-square results). Likewise the emotional reactions were not significantly different for men and women.

When participants were asked what self-promotion meant to them, their responses were very revealing. Responses to this item were coded as active versus passive. Active responses were coded as verbalizing your talents, skills, speaking up, telling the right people about your accomplishments. Passive responses included doing their job and hoping someone would notice, bettering oneself through education, self growth, maturity, confidence. Males defined self-promotion in significantly more active terms than did females ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 45) = 12.76, p = .00$ ). Ninety-five percent of the males described self promotion as speaking up for oneself, showcasing their abilities, talents, and skills while only forty-six percent of the women felt this way. Fifty-four percent of women defined self-promotion as hoping someone would notice their hard work, continuing to work hard, and bettering themselves through education and self-growth. These results suggest

that men and women define self-promotion in very different ways and take very different paths to achieving self-promotion. (See table 4 for results and Appendix B for gender, occupations and response results).

Participants were also asked whether they found self-promotion easy or difficult. No significant differences were found on this question (See Table 5 for results).

Table 3

Percentages of Females and Males Responding to Scenarios, Chi-square Analysis and Significance.

Scenario 1	Female	Male	$\chi^2$	p
<u>Behavior</u>				
Active	83.3%	76.2%	.36	.55
Passive	16.7%	23.8%		
<u>Emotion</u>				
Negative	37.5%	47.6%	1.21	.54
Neutral	58.3%	52.4%		
Scenario 2	Female	Male	$\chi^2$	p
<u>Behavior</u>				
Active	79.2%	81.0%	.02	.88
Passive	20.8%	19.0%		
<u>Emotion</u>				
Negative	8.3%	19.0%	1.11	.29
Neutral	91.7%	81.0%		

Table3 continued

Scenario 3	Female	Male	$\chi^2$	$p$
<b>Behavior</b>				
Active	70.8%	66.7%	.09	.76
Passive	29.2%	33.3%		
<b>Emotion</b>				
Negative	54.2%	42.9%		
Neutral	45.8%	57.1%	.57	.45
<b>Scenario 4</b>				
Scenario 4	Female	Male	$\chi^2$	$p$
<b>Behavior</b>				
Active	50.0%	52.4%	.03	.87
Passive	50.0%	47.6%		
<b>Emotion</b>				
Positive	33.3%	38.1%	.11	.74
Neutral	66.7%	61.9%		

Table 4

Percentages of Males and Females Responding to the Question About the Meaning of Self-promotion, Chi-square Analysis and Significance.

Meaning	Female	Male	$\chi^2$	$p$
Passive	54.2%	4.8%	12.76	.00
Active	45.8%	95.2%		

Table 5

Percentages of Males and Females Responding to Whether Self-promotion is Easy or Difficult, Chi-square Analysis, and Significance.

Difficulty	Female	Male	$\chi^2$	$p$
Easy	58.3%	66.7%	.33	.56
Difficult	41.7%	33.3%		

## Discussion

The focus of this research was to explore the perceptions between women and men about self-promotion. The expectations in general were that men would self-promote more often and with greater ease. The results of the study overall were not consistent with our expectations.

In the quantitative part of the survey, we found significant results for two out of the three factors identified. For instance, females were more likely to use self-promotion, felt that using self-promotion was more consistent with their image than men, and have actually benefited by doing so. These findings are in contrast to past research which has

suggested that women feel uncomfortable self-promoting because they fear social reprisal and not being liked. If women felt that self-promotion was more consistent with their own image and that they have benefited when they did use it, then perhaps women are becoming less worried about what others think and more willing to use self-promotion to obtain workplace benefits than previously.

We also found significant results for the factor of comfort. More women than men felt comfortable promoting themselves and advocating for themselves. Past research has pointed to women feeling uncomfortable negotiating and altering their self-presentational styles to fit in with society's gender norms. Our study suggests that that is changing and women are feeling more comfortable using self-promotion and not feeling as anxious as they used to. Perhaps women are more comfortable with self-promotion because it is necessary for advancement and they have gained confidence as they use it more. In addition, perhaps it is more accepted in the workplace for women to self-promote thereby removing some of the barriers women experience when using it.

We found no significant difference between men and women for the factor of notice. Both men and women felt comfortable and were able to verbalize their talents and abilities when they needed to, and had similar feelings about hard work speaking for itself. This is still not consistent with our expectations because we proposed that more men than women would be able to verbalize abilities comfortably. The internal reliability for this factor was only .24 leading us to not expect it to correlate very highly with other measures. The non significant result can be explained because the measure had low reliability or in other words, it was a bad measure.

The qualitative portion of our survey found no significant differences between men and women in response to our scenarios. Four of the scenarios were designed to assess themes focused on what would prompt a person to use negotiation and self-promotion. Both men and women reported they would use self-promotion with about the same frequency in situations where they perceived inequities or unfairness. Both men and women had similar emotional responses expressing negative reactions to situations where their contributions went unnoticed. We initially expected that more men would speak up suggesting that perhaps women are becoming better at negotiating, advocating for themselves and using self-promotion to get ahead or get what they need. When men and women were asked if self-promotion was difficult, there were no significant differences. Slightly more men reported self-promotion being easier than women and slightly more women reported self-promotion as difficult, however this was not significant.

The most revealing question in assessing perceptions between men and women about self-promotion asked participants to describe what self-promotion meant to them. As reported, there were significant differences that showed women were more likely to adopt a passive approach to self-promotion while men were more likely to self-promote in an active way. These results suggest that self-promotion means very different things to men and women. Women think about it differently and go about it differently than men. In fact, over half the women surveyed expressed that they would hope to be noticed for their efforts and work at bettering themselves as opposed to speaking up and bringing their skills and abilities to the attention of decision makers. Women tended to be more thoughtful and inwardly focused in how they perceived self-promotion. This way, they will appear more competent, desirable and therefore more deserving.

Men on the other hand, felt that self-promotion was just something one did at one's job. A necessary part of one's job. Men were not shy or hesitant about promoting themselves and would boast and point out and showcase what they were already doing.

As responses to this question demonstrated, it was important to have the quantitative as well as qualitative results of our study. The responses revealed that men and women think of self-promotion in very different ways. While women may feel comfortable seeking out growth opportunities, they may not feel very comfortable drawing attention to their performance or in using the same tactics as males. If the construct of self-promotion means such different things to men and women, these different conceptualizations could account for the different outcomes they receive and their self-

Limitations of this study include the fact that participants may answer closed-ended questions automatically without giving the concepts adequate thought. It may also be that participants interpret survey items in personal ways. The evidence suggests that men and women interpreted the meaning of self-promotion in very different ways.

To assess different interpretations more fully, the open ended questions might be coded for participants confidence and thoughtfulness. The question asked what self-promotion meant to each person. The participants' answered this question thoughtfully as it was about them personally, and probably had more to do with their own experiences rather than reactive responses to situations that may or may not be relevant.

reported differences in comfort self-promoting.

Additionally, the validity of the quantitative survey is unknown as this scale was created for this study. The factors were empirically determined and some of the item loadings do not appear consistent with what one might expect rationally. Qualitative

items should be compared to quantitative items to determine other interpretations of self-promotion. Each scale may be rating different themes.

It is surprising that on most of the survey women answered in favor of self-promotion. We did not expect this to be the case as past research painted a very different picture of women's negotiation and self-promoting abilities. While reporting positive attitudes toward self-promotion, women also indicated they feel the need to "be better", gain more confidence, grow personally, and intellectually in order to feel deserving of the same things that men already feel comfortable with. These themes and perceptions speak to past research which indicated that women who soften their self-promotional styles have better success. In other words, women may be choosing to self-promote in a more feminine way.

Future research may want to examine this possibility and its potential effects. Research examining how men and women define self-promotion and whether women use self-promotional styles that are more consistent with their gender role expectancies would be helpful to explore these explanations further. Another interesting area to study might be generational differences in self-promotion styles. Do women of different generations use different strategies? Examining the differences in types of occupations might also reveal interesting themes. Certain types and levels of occupations may vary in how much self-promotion is needed, possibly making it easier for women to engage in these types of behaviors. Personality types may play an important part in a person's ability to self-promote. Perhaps extroverted people find self-promotion easier than introverted or shy people. People who possess a sense of entitlement may engage in self-promotion more than others.

On the one hand, the results indicate that the results of this study are interesting because of the inconsistencies in what they say about gender and self-promotion. Women may be less uncomfortable self-promoting than and men feel that it is consistent with their image. Perhaps as more women begin to understand the role of self-promotion in obtaining rewards and recognition at work, they have grown more comfortable doing it. Alternatively, women appear to define self-promotion differently than men. Perhaps differences in self-reported comfort with self-promotion stem from the meaning of the activity to men and women.

## References

- Babcock, L., and Laschever, L., (2003). Women need to learn the art of the deal. *USA Today*, Nov. 13, 2003.
- Bowles, H., Babcock, L., and Lai, L., (2007). Social incentives for gender difference in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it doesn't hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 103, 84-103.
- Bagihole, B., and Goode, J., (2001). The contradiction of the myth of individual merit, and the reality of a patriarchal support system in academic careers; a feminist investigation. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 8, 161-180.
- Boaler, J., (2002). Paying the price for "sugar and spice": shifting the analytical lens in equity research. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*. 4, 127-135.
- Brauer, M. Judd, C., and Vincent, J., (2001). The communication stereotypes: the effects of group discussion and information distribution on stereotypic appraisals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 65, 463-475.
- Butler-Ellis, L., and Wittenbaum, G., (2000). Relationships between self-construal and verbal promotion. *Communication Research*. 2, 704-722.
- Calhoun, P., (1999). Integrative bargaining: does gender make a difference. *International Journal of Conflict Management*. 3, 203-225
- Carli, L., (1990). Gender, language and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59, 941-951.
- Cejka, M., and Eagly, A., (1999). Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 413-42.

- Ceynar-Rosell, M., and Hartman, S., (2001). Self-presentation of beliefs about gender discrimination and feminism. *Sex Roles. 647, 13-26.*
- Cialdini, R., Wosinska, W., Dabul, Whetston-Dion, R., and Hesze, I., (1998). When social role salience leads to social role rejection: modest self-presentation among in two cultures. *Personality and Communication Bulletin. 7, 9-18.*
- Cleaver, T., (2000). Find a job through self-promotion. *Marketing News. 1, 2-5.*
- Deaux, K. and LaFrance, M., (1998). D.T. Gilbert and Fiske and G. Lindsay, Editors, The Gender Belief system, authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, *The handbook of social psychology (4<sup>th</sup> ed, 788-827), Wiley, New York.*
- Eagly, A., (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation.* Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Eagly, A., and Johnson, B., (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108, 233-252.*
- Eagly, A., Makhijani, M., Klonsky, B., (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin. 111, 19-27.*
- Gibelman, M., (2003). So how far have we come? pestilent and persistent gender gap in pay. *Social Work. 48, 1-11.*
- Gini, A., and Sullivan, M., (1998). Women's work: seeking identity through occupations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal. 1, 39-45.*
- Goffman, E., (1966). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization* Gatherings. New York, NY, Free Press.
- Harris, L., and Fireston, L., (1998). Changes in predictors of gender role ideologies among women: a multivariate analysis. *Sex Roles. 38, 3-13.*

- Heilman, C., Block, N., and Martell, J., (1995). Sex stereotypes: do they influence perceptions of managers? *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*. 6,237-252.
- Howell, S., Carter, L., and Schied, F. (2002). Gender and Women's Experience at Work: A critical and feminist perspective on human resource development. *Adult Education Quarterly*. 52 , 112-127.
- Iedema, J., and Poppe, J., (1994). The effect of self-presentation on social value orientation. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 6, 12-26.
- Janoff-Bulman, K., and Wade, M., (1996). The dilemma of self advocacy for women. another case of blaming the victim? *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 15, 35-37.
- McDonald, P., (2002). A crash course in self-marketing: whether you're satisfied in your current position or not, identifying and showcasing your strengths should be a key part of your professional advancement strategy. *Financial Executive*. 1, 18-22.
- Rudman, L., (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: the costs and benefits of counter-stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 54 , 629-645.
- Rudman, L, and 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, 1004-1100.
- Segil, S., (2004). Practical negotiation principles. *Strategic Communication Management*. 3, 22-89.
- Spence, J., and Buckner, C., (2000). Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, sexist attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 42-60.
- Stuhlmacher, F., Citera, M. and Willis, T., (2007). Gender differences in virtual

negotiation: theory and research. *Sex Roles*, 57, 329-339.

Tieman, A., (2002). Exec pay gap grows between the sexes. *Modern Healthcare*. 32, 2-12.

Wade, M., (2001). Women and salary negotiation: the costs of self- advocacy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 65-76.

## Appendix A: Interview Survey

Occupation:

Gender: Male Female

Close-ended statements.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Neither 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

1. I feel comfortable promoting myself at work.

1 2 3 4 5

2. I am able to advocate for myself at my job.

1 2 3 4 5

3. I feel that hard work alone should speak for itself for one to be noticed.

1 2 3 4 5

4. I have never promoted myself at work for a raise or better position.

1 2 3 4 5

5. I have benefited from self-promotion at my job.

1 2 3 4 5

6. I feel that if I promote myself at work I will not be liked.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Talking about my accomplishments and abilities at work is just not my style.

1 2 3 4 5

8. I can recognize my talents and abilities and verbalize them when I need to.

1 2 3 4 5

9. I am embarrassed to talk about myself to get ahead.

1 2 3 4 5

Appendix A continued

Scenarios. Open-ended.

1. You have been working at your current job for a couple of years and have been doing increasingly well but your boss has not given you a raise or even acknowledged your success. What is your reaction?
2. You are interviewing for a certain position that has certain requirements, and you meet and exceed those requirements. The interviewer informs you that they would like to hire you and they offer you a certain salary. You feel that the offer is not quite what it should be given your qualifications. What is your reaction?
3. You have been working in your present job for a number of years and you find out that a co-worker who has worked less time than you and has less experience, and has less abilities is making more than you. What is your reaction?
4. You take pride in your work but others on the job don't take notice. What is your reaction?
5. What does self-promotion mean to you?
6. Do you find promoting yourself easy or difficult?

Appendix B: Participant Profiles and whether they viewed self-promotion as Active or Passive

Gender	Occupation	Self-promotion definition
1. Male	Farrier	Active
2. Male	Editor/writer/TV producer	Active
3. Female	Social Worker	Passive
4. Male	Bank operations mngr.	Passive
5. Female	Jewelry maker	Active
6. Female	Attorney	Passive
7. Female	LPN	Passive
8. Male	Golf course superintendent	Active
9. Male	Sales	Active
10. Female	Technical analyst/IBM	Active
11. Male	Mechanic	Active
12. Female	Medical sales	Passive
13. Male	Environmental scientist	Active
14. Female	Adjunct professor	Active
15. Female	Bookkeeper	Passive
16. Male	Self employed business owner	Active
17. Female	X-ray technician	Active
18. Male	Food service worker	Active
19. Female	Psychiatric nurse	Passive

Appendix B continued

Gender	Occupation	Response
20. Female	Insurance underwriter	Passive
21. Male	Engineer	Active
22. Female	Sales	Passive
23. Male	Product mngr. software	Active
24. Female	Nurse	Passive
25. Male	Software engineer	Active
26. Female	Staffing coordinator	Passive
27. Female	Sales	Passive
28. Female	Bartender/waitress	Active
29. Female	Office manager	Active
30. Male	Pilot	Active
31. Female	Flight attendant	Active
32. Female	Sales/electrical distribution	Passive
33. Male	Golf course superintendent	Active
34. Male	Attorney	Active
35. Female	Legal secretary	Active
36. Male	Bus driver	Passive
37. Female	Quotations manager	Passive
38. Male	Sales manager	Active
39. Female	Sales	Active

Appendix B continued

Gender	Occupation	Response
40. Male	Carpenter	Active
41. Female	Executive sales	Active
42. Female	Manager	Active
43. Male	Electrician	Active
44. Male	Accountant	Active
45. Male	Engineer	Active