

WOMAN OR LEADER FIRST? GENDER BIAS IN THE PERCEPTION OF FEMALE LEADER EFFECTIVENESS

Jamie Birdwell, Florida Institute of Technology, Coast oem

ABSTRACT

Even though more women are part of the workforce, women still face considerable obstacles in leadership. Among these obstacles, a subordinate's perception of the leader is most salient. Considerable research has been undertaken to understand the disparity of subordinate perceptive evaluations between male and female leaders. This article examines two questions: Does the gender of the leader influence the subordinates' attitudes regarding the leader's effectiveness? If so, to what extent do women suffer disadvantages from the perceptions of their subordinates? Examined through the lens of role congruity theory, this article shows that women face significant hurdles when compared to men in similar positions; however, research shows potential moderating effects such as leadership style, time, and organizational culture, calling for future research to expand the understanding of the emerging phenomenon better. Managerial implications are presented to aid firms in increasing the leadership effectiveness of women, as well as suggestions to help challenge persistent impediments to successful female leadership.

Keywords: Leadership Effectiveness, Gender Bias, Female Leadership, Role Congruity Theory, Gender Stereotypes

INTRODUCTION

Men continue to occupy significantly more leadership positions than women, even though more women are part of the workforce than men. As gender diversity has increased in employee makeup, issues related to gender bias are salient workplace problems. Compensation and leadership positions for women still trudge behind men. For example, in 2019, women earned approximately 79 cents to every dollar earned by males (Elkins, 2020), and data from the US Census Bureau's 2018 American Community Survey showed that, as compared to earnings of Caucasian men, Asian women earned 97%, Caucasian women 80%, African American women 66%, and Hispanic women 58% (Sheth, Gal, Hoff, & Ward, 2020). Further census data shows that managerial positions occupied by women are 38%, and, in Fortune 500 companies, women account for only 4.2% of chief executive positions (Waber, 2014). Given this minority-related disadvantage, women leaders tend to engage in more masculine leader behaviors (Eagly, Nater, Miller, Kaufmann, & Sczesny, 2020; Koenig & Eagly, 2014; Saint-Michel, 2018).

As organizational diversity evolves, firms need to be adept and agile to focus on gender inequities. Perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of both genders may affect organizational culture. Men and women have disparate life experiences, gender socialization, and gender norms, and these differences influence leadership development and promotion (Kiser, 2015). For example, studies have shown that women face issues with advancement past middle management (Schnarr, 2012). Evidence suggests male executives appear to have little concern to promote women to managerial

roles, thereby perpetuating a climate of gender polarization (The Conference Board of Canada & Canada, 2013). As Kiser (2015) states, "if men control promotion and advancement to upper-level positions, and an organization does not promote a culture of gender diversity, women are left behind and do not have the same opportunities as men for promotion" (p. 599).

Much research and many frameworks have been developed to understand and explain the differences between men's and women's status in organizations. Both cultural theories and role theories may be used to improve the understanding of those differences. Cultural theories describe the collectively shared patterns of assumptions, values, and expectations that guide the firm's cognitions, emotions, and perceptions (Koland, 2016; Rosser, 2003). Hence, the culture includes the "collective, subjective logic that forms the unspoken, often unconscious subtext of social life" (Rosser, 2003, p. 74).

Like cultural theories, role theories focus attention on expectations and norms for gender-specific behaviors (Saint-Michel, 2018; Vinkenburg, van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011; Zheng, Kark, & Meister, 2018) and are, in the case of this article, concerned with gender differences expressed through disparate expectations of leader behaviors (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011). Ayman (1993) contended that roles are normative and are the primary means by which social judgments are used to identify the "ideal" behavioral patterns (Becker, Ayman, & Korabik, 2002).

Consequently, role theory allows one to compare and contrast qualitatively and quantitatively the perceived norms and behaviors exhibited by men and women in leadership positions. Role theories allow for the empirical study of the influence of followers' perceived expectations on a leader's effectiveness (Rosser, 2003). This article will use role theory to explore perceived expectations of leaders' effectiveness rather than a more macro perspective consistent with cultural theories.

This article contributes to the extant literature by focusing on subordinates' role and their perception of leadership, particularly in their sensitivity, discernment, and evaluation of female leadership effectiveness. Fundamentally, this article seeks to determine the following:

RQ 1. Does the gender of the leader influence the subordinates' attitudes regarding the leader's effectiveness?

RQ 2. If so, in what way do women suffer disadvantages from the perceptions of their subordinates?

To answer these questions, this article will analyze the follower's perceptions of women leaders compared to men through the lens of role congruity theory. This analysis shows that women face significant hurdles compared to men in similar positions; however, research identifies potential moderating effects such as leadership style, time, and organizational culture.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research has focused on a more comprehensive and better understanding of the tensions between the female gender and leadership role(s). Since the 1970s, several theories have been put forward to explain the undervaluation of women as leaders, including the lack of fit theory (Heilman, 2001),

expectation theory (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Ridgeway, 2001; Ridgeway & Jacobson, 1977), the *think-manager-think-male* paradigm (Schein, 1973), and role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Psychological research has shown people tend to attribute the same characteristics to both men and leaders while attributing less to women and managers (Klatt, Eimler, & Krämer, 2016).

Because of a perceived incongruity between female traits and the masculinity of leadership, researchers have focused on the deficits and obstacles of women becoming leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Rosette & Tost, 2010). Indeed, Festing, Knappert, and Kornau (2015) argue that one of the most significant obstacles women face is the lack of a cultural fit between female values and male-dominated leadership roles, especially in the highest level of management. Women in situations and settings that align more with the perceived female gender role tend to experience fewer obstacles and have higher evaluations (Ferguson, 2018; Ridgeway, 2001).

Extensive literature (Avolio, Walumba, & Weber, 2009; Brands, Menges, & Kilduff, 2015; Collins, Burrus, & Meyer, 2014; Newman & Butler, 2014; Post, 2015) on the dyadic relationship between leader and follower shows that this relationship has a substantial impact on job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employee turnover (Geys, 2014). Many of the characteristics of leadership are more congruent to male, agentic qualities than female, communal traits (Díaz-García, 2010; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Hoover, Hack, Garcia, Goodfriend, & Habashi, 2019; Lemoine, Aggarwal, & Steed, 2016); therefore, the assumption for leadership is more associated with masculinity than femininity (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Koenig & Eagly, 2014; Saint-Michel, 2018; Wang, Chiang, Tsai, Lin, & Cheng, 2013). However, Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, and Weber (2014) contend that academic study and debate between gender researchers and leadership scholars should not focus on the perceptions of gender differences between men and women. Instead, they argue, the discussion should center on how, when, and why there may be gendered differences in subordinate perceptions of the leader's effectiveness.

Foundationally, Eagly, Karau, and Johnson (1992) undertook a comprehensive meta-analysis of gender-based evaluation of leaders. Their investigation included a sample of sixty-one studies and 147 units. They found that the extant empirical literature of the time showing that women are devalued in leadership roles is significant yet divergent (Rosser, 2010). Further findings indicated that female leaders tended to be more negatively evaluated than men when they engaged in autocratic (agentic) behavior (Eagly et al., 1992; Rosser, 2010). Additionally, their findings indicated female leaders "tended to be especially devalued when they direct male subordinates" (Rosser, 2010, p. 73). Eagly et al.'s (1992) research suggested that traditional leadership stylings are perceived to be masculine and favorable for male leaders, while participatory leadership was characterized as female and less favorable.

Leadership in the United States is typically associated with masculinity (Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hernandez Bark, Escartin, Schuh, and van Dick, 2016; Jogulu & Wood, 2006; Koenig & Eagly, 2014; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Sojo, Wood, Wood, & Wheeler, 2016; Wang et al., 2013; Wood & Eagly, 2015). Gender stereotypes are automatically triggered cognitively because of the perception of the gender of the person (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Haslam & Renneboog, 2011; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2003). Although

contemporary literature and its descriptions of managerial roles do include some stereotypically feminine elements (being helpful, understanding) and gender-neutral stereotypes (intelligent, dedication), most qualities are as demonstrably masculine as they were in the 1950s (Carli & Eagly, 2016; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Elprana, Felfe, Stiehl, & Gatzka, 2015; Hearn, 2019; Vinkenburg et al., 2011).

Perceptions of leadership as masculine does yield a variety of effects. Since people attribute more authority to men, men tend to be more influential in groups than women. Therefore, women may try to adopt those more agentic traits that are so stringently ascribed to men to be perceived as capable of leading effectively (Carli, 2001; Hernandez Bark et al., 2016; Lemoine et al., 2016). Further, women face discrimination relative to many leadership positions, especially in male-dominated areas, where those positions are perceived to be incongruous with the female's gender roles (Eagly et al., 1995; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Kalysh, Kulik, & Perera, 2016). Research (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Schein, 2007) asserts that the masculine stereotype of leadership may contribute to the segregation of the workforce whereby "men tend to monopolize positions of authority" (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006, p. 52). Van Engen et al. (2001) argued that how women think about themselves as potential leaders is a consequence of leadership's perceived masculinity.

Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, and Nauts (2012) and Rudman and Glick (2001) found that their followers consider women who exhibit agentic qualities to be less fit for positions that require communal traits such as interpersonal orientation. Research of Heilman and Chen (2005) contended that women are expected to be altruistic and helpful. Followers viewed the female leaders negatively if they were not, while men were seen more positively when male leaders engaged in altruistic behaviors but were not penalized when they did not. Rhee and Sigler (2015) found that subordinates evaluated female leaders more negatively for both authoritarian and participatory managerial leadership styles than males who used similar leadership styles. Further, they found that male leaders were equally preferred and perceived as effective whether their style was authoritarian or participatory.

ROLE CONGRUITY THEORY

Gender Role Stereotypes. Gender roles are "beliefs...expectations...in that they [gender roles] are normative and...describe qualities or behavioral tendencies believed desirable for each sex," and there is a perception inferred between the role and the people who are engaged in that role as possessing traits or characteristic of the needs of that specific role (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574). The effect of gender roles influences organizational behavior in the way people react to leaders in terms of gender expectancies (de Klerk & Verreynne, 2017; Vinkenburg et al., 2011) and the extent to which people internalize their gender role (Hernandez Bark et al., 2016; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011). Gender roles are deeply rooted in societal expectations and norms (Bosley, 2018).

Gender role stereotypes contain both descriptive and prescriptive norms for gendered behavior, describing the expectations about who men and women are as well as who they should be (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ferguson, 2018; Onesto, 2017; Vinkenburg et al., 2011) and are deeply rooted in societal norms and expectations (Bosley, 2018). "Descriptive norms are the

shared beliefs about what men and women actually do, whereas prescriptive norms are the shared understandings of what men and women ought to do" (Ferguson, 2018, p. 410). Therefore, the agentic gender role describes and prescribes that men should be assertive, independent, and self-confident; however, the communal gender role describes and prescribes that women should be expressive, helpful, and nurturing. Role incongruity occurs when a woman or man performs social roles that do not align with the descriptive and prescriptive norms for their gender, whereas role congruity occurs when the two social roles align. For example, if a woman is performing a nurturing role, such as a caregiver, and fits the stereotyped behavior and expectations, she will experience role congruity. However, if a man were to perform that same role, he would suffer role incongruity because the social expectation is incompatible with the stereotypical gender role expectations.

Role Theories. Role theories focus on expectations and norms (Billing & Alvesson, 1994) and are concerned with gender differences expressed through disparate expectations and behaviors (Billing & Alvesson, 1994; Billing, 2011; Bosley, 2018). Ayman (1993) contended that roles are normative and are the primary means by which social judgments are used to identify the "ideal" behavioral patterns. Eagly and Carli (2007) maintained that people tend to classify male and female leaders according to how they associate their feelings about men and women in general. Once they have categorized a person as a leader, they frame that person into their expectations based on those associations (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

As postulated by Eagly and Karau (2002) in their seminal article, role congruity posits that the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions may result from gender role stereotypes held by followers. Fundamentally, role congruity theory assays the association between gender roles and the other social roles individuals enact (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ferguson, 2018). Ridgeway (2013) argued that people's primary means of understanding and engaging in social behavior is primarily based on gender. Therefore, women may suffer disadvantages in leadership because of prejudice against female leaders as well as resistance when women occupy leader roles (Eagly, 2007; Peachey & Burton, 2011).

Eagly and Karau's theory also postulates that leadership stereotypes exist, and such stereotypes are the basis for expectations of leadership qualities for leaders (Vu, Duong, Barnett, and Lee (2017). Because of these stereotypes, men are seen as possessing the necessary and inherent qualities, those more "congruent," of leadership, whereas women are not perceived as having the requisite skills to lead efficiently (Vu et al., 2017). Significant research shows that all leadership roles, whether the role calls for communal "feminized" traits and skills, entail some degree of gender-role incongruity, and supervisors are anticipated to act agentially (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Caleo, 2018; Koenig et al., 2011; Lyness & Heilman, 2006; Powell, 2011).

Role Congruity Theory. Role congruity theory is an evolutionary step from social role theory whereby perceivers infer a correspondence between their actions and their inner dispositions. Therefore, the descriptive nature of gender roles originates in others' beliefs rather than in the person demonstrating the behavior (Cenkci & Ozelik, 2015). The supposition here is that certain traits and behavioral tendencies are perceived to be desirable for each gender, as well as the social expectations of the roles that men and women should occupy (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Lemoine et al., 2016; Peachey & Burton, 2011). Role congruity theory advanced the notion that women leaders

face potential prejudice since leadership ability is generally ascribed to men who display agentic qualities rather than women who exhibit communal (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Gloor, Morf, Paustian-Underdahl, & Backes-Gellner, 2020; Triana, Richard, & Yücel, 2017). Further, role congruity theory contends that women (1) may be disadvantaged in securing leadership positions because they are not perceived as qualified because they lack the necessary leadership skills, and (2), even if a woman occupies a leadership position, she may be unfavorably evaluated because she "may be perceived as violating the gender norm ascribed to women" (Peachey & Burton, 2011, p. 418). Empirical research has shown that the masculinity of leader role expectations are, in fact, very robust and have been found across nationalities (Cenkci & Ozcelik, 2015; Schein, 2001), in a variety of industries/services (Ko, Kotrba, & Roebuck, 2015), and by a variety of methods (Rosette & Tost, 2010).

Role congruity has profound effects on discrimination and prejudice in that leaders are perceived as legitimate if that role aligns with social expectations (Ferguson, 2018). Eagly and Karau (2002) theorized that role incongruity leads to two forms of discrimination and prejudice toward female leaders. First, because of descriptive gender norms, people have *a priori* beliefs about males and females based on stereotyped gender roles. Because agentic qualities ascribed to men closely resemble those attributed to leadership more so than do the communal attributes ascribed to women (Lemoine et al., 2016), women are more likely to experience impediments to access these roles if they engage in behavior incongruous with perceived expectations. Second, when men and women who already perform or participate in social roles that deviate from expected gender roles, they will experience prejudice and discrimination. Communal performance by men or agentic actions by women is evaluated less favorably and seen as less legitimate because of a violation of prescriptive gender norms about what men and women ought to do (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Fritz & van Knippenberg, 2017; Saint-Michel, 2018).

Research is beginning to show that role congruity may be moderated by leadership style, especially when considering that women have been more favorably evaluated than men when they display transformational leadership (Cuadrado, Navas, Molero, Ferrer, & Morales, 2012; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Koenig et al., 2011; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014; Peachey & Burton, 2011), as well as the gender of the followers (Gloor et al., 2020) as the perceived masculinity of leadership moderates over time (Koenig et al., 2011; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014). Although an in-depth exploration of leadership styles and theories is beyond the scope of this article, transformational leadership has been shown to be more congruent with the stereotypical female gender role, whereas transactional leadership is ascribed more with a masculine gender role (Brescoll, 2016; Kiser, 2015; Koenig et al., 2011; Saint-Michel, 2018). Since positive organizational outcomes have been found to be related to transformational leadership, women leaders who display transformational qualities may have a leadership advantage over men (Rosette & Tost, 2010; Saint-Michel, 2018; Wang et al., 2013). Peachey and Burton (2011), in an empirical study of perceptions of the effectiveness of male and female leaders in intercollegiate athletic directors, argued that organizational context might mediate this female leadership advantage. Their study's results provided evidence that, indeed, organizational context does seem to mediate female leadership advantage through transformational leadership. Regardless of leadership style, subordinates' gender role expectations and biases about the leader may impact the leader's perceived effectiveness (Gloor et al., 2020; Koenig et al., 2011).

PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Subordinate perceptions of the leader are salient to understanding the leader's effectiveness. Research shows that women leaders are disliked more than men who occupy similar positions and roles (Fitzsimmons, Callan, & Paulsen, 2012; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007) and face social and economic penalties (Rosette & Tost, 2010) when they enact or direct authority (Brescoll, 2011). Rosser (2003) hypothesized that perceptions are rooted in an individual's experiences with a leader's behavior, directly or indirectly, based on what a leader says and does. The contextual and cognitive factors which influence gender perception include (1) the beliefs, expectations, and motivator between the leader and the perceiver; (2) whether or not elements inform the gender schema among which are the nature of the task, the characteristics/traits of the leader, and the organizational context; (3) whether or not differential expectations are conveyed to women and men; and (4) whether these result in adaptation of the leader's self-protection (Becker et al., 2002).

Research has long held that social perceivers hold stereotypic beliefs about groups (Katz & Braly, 1933; Vinkenburg et al., 2011) and their leadership. Therefore, individuals determine whether or not they believe the leader(s) is(are) effective. Moreover, Heilman (2001) asserts women who aspire to leadership positions face a perceived lack of fit. Both the lack of fit (Heilman, 2001) and the think-manager-think-male paradigm (Groeneveld, Bakker, & Schmidt, 2020; Schein, 1973) empirically describe the barriers women may face in achieving leadership positions. Women are not believed to have the perceived requisites to assuming a leadership position as males--the same abilities, traits, and talents (Klatt et al., 2016). Role congruity theory has shown that perceptions of role incompatibility have profound adverse effects on a woman's leadership effectiveness (Bongiorno, Bain, & David, 2014; Gloor et al., 2020; Rosette & Tost, 2010; Saint-Michel, 2018), leader emergence (Lemoine et al., 2016) and perceptions of leadership style and ability (Ellemers, Rink, Derks, & Ryan, 2012; Esser, Kahrens, Mouzughy, & Eomois, 2018; Porter, 2009).

Subordinate's Leadership Expectations. Individuals/subordinates have expectations for how women and men should behave in general and how male and female leaders should act. Historical research by Lord & Maher (1993) maintained that as a leader behaves with a subordinate's expectations consistently, subordinates rate the leader as effective. Indeed, Lord and Maher's (1993) leadership categorization theory posits that individuals hold mental representations (prototypes) by which leaders should behave. A person's prototype affects many aspects: his/her attention, encoding, and schema information (Phillips & Lord, 1982), and physical features associated with sex, ethnicity, and race may activate prototypes which may affect perceiver's expectations for male or female leaders (Lord & Emrich, 2001).

Eagly et al. (1992) found that male leaders were evaluated slightly more favorable than female leaders, primarily when leaders were described using a masculine leadership style; however, current research suggests that perception of the masculinity of a leadership role may be lessening (Koenig et al., 2011; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014). Dominant women and women who use more assertive speech are less influential to men than women who are less dominant or assertive (Baxter, 2015), and women who express anger tend to be evaluated less favorably than men (Schaubroeck & Shao, 2012).

Echoed in Rosser's (2003) assertion that organizational context has a strong influence on leader behavior, Becker et al. (2002) found substantial support between the subordinate perception of the leader's effectiveness as a function of the leader's gender and the organizational context. Specifically, they found that being in an out of role position enhanced the follower's perception of both initiating structure and female leaders' consideration. Further, they found that high self-monitoring women leaders had lower self/subordinate discrepancies in the educational field versus industry, suggesting that high self-monitoring women attend more to organizational norms than situational cues. The authors did acknowledge the possibility that industry may be a moderating factor; however, their findings show that high self-monitoring women face less conflict with perceptive behaviors than low-monitoring women (Becker et al., 2002).

Lack of FIT. Historic literature suggested that women who aspire to leadership positions face a perceived lack of fit. Statham (1987) suggested that sex-differentiated management may exist. In her study, she found that female leaders were perceived as more task-oriented and focused on their followers. Women leaders interacted more with subordinates, and followers felt that the female leaders paid close attention to everything happening within their purview. On the other hand, she found men were perceived to be more self-focused, more distant from their followers, and emphasized their power over people and situations. Followers felt that the male leader led from a distant, "stay out of it" manner.

More currently, Paustian-Underdahl et al. (2014), in a meta-analytic study of forty-nine years of research of contextual moderators of perceptions of leadership effectiveness, presented several notable findings. First, they found the moderating effect of the relationship between a leader's role and the perception of that leader's effectiveness, observing that different results occur depending on whether self- or other-ratings serve as the measure of the leader's effectiveness. Second, consistent with role congruity theory, gender differences were moderated by the extent to which the examined firm was male or female-dominated. The perception tended to view the male leader as more effective if the organization was male dominant. Paustian-Underdahl et al. (2014) found the results were consistent with Eagly et al.'s (1995) results, although the effects seem to have waned over time (again suggesting time may have a moderating effect). Paustian-Underdahl et al.'s quantitative findings showed $d = .12$, 95% CI [-.09, .32], while Eagly et al.'s (1995) results were for $d = .42$, 95% CI [.32, .52].

Third, Paustian-Underdahl et al. (2014) found that specific leadership roles (i.e., business, education) may be seen as incongruent with a male gender role, thereby negatively affecting the perceived success of the male leader. Fourth, women are viewed to be more effective than men in middle management and senior leadership positions (Baker & Cangemi, 2016). Through the lens of Foschi's double standards of leadership model (Cited by Paustian-Underdahl, 2014) whereby women are perceived to be seen as more effective than men in top leadership positions because of the perceptions of the extra competence of the female leader, Paustian-Underdahl et al. (2014) contended that role congruity theory might be supplemented to illustrate the perceptions of additional competence may override perceptions of women's incongruity. Fifth, gender-related stereotypes regarding perceptions of female leadership effectiveness appear to have slightly shifted from Eagly et al.'s (1995) in that women leaders are being viewed more effectively by both men and women as the number of women has increased in the workplace.

Leadership Style and Gender. Extant research has indicated an interaction between leadership style and leader gender, and that interaction may moderate subordinate evaluation of the leader's effectiveness (Cenkci, & Özçelik, 2015). In a study of Taiwanese employees and how leadership style (authoritarian or benevolent—agentic or communal) interacts with the gender of the leader to impact employee performance, Wang et al. (2013) found evidence that indicated that the supervisors' gender affects the degree of perceived leadership effectiveness. Oakley (2000) showed that when women leaders engage more control-oriented and authoritarian leadership, they are more likely to experience negative feedback from subordinates rather than their male colleagues because of perceived incongruity between gender and the expected role. Research by Cheng & Lin (2012) found that as men engage in authoritarian and dominant behavior over their subordinates, their leadership is perceived as more effective, consistent with role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Additionally, Cheng and Lin's (2012) research showed that women were expected to enact more benevolent leadership (consistent with perceived communal female traits), and subordinates reacted more positively when female leaders did so. In fact, subordinates performed at lower levels when female leaders showed less benevolent leadership than did subordinates led by men. However, an empirical study by Cenkci & Özçelik (2015) suggests that gender does not significantly affect the relationship between leadership style and employee work engagement. Nevertheless, the authors readily admit that culture could have moderated that relation as their study was conducted solely of Turkish firms, firms that are accustomed to male-dominance and authoritative leadership.

Scott and Brown (2006) found empirical evidence that subordinates have difficulty encoding leadership behaviors into underlying leadership traits when female leaders perform using agentic traits. Their findings suggest that female leaders are subjected to gender roles and leadership comparisons by their subordinates; however, Scott and Brown (2006) did not compare women's results against male leaders. Wang et al. (2013) sought to expand Scott and Brown's (2006) study to include that comparison. Findings from their initial study of fifteen Taiwanese electronic manufactures (mostly male) found that when male leaders engaged in benevolent leadership, their subordinates had stronger positive performances. Additionally, they discovered that authoritarian leadership and leader gender affect subordinate creativity, although there was no significant effect on task performance. Further findings indicated that female leaders engage in more authoritarian leadership than male leaders with no discernible differences in benevolent leadership between the genders. These findings led them to another study.

In their second study, Wang et al. (2013) collected data from Taiwanese customer service units (mostly female) within a large commercial bank. They found that female leader use of authoritarian leadership had a substantial adverse effect on subordinate performance. They also found that female leaders' benevolent leadership had a less favorable impact on subordinate task performance than men. The collaborating effect of benevolent leadership and leader gender on the follower's conscientiousness was not significant. In Study 2, their findings showed that female leaders' benevolent leadership was positively associated with follower behavior, suggesting that women leaders are more effective in predominantly female settings, consistent with Eagly et al.'s (1995) findings. However, in both studies, they found that female leaders' use of benevolence had weaker effects on subordinate performance than male leaders, especially in male-dominated settings.

Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, and Reichard (2008) conducted a series of four studies to provide an in-depth study of role congruity theory; to understand whether current leadership prototypes are complementary to sex roles; and to explain the extent to which gender role violations influence leadership effectiveness ratings. As a whole, these empirical studies demonstrate that leadership prototype dimensions do differ in salience between men and women, supporting role congruity theory. Additionally, an individual's sex-type (feminine or masculine) affects their opinions of a leader's gender consistent actions. Their studies suggest that male leaders tend to be perceived by subordinates as more effective than female leaders, *ceteris paribus*. They found that sex disparities appeared more pronounced for leadership effectiveness ratings than other factors such as likeability. Further findings indicated that female followers expect that their female leaders should also be sensitive. Those women who did not display sensitivity were rated as less effective. However, contrary to role congruity theory, Johnson et al. (2008) found that sensitive female leaders were liked as well as influential female leaders, but both were liked more than sensitive male leaders.

Moderating Effects and Evolving Attitudes. However, not all researchers agree. Bosak and Sczesny (2011) sought to show that, as more women continue to enter the workforce, especially those in male-dominated areas, the perceived incongruity associated with traits ascribed to each gender (and, thereby, stereotypes) would decrease over time. In their study, their second hypothesis posited that the perceived variation in women's roles would mediate the effects on masculine traits attributed to women, and perceived adjustment(s) in leadership abilities will mediate the effects on feminine characteristics associated with leaders. Their empirical study of 160 management students recruited from the University of Bern, Switzerland, found that participants projected that women would significantly increase in masculine traits over time, reducing the perceived role incongruity between gender and leader. The traits ascribed to men and leadership remained stable over time. Further, they found evidence to suggest that perceived changes in women's roles did mediate the impact on beliefs about masculine traits in female leadership.

They conducted a second study with 196 participants (106 male, 90 female) at the University of Bern. In this study, Bosak and Sczesny (2011) posited that the incongruity in beliefs about leaders and women should diminish as role distributions shift due to a projected (manipulated for the experiment) increase in women's masculine traits. Their second study found evidence that individuals perceive leadership as a masculine behavior, especially in male-dominated work settings. As women became leaders, their findings showed that followers assigned masculine traits to the female leaders and evaluated them equal to men in the same leadership position. Additionally, they found that male leaders increased in feminine traits as the role distributions became equal. Because that was a surprise and could not be easily explained, Bosak and Sczesny postulated that that shift occurred potentially due to the manipulation of the experiment. Further research in this area is needed.

In an empirical study of 2267 people (1546 male and 721 female) using a customized 360-degree feedback evaluation, Pfaff, Boatwright, Potthoff, Finan, Ulrey, & Huber (2013) found that subordinates' perceptions of the female leaders use of nine of ten task-oriented behaviors were much higher than for men. Women utilized relationally oriented actions more so than their male counterparts did. However, subordinates and other leaders/supervisors perceived that women and men leaders use task-oriented behavior almost equally, while female middle managers view

themselves as engaging in task-oriented behaviors more than men recognize themselves in the same regard. Since task-oriented behaviors are historically associated with agentic leadership, these findings do not support role congruity. Rather, these results seem to confound more than clarify. Future research into understanding this disparity is warranted.

Exposure to Female Leaders. Dasgupta & Asgari (2004) identify research that demonstrates that some automatic attitudes and beliefs (stereotypes, for example) may be malleable when specific motivational factors spur people or when individuals practice specific strategies to avoid stereotypical or prejudicial responses. Their empirical research showed that seeing women in high profile *and* counter-stereotypical leadership positions (business leaders, judges, scientists, etc., those considered more masculine) has a robust impact on women's unconscious beliefs about their ingroup (Dasgupta & Asgari, 2004). As the female participants in their study were exposed to more famous female leaders, they were more likely to associate leadership traits to women more than those who were exposed to controlled exemplars (Dasgupta & Asgari, 2004).

In their second study that involved students in a university setting, Dasgupta and Asgari (2004) found a mediating factor: how often people are exposed to women in leadership mediates their gender-specific attitudes, stereotypes, and beliefs. In other words, results showed that as more of the students encountered female instructors, the less they expressed gendered stereotypes automatically. Additionally, female students showed a marked increase in women's automatic stereotypical responses to other women if they encountered mostly male faculty members. Finally, their studies support social role theory by showing that women are much more likely to be involved in communal care-taking roles while men are disproportionately located in more authoritative, agentic roles, both of which perpetuate gender stereotypes. Following these studies, Dasgupta and Asgari (2004) suggested that changes in automatic gender-stereotypical responses demonstrated in their studies could potentially decrease the perceived incongruity between gender roles and leadership roles. They maintain that differences in perceived discrepancies and automatic gender stereotypes may offer women access to more agentic leadership positions, provide perceivers more opportunities to evaluate women who already occupy agentic leadership roles as more effective, and reduce the power of gender stereotypes through a conscious belief change over time (Lemoine et al., 2016).

Empirical findings from Yang and Aldrich's (2014) research of entrepreneurial teams and start-ups suggested that women would generally face fewer disadvantages in business leadership, except for male/female perceived spousal characteristics (male as the breadwinner, the female as a homemaker) and related accountability. Yang & Aldrich (2014) found that ascribed attributes, despite growing egalitarian value systems, remain a fundamental basis for assigning rewards and distributing leadership. Further findings indicated that gender acts as an underlying and often unacknowledged "cultural and cognitive principle lurking beneath the surface of all social interactions" (Yang & Aldrich, 2014, p. 322).

Among the most significant sociocultural threat to leadership gender equality, especially in the highest levels of leadership, maybe the lingering stereotypes and implicit biases regarding the gendered idea of leadership roles (Pfaff et al., 2013). Pfaff et al.'s research shows that women in middle management are perceived as being prepared both cognitively and behaviorally to ascend to the most elite levels of firm leadership. Empirical data collected by Festing et al. (2015)

indicated that gender-related biases on HRM practices might perpetuate male-oriented leadership practices and prevent women from attaining higher levels of leadership. Beaman, Chattopadhyay, Duflo, Pande, and Topalova (2009) found that prior exposure to female leaders improves perceptions of leader effectiveness for women in general and reduces the influences of gender stereotypes.

LIMITATIONS

This article is limited to the degree of the scope of the surveyed articles, data, and research. Additionally, this research reviews the extant literature and does not conduct any empirical or quantitative study. Instead, it relies on the data collected from other researchers. This paper did not evaluate the degree of leader power and its potential influence(s) on a subordinate's reaction. As far back as 1991, Ragins suggested that gender differences regarding power may significantly impact the leader-subordinate exchange. She argues that female leaders lacking in power will lose subordinate support. This area may be fruitful for further research but is not examined in this setting. This article also did not profoundly consider the distinctive leadership stylings or choices and how those may impact the subordinate's perception of leadership effectiveness beyond what was presented.

In this research, gender was viewed through biological sex rather than as a spectrum or construct. For the purpose of this study and following research by psychologists Ellemers (2014, 2018) and Ramos, Barreto, Ellemers, Moya, Ferreira, & Calanchini (2016), gender was regarded as the observations of how men and women behave as explained by inherent biological differences between them. Other than a cursory review, research into potential moderating effects of disparate cultures was not thoroughly explored.

IMPLICATIONS

Firms must do more than merely placate women or encourage their ascension in the ranks of leadership. Women must be empowered, given proper training, and afforded the opportunities to lead. "As long as companies do not go beyond the usual measures...they will only address the symptoms" of the problem (Festing et al., 2015, p. 74). For managers, identifying the requisite leadership style to fit the followers' needs is paramount; for female leaders, it is critical (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Understanding that gender stereotypes and role congruities influence style will allow both men and women to identify the appropriate situational leadership style. Further, followers may be trained to better understand their roles in the leadership-followership dyad to alleviate or prevent a stereotypical reaction to the leader's gender.

Granted, over time, the stereotypical masculinization of leadership has waned (Koenig et al., 2011; Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014); however, women still must be higher qualified than men, outperform to receive a promotion, and receive less pay than similarly positioned men with commiserate expertise, training, and tenure (Lammers & Gast, 2017). Additional workforce training is costly, especially if the additional training does not transfer to the entire organization (Gloor et al., 2020). Gloor et al. (2020) suggest that women face a potential backlash if women are trained to use more agentic characteristics, and organization-wide interventions and training may

solidify stereotypes. Their suggestion of "team-based interventions" (p. 507) echoes research that more diverse teams tend to diminish gender bias (Kalysh et al., 2016). Targeted training using diverse teams may help mitigate training costs while potentially reducing gender inequity (Gloor et al., 2020; Kalysh et al., 2016; Onesto, 2017).

Additionally, firms should explore ways that diverse teams may be utilized to increase the organizational culture's attitudes towards diversity and inclusion. Socialization activities where men and women collaborate in small team settings have been shown to help break down stereotypical beliefs (Madsen & Scribner, 2017). Reviewing or adopting espoused corporate values that incorporate diversity in the workforce, including leadership positions, may promote more positive attitudes toward all minorities, not just women.

Companies and managers should create a mentoring program that will help women in the job promotion process and the acclimation to its organizational culture. Mentoring should not be considered merely as a part of the onboarding process. On the contrary, continued mentorship over time aids both women and minorities with increased job satisfaction and retention (Fuller, Cliffe, & Moorosi, 2015; Roebuck & Smith, 2011).

FUTURE RESEARCH

Some areas for future research have already been noted. A model created by evidence gathered by Vial, Napier, and Brescoll (2016) provides an opportunity to explore the moderating effect of power within the self-reinforcing cycle of illegitimacy faced by women leaders. Since power and its results were beyond this article's scope, an analysis of their research and testing their substantial model may explain the dichotomous perceptions between male and female leaders. Following the example of Bosak and Sczesny (2011), researchers should continue long-term, longitudinal empirics to determine if time has had a moderating effect on follower attitudes toward female leaders. In other words, as the baby boomers leave the workforce, what impact has generation X or millennials had and did each generation view female leaders differently? These two questions should generate much research and debate.

Additionally, climate and cultural impacts cannot be neglected, and continued study in these areas will be beneficial. Wang et al.'s (2013) and Bosak and Sczesny's (2011) research suggest cultural differences may influence the subordinate's response to and evaluation of a leader based on gender. The degree to which stereotypes are pervasive may result from cultural norms and may vary between large cultural groups (Hispanic as compared to Asian, for example) and within subgroups (Cuban, Mexican, Japanese, and Chinese). Hofstede's research could be compared with other scholarship to examine the cultural impact of gender, and, in particular, how team training may challenge stereotypes and socialize newer norms in smaller settings by culturally and gender diverse teams. Finally, research examining the question "do women face continued obstacles to leadership in senior levels?" may provide useful information for promoting and retaining high-quality female leaders.

CONCLUSION

Women have faced obstacles and difficulties in attaining and possessing leadership positions at all levels. The article analyzed gender through the lens of role congruity theory, as postulated by Eagly and Karau (2002), to determine to what extent followers perceived gendered differences in leadership effectiveness. Much research, both empirical and theoretical, shows that women leaders are perceived differently by followers as compared to their male counterparts. Several studies point to the moderating effects of leadership style and culture. Additionally, some studies (Bosak and Sczesny, 2011; Pfaff et al., 2013) present findings that show the potential that time moderates attitudes and behaviors toward women leaders, thereby leveling perceptions toward genders in leadership. While much study has occurred, future areas, especially those involving power as moderators, may provide a better understanding of a leader's perceived effectiveness between genders.

REFERENCES

- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 421–449.
- Ayman, R. (1993). Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions. In R. Chemers, M. M. Ayman (Ed.). Academic, New York.
- Baker, J., & Cangemi, J. (2016). Why are there so few women CEOs and senior leaders in corporate America? *Organization Development Journal*, *34*(2), 31–43.
- Baxter, J. (2015). Who wants to be the leader? The linguistic construction of emerging leadership in differently gendered teams. *International Journal of Business Communication*, *52*(4), 427–451.
- Becker, J., Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2002). Discrepancies in self/subordinates' perceptions of leadership behavior. *Group & Organization Management*, *27*(2), 226–244.
- Berger, J., Fisek, M. H., Norman, R. Z., & Zelditch, M. (1977). *Status characteristics and social interaction*. New York: Elsevier Scientific.
- Billing, Y. D. Alvesson, M. (1994). *Gender, managers, and organizations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Billing, Y. D. (2011). Are women in management victims of the phantom of the male norm? *Gender, Work and Organization*, *18*(3), 298–317.
- Bongiorno, R., Bain, P. G., & David, B. (2014). If you're going to be a leader, at least act like it! Prejudice towards women who are tentative in leader roles. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *53*(2), 217–234.

- Bosak, J., & Sczesny, S. (2011). Exploring the dynamics of incongruent beliefs about women and leaders. *British Journal of Management*, 22(2), 254–269.
- Bosley, E. (2018). *Developing their voices: The experiences of women senior executives in federal government as they develop voice*. [The George Washington University].
- Brands, R. A., Menges, J. I., & Kilduff, M. (2015). The leader-in-social-network schema: Perceptions of network structure affect gendered attributions of charisma. *Organization Science*, 26(4), 1210–1225.
- Brenner, O. C., Tomkiewicz, J., & Schein, V. E. (1989). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(3), 662–669.
- Brescoll, V. L. (2011). Who takes the floor and why: Gender, power, and volubility in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(4), 622–641.
- Brescoll, V. L. (2016). Leading with their hearts? How gender stereotypes of emotion lead to biased evaluations of female leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 415–428.
- Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 725–741.
- Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (2016). Women face a labyrinth: An examination of metaphors for women leaders. *Gender in Management*, 31(8).
- Cenkci, A. T., Ozcelik, G. (2015). Leadership styles and subordinate work engagement: The moderating impact of leader gender. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, 7(4), 8–20.
- Cheng, M., & Lin, Y. (2012). The effect of gender differences in supervisors' emotional expression and leadership style on leadership effectiveness. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(9), 61–72.
- Collins, B. J., Burrus, C. J., & Meyer, R. D. (2014). Gender differences in the impact of leadership styles on subordinate embeddedness and job satisfaction. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25(4), 660–671.
- Cuadrado, I., Navas, M., Molero, F., Ferrer, E., & Morales, J. F. (2012). Gender differences in leadership styles as a function of leader and subordinates' sex and type of organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(12), 3083–3113.
- Dasgupta, N., & Asgari, S. (2004). Seeing is believing: Exposure to counterstereotypic women leaders and its effect on the malleability of automatic gender stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(5), 642–658.

- de Klerk, S., & Verreynne, M. L. (2017). The networking practices of women managers in an emerging economy setting: negotiating institutional and social barriers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(3), 477–501.
- Díaz-García, M. C., & J.-M. (2010). Entrepreneurial intention: The role of gender. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 6, 261–283.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantages and disadvantages: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(1), 1–12.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth*. Harvard University Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573–598.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Johnson, B. T. (1992). Gender and leadership style among school principals. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 28(1), 76–102.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(1), 125–145.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 3–22.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes, M. T., Trautner (Ed.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (Mahwah, NJ, pp. 123–174). Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., Nater, C., Miller, D. I., Kaufmann, M., & Sczesny, S. (2020). Gender stereotypes have changed: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of U.S. public opinion polls from 1946 to 2018. *American Psychologist*, 75(3), 301–315.
- Elkins, K. (2020). Here's how much men and women earn at every age. *CNBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnbc.com/2019/04/02/heres-how-much-men-and-women-earn-at-every-age.html>.
- Ellemers, N. (2014). Women at work: How organizational features impact career development. *Policy Insights Behavioral Brain Science*, 1, 46–54.
- Ellemers, N. (2018). Gender stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 275–298.
- Ellemers, N., Rink, F., Derks, B., & Ryan, M. K. (2012). Women in high places: When and why promoting women into top positions can harm them individually or as a group (and how to prevent this). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 163–187.

- Elprana, G., Felfe, J., Stiehl, S., & Gatzka, M. (2015). Exploring the sex difference in affective motivation to lead: Furthering the understanding of women's underrepresentation in leadership positions. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 14*(3), 142-152.
- Esser, A., Kahrens, M., Mouzughy, Y., & Eomois, E. (2018). A female leadership competency framework from the perspective of male leaders. *Gender in Management, 33*(2), 138–166.
- Ferguson, T. W. (2018). Female leadership and role congruity within the clergy: Communal leaders experience no gender differences yet agentic women continue to suffer backlash. *Sex Roles, 78*(5–6), 409–422.
- Festing, M., Knappert, L., & Kornau, A. (2015). Gender-specific preferences in global performance management: An empirical study of male and female managers in a multinational context. *Human Resource Management, 51*(1), 55–79.
- Fitzsimmons, T. W., Callan, V. J., & Paulsen, N. (2012). Gender disparity in the c-suite: Do male and female CEOs differ in how they reached the top? *Leadership Quarterly, 32*(2), 245–266.
- Fritz, C., & van Knippenberg, D. (2017). Gender and leadership aspiration: The impact of organizational identification. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 38*(8), 1018–1037.
- Fuller, K., Cliffe, J., & Moorosi, P. (2015). Women's leadership preparation within the senior leadership team. *Planning and Changing, 46*(3), 388–415.
- Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55*(1–2), 51–61.
- Geys, B. (2014). Employees' preferences toward (un) likable managers. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(5), 875–884.
- Gloor, J. L., Morf, M., Paustian-Underdahl, S., & Backes-Gellner, U. (2020). Fix the game, not the dame: Restoring equity in leadership evaluations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 161*(3), 497–511.
- Groeneveld, S., Bakker, V., & Schmidt, E. (2020). Breaking the glass ceiling, but facing a glass cliff? The role of organizational decline in women's representation in leadership positions in Dutch civil service organizations. *Public Administration, 98*, 441–464.
- Haslam, S. A., & Renneboog, L. (2011). Who gets the carrot and who gets the stick? Evidence of gender disparities in executive remuneration. *Strategic Management Journal, 32*(July 2010), 301–321.

- Hearn, J. (2019). Gender, work and organization: A gender – work – organization analysis. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 26(October 2018), 31–39.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 657–674.
- Heilman, M. E., & Caleo, S. (2018). Combatting gender discrimination: A lack of fit framework. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 21(5).
- Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 431–441.
- Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks?: The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 81–92.
- Hernandez Bark, A. S., Escartín, J., Schuh, S. C., & van Dick, R. (2016). Who leads more and why? A mediation model from gender to leadership role occupancy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(3), 473–483.
- Hoover, A. E., Hack, T., Garcia, A. L., Goodfriend, W., & Habashi, M. M. (2019). Powerless men and agentic women: Gender bias in hiring decisions. *Sex Roles*, 80, 667–680.
- Jogulu, U. D., & Wood, G. J. (2006). The role of leadership theory in raising the profile of women in management. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(4), 236–250.
- Johnson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., Zewdie, S., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 106(1), 39–60.
- Kalysh, K., Kulik, C. T., & Perera, S. (2016). Help or hindrance? Work-life practices and women in management. *Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 504–518.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 28(3), 280–290.
- Kiser, A. I. T. (2015). Workplace and leadership perceptions between men and women. *Gender in Management*, 30(8), 598–612.
- Klatt, J., Eimler, S. C., & Krämer, N. C. (2016). Makeup your mind: The impact of styling on perceived competence and warmth of female leaders. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 165(5), 483–497.
- Ko, I., Kotrba, L., & Roebuck, A. (2015). Leaders as males?: The role of industry gender composition. *Sex Roles*, 72(7–8), 294–307.

- Koenig, A. M., & Eagly, A. H. (2014). Evidence for the social role theory of stereotype content: Observations of groups' roles shape stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107*(3), 371–392.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(4), 616–642.
- Koland, D. F. (2015). *A new game: Shifting the leadership culture to close the gender gap in corporate America*. [University of St. Thomas].
- Lammers, J., & Gast, A. (2017). Stressing the advantages of female leadership can place women at a disadvantage. *Social Psychology, 48*(1), 28–39.
- Lemoine, G. J., Aggarwal, I., & Steed, L. B. (2016). When women emerge as leaders: Effects of extraversion and gender composition in groups. *Leadership Quarterly, 27*(3), 470–486.
- Lord, R. G., & Emrich, C. G. (2001). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *Leadership Development: A Review in Context, 11*(4), 551–579.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing: Linking exceptions and performance*. New York: Routledge.
- Lyness, K. S., & Heilman, M. E. (2006). When fit is fundamental: Performance evaluations and promotions of upper-level female and male managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 777–785.
- Madsen, S. R., & Scribner, R. T. (2017). A perspective on gender in management The need for strategic cross-cultural scholarship on women in management and leadership. *Cross Cultural and Strategic Management, 24*(2), 231–250.
- Newman, A., & Butler, C. (2014). The influence of follower cultural orientation on attitudinal responses towards transformational leadership: evidence from the Chinese hospitality industry. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(7), 1024–1045.
- Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based senior barriers to management positions: Understanding scarcity of female CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 27*(4), 321–334.
- Offor, E. E. (2011). *Analysis of sex stereotyping on women's positive evaluation and promotion to executive leadership roles*. [Univeristy of Maryland].
- Onesto, L. M. (2017). *Women's leadership effectiveness within the technology industry: How gender roles and emotional intelligence impact followers' evaluations*. [The Chicago School of Professional Psychology].

- Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., Walker, L. S., & Woehr, D. J. (2014). Gender and perceptions of leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contextual moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(6), 1129–1145.
- Peachey, J. W., & Burton, L. J. (2011). Male or female athletic director? Exploring perceptions of leader effectiveness and a (potential) female leadership advantage with intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles, 64*(5–6), 416–425.
- Pfaff, L. A., Boatwright, K. J., Potthoff, A. L., Finan, C., Ulrey, L. A., & Huber, D. M. (2013). Perceptions of women and men leaders following 360-degree feedback evaluations. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 26*(1), 35–56.
- Phillips, J. S., & Lord, R. G. (1982). Schematic information processing and perceptions of leadership in problem-solving groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*(4), 486–492.
- Porter, D. D. S. (2009). *A study of the perceptions of female leaders' qualifications, leadership style, and effectiveness among elective and selective leaders*. [Clark Atlanta University].
- Post, C. (2015). When is female leadership an advantage? Coordination requirements, team cohesion, and team interaction norms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Powell, G. N. (2011). The gender and leadership wars. *Organizational Dynamics, 40*, 1–9.
- Ragins, B. R. (1991). Gender effects in subordinate evaluations of leaders: Real or artifact? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(3), 259–268.
- Ramos, M. R., Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., Moya, M., Ferreira, L., & Calanchini, J. (2016). Exposure to sexism can decrease implicit gender stereotype bias. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 46*(4), 455–466.
- Rhee, K. S., & Sigler, T. H. (2015). Untangling the relationship between gender and leadership. *Gender in Management, 30*(2), 109–134.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 637–655.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2013). Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world. *Social Forces, 92*(1), 401–405.
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Jacobson, C. K. (1977). Sources of status and influence in all female and mixed sex groups. *The Sociological Quarterly, 18*(3), 413–425.
- Robinson, J. L., & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2003). Leadership behavior of male and female managers, 1984-2002. *Journal of Education for Business [H.W. Wilson - EDUC], 79*(1), 28–33.

- Roebuck, D. B., & Smith, D. N. (2011). Wisdom from executive female leaders: What can organizations, executive education programs, and graduate students learn? *Journal of Executive Education*, 10(1), 43–74.
- Rosette, A. S., & Tost, L. P. (2010). Agentic women and communal leadership: How role prescriptions confer advantage to top women leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 221–235.
- Rosser, V. J. (2003). Faculty and staff members' perceptions of effective leadership: Are there differences between women and men leaders? *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 36(1), 71–81.
- Rosser, S. V. (2010). *The gender gap in patenting: A feminist issue preventing equality*. (V. Nardi, Ed.). New York: Nova Sciences Publishers, Inc.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743–762.
- Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 165–179.
- Saint-Michel, S. E. (2018). Leader gender stereotypes and transformational leadership: Does leader sex make the difference? *Management (France)*, 21(3), 944–966.
- Schaubroeck, J. M., & Shao, P. (2012). The role of attribution in how followers respond to the emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 23(1), 27–42.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 675–688.
- Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: Reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review*, 22(1), 6–18.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 95–100.
- Schnarr, K. (2012). Are female executives finally worth more than men? *Ivey Business Journal*, 1(1), 1–3.
- Scott, K. A., & Brown, D. J. (2006). Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101(2), 230–242.

- Sheth, S., Gal, S., Hoff, M., & Ward, M. (2020). 7 charts that show the glaring gap between men's and women's salaries in the US. Retrieved from <https://markets.businessinsider.com/news/stocks/gender-wage-pay-gap-charts-2017-3-1029049751>
- Sojo, V. E., Wood, R. E., Wood, S. A., & Wheeler, M. A. (2016). Reporting requirements, Targets, And quotas for women in leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 519–536.
- The Conference Board of Canada, & Canada, T. C. B. of. (2013). He says, she says: gender gap persists in attitudes toward women's advancement in the workplace. Retrieved from www.conferenceboard.ca/press/newsrelease/13-05-15/he_says_she_says_gender_gap_persists_in_attitudes_toward_women_s_advancement_in_the_workplace.aspx
- Triana, M. D. C., Richard, O. C., & Yücel, İ. (2017). Status incongruence and supervisor gender as moderators of the transformational leadership to subordinate affective organizational commitment relationship. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(2), 429–467.
- Van Engen, M. L., van der Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context, and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 74, 581–598.
- Vial, A. C., Napier, J. L., & Brescoll, V. L. (2016). A bed of thorns: Female leaders and the self-reinforcing cycle of illegitimacy. *Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3).
- Vinkenburg, C. J., van Engen, M. L., Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2011). An exploration of stereotypical beliefs about leadership styles: Is transformational leadership a route to women's promotion? *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 10–21.
- Vu, H. T., Duong, H. T., Barnett, B., & Lee, T. (2017). A role (in)congruity study on Vietnamese journalists' perception of female and male leadership. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 27(6), 648–664.
- Wang, A. C., Chiang, J. T. J., Tsai, C. Y., Lin, T. T., & Cheng, B. S. (2013). Gender makes the difference: The moderating role of leader gender on the relationship between leadership styles and subordinate performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122, 101–113.
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2015). Two traditions of research on gender identity. *Sex Roles*, 73(11–12), 461–473.
- Yang, T., & Aldrich, H. E. (2014). Who's the boss? Explaining gender inequality in entrepreneurial teams. *American Sociological Review*, 79(2), 303–327.
- Zheng, W., Kark, R., & Meister, A. L. (2018). Paradox versus dilemma mindset: A theory of how women leaders navigate the tensions between agency and communion. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(5), 584–596.

QRBD

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF BUSINESS DISCIPLINES

November 2020

Volume 7
Number 3



A JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF BUSINESS DISCIPLINES
SPONSORED BY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
ISSN 2334-0169 (print)
ISSN 2329-5163 (online)