

Causal Discovery Methods to Map the Longitudinal Relationship Between Workplace Microaggressions, Social Support Networks, and Leadership Efficacy in Women


Raul. Rodríguez Pérez¹, Fernanda. Ortega^{2*}

¹ Senior Researcher, Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Cuernavaca, Mexico



² Department of Social Psychology, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mexico City, Mexico

* Corresponding author email address: fernanda.ortega@unam.mx

Editor

Valiolah Farzad
Department of Psychology and
Counseling, KMAN Research
Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario,
Canada
v.farzad@kmanresce.ca

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Martha Louzada Júnior
Department of Applied Social Sciences, State University of Southwest Bahia, State
of Bahia, Brazil. Email: mjunior@ufba.br
Reviewer 2: Sharmin Nasrin
Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, University of Dhaka,
Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh. sharminnasrin@du.ac.bd

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The theoretical model linking microaggressions to leadership efficacy via erosion of social support networks is compelling and coherent, but the framing would benefit from a more systematic integration of intersectionality scholarship and contemporary work on structural versus interpersonal discrimination; at present, references to women of color and intersectional hostilities appear more in the discussion than in the core theoretical rationale, which slightly weakens the generalizability and nuance of the conceptual framework.

The description of the sample and context is somewhat underspecified: given that the survey is administered in Spanish and measures are culturally adapted for the Mexican context, the paper should provide more detail about the sampling frame, industries represented, inclusion criteria, response rates, and any attrition patterns across waves, and then explicitly discuss how these features constrain external validity and the populations to which the findings can be generalized.

The discussion effectively situates the findings within broader literatures on microaggressions, social exclusion, and leadership efficacy, and the narrative about social isolation as the secondary injury is particularly insightful; still, the paper would benefit from a more explicit limitations section that addresses cultural specificity, self-report bias, potential common-

method variance, three-wave spacing decisions, and the possibility that changes in organizational context (e.g., leadership transitions, policy shifts) over the study period might also influence the observed trajectories.

The practical implications for organizations—emphasizing both the need to reduce microaggressions and to strengthen social support structures—are directionally sound, yet somewhat general; more concrete, evidence-based recommendations (e.g., specific mentoring or sponsorship program designs, network-building interventions, leadership training content, and mechanisms for monitoring microaggressions over time) would increase the utility of the paper for practitioners and policy-makers seeking to act on the findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The measurement section is generally rigorous, with appropriate attention to translation/back-translation and high internal consistencies for all scales; nonetheless, the manuscript would be strengthened by reporting full psychometric information (e.g., confirmatory factor analyses, measurement invariance across waves, and any cultural adaptation procedures beyond linguistic translation) to reassure readers that the constructs are stable and comparable over time in this specific cultural and occupational context.

The methodological choice to employ the PC algorithm with temporal constraints and extensive bootstrapping is innovative and potentially impactful for organizational research, yet the explanation of the algorithm's assumptions and limitations is somewhat brief; the authors should more explicitly discuss issues such as causal sufficiency, the reliance on conditional independence tests, potential impacts of unmeasured confounding, and why an 80% edge-retention threshold and $p < .05$ were selected, possibly complemented by sensitivity analyses.

The results are presented clearly at a high level, and the identification of an indirect pathway from microaggressions to leadership efficacy via social support is persuasive; however, more detailed reporting of key statistics (e.g., exact sample size, means and standard deviations for each wave, edge frequencies across bootstrap iterations, standardized path coefficients with confidence intervals, and full model fit indices) would enhance transparency and allow readers to better evaluate the robustness and practical magnitude of the effects.

The mediation claims derived from the PC-discovered DAG followed by path modeling are intriguing but verge on overstatement in terms of causality; the authors should calibrate their language to emphasize “causal plausibility” or “causal structure under given assumptions” and clarify the distinction between statistical mediation and true causal mechanisms in observational data, perhaps by adding a dedicated subsection that outlines these assumptions and acknowledges alternative models that might also fit the data.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.