

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
MBA PROGRAM**

**The Perceived Difference between Male and Female Managers:
A Case of Five Selected Ministry Offices in Addis Ababa.**

**A Paper Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Business Administration.**

By: Abraham Bekele

**October 2010
Addis Ababa**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
MBA PROGRAM

The Perceived Difference between Male and Female Managers: A Case of
five selected Ministry Offices in Addis Ababa.

By: Abraham Bekele GSR/1986/01

Approved by Board of examiners:

Advisor

Signature

Examiner

Signature

Examiner

Signature

Examiner

Signature

STATEMENT OF CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that Ato Abraham Bekele has carried out his research work on the topic entitled, The Perceived Difference between Male and Female Managers: A Case of five selected Ministry Offices in Addis Ababa.

The work is original in nature and is suitable for submission for the award of Master of Business Administration.

Advisor: Ato Teshome Bekele

Date: _____

STATEMENT OF DECLARATION

I, Abraham Bekele declare that this study entitled, The Perceived Difference between Male and Female Managers: A Case of five selected Ministry Offices in Addis Ababa is my own effort and study. I have carried out the study independently with the guidance and support of the research advisor. This study has not been submitted for award of any degree or diploma program in this or any other institution and that all sources of materials are duly acknowledged. It is offered here in partial fulfillment for the requirement for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Abraham Bekele

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgements.....	i
List of Acronyms	iv
List of Tables.....	v
Abstract	vi
Chapter One	1
1. Introduction.....	10
2. The research problem.....	12
3. Research objective	14
4. The Research Hypothesis.....	15
5. Research Methodology	16
6. Significance of the Study	19
7. Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	19
Chapter Two	20
2. Leadership and Gender	20
2.1 An Overview Leadership and Gender	20
2.2 Social Role Theory: Gender Stereotypes	20
2.3 Congruence of Leader Roles and Gender Roles.....	22
2.4 Gender and Leadership Styles	24
2.4.1 Task-oriented, Interpersonally-oriented, and Autocratic–democratic Styles.....	25
2.4.2 Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Styles.....	26
2.5 Femininity and Masculinity	29
2.5.1 The Development of Femininity and Masculinity	30
2.6 Effects of Gender on Leader Emergence	33

2.7 The Impact of Gender on Effectiveness of Leaders.....	34
2.8 Evaluation of and Satisfaction with Leaders	36
Chapter Three	38
3. Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion	38
3.1 Biographical Information.....	38
3.2 Leadership style and Gender.	39
3.3 Outcomes of Leadership: Extra Effort, Effectiveness and Satisfaction.	44
3.4. Measures of Masculinity and Femininity.	48
3.5 Discussion of Results.	40
Chapter Four	55
4 Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations	55
4.1 Summary	55
4.2 Conclusion.....	57
4.3 Recommendations	58
4.4 Areas for Further Research	49
References	
Appendices	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Taking this opportunity, I would like to thank my advisor Ato Teshome Bekele for his valuable time, critical comments, his patience and cooperation that enabled me to conduct the research out of schedule and made the work more fruitful. My heart felt gratitude goes to Dr Tilahun Tekilu for his relentless efforts made in teaching Business Research Methodology course. Due to his unreserved effort, I have uncovered the shadow and enabled to see some light in the area of scientific research. I also would like to thank him for his valuable time spent in reading the draft analysis and his critical comments that contributes its part in the fruitfulness of the study. I would like to thank Ato Mahari Tekeste, Quality and Compliance Directorate Director at Ministry of Health, Ato Minas Yifru, Audit Manager at Office of Auditor General, Ato Demisash Getachew, Regional Budget Compensation and Subsidy Director General at Office of Auditor General. They are always at the side me and their assistance was so great especially in distributing and collecting the survey questionnaire in their respective organizations. I am grateful to Ethiopian Telecommunications Corporation (ETC) for giving me the chance to join this program. I also would like to thank all ETC Procurement Department staff for their moral and material support.

Finally, I would like to thank my families and all my friends, your moral and material support was so great to me. I am proud of you all!

Abraham Bekele

October 2010

LIST OF ACRONYMS

FMoE	Federal Ministry of Education
FMoFED	Federal Ministry of Economic Development and Finance
FMoH	Federal Ministry of Health
FmoTC	Federal Ministry of Transport and Communication
OFAG	Office of Federal Auditor General
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
TL	Transformational Leadership Style
TCL	Transactional Leadership Style
IA	Idealized Attributes
IB	Idealized Behavior
IS	Intellectual Stimulation
IM	Inspirational Motivation
IC	Individual Consideration
CR	Contingent Reward
MBEA	Management By Exception Active
MBEP	Management By Exception Passive
LF	Laissez Faire Leadership Style
EF	Effectiveness
EE	Extra Effort
ST	Satisfaction
MLQ	Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
BSRI	Bem Sex Role Inventory
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance

LIST OF TABLES	Page
Table 1: Academic Level * Sex Cross tabulation.....	28
Table 2: Number of response by organization.....	29
Table 3: Leadership style and Gender: F ratios, Sum of squares, Mean square, Degrees of freedom (df) and level of Significance (p).....	29
Table 4: Group means, standard deviations (SD) of Transformational Leadership sub scales for male and female managers.....	32
Table 5: Group means, standard deviations and research validated benchmarks between male and female managers on Transactional Leadership factors.....	33
Table 6: Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership and Gender.....	33
Table 7: Group Means, Standard deviation, Research validated benchmarks between male and female managers on measures of Extra effort, Effectiveness & Satisfaction.....	35
Table 8: Correlations (r), N=113, between types of leadership, constructs Within each leadership style and outcomes of leadership.....	36
Table 9: Average scores of male, (N= 62) and female, (N=24) subordinates' evaluation for their corresponding male and female managers.....	37
Table 10: Masculinity, Femininity and Standard Deviation Scores of Male and Female managers.....	39
Table 11: The average Feminist and Masculinity scores for each Organization.....	40

ABSTRACT

Whether men and women behave differently in managerial roles is a much debated question. Many scholars developed different theories about the impacts of gender roles in understanding differences between male and female managers. Most studies also proved that gender role stereotyping resulted differences between male and female managers leadership style, value systems, effectiveness, career advancements, etc. Thus, this study was planned to examine the perceived differences between male and female managers on the job (in Ethiopian context) by using managers self and their subordinates' evaluation. The study was conducted from the randomly selected five ministry offices found in Addis Ababa. The already developed Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSI) and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) were used as data collection tools. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) on statistical measures was performed based on the number of responses obtained from male female managers self and subordinates evaluations. The most interesting finding revealed in this research is the presence of gender differences in leadership style. Both male and female managers were rated to exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors than transactional leadership behaviors. However, female managers were rated to exhibit significantly more transformational behaviors than male managers, $F(1, 111) = 18.954, P < 0.001$ and male managers were rated to exhibit significantly more transactional behaviors $F(1, 111) = 21.662, P < 0.001$ than female managers. The other significant finding of this study is that male managers are rated to be more masculine than female managers and female managers are more feminine than male counter parts. Gender role stereotyping is found to be the cause of most of the differences revealed in this study.

Chapter One

The Perceived Difference between Male and Female Managers

1. Introduction

Considerable amounts of research have been devoted to understand the factors associated with differences between male and female managers. Following the research, different theories have been developed concerning male and female managers. Goktepe and Shneier (1989) cited in P. Hare, Koenings and E. Hare (1997) characterize leadership differences by two factors biological sex and gender. The study of Schein, and Mueller (1992) show that sex role stereotyping is the major factor on explaining requisite management characteristics across three countries: United States of America, Great Britain and Germany. Those research outcomes, which used biological sex as a factor to characterize leadership differences between male and female managers, believe that leadership is biologically determined, behaviorally demonstrated and innate to the male species (Appelbaum, Audet and Miller, 2003; Mathipa and Tsoka, 2001).

Later on, research outcomes indicate that gender predicts leadership behavior better than biological sex (Kent and Moss, 1994; Appelbaum, Audet and Miller, 2003; Wu, 2009; Eagly and Carli, 2003). After identifying gender as a main factor to express difference between male and female managers, researchers have tried to classify the differences in terms of leadership style: men managers employ transactional leadership style where as women managers employ transformational leadership styles (Eagly and Carli, 2003; Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Cuadrado, Morales and Recio, 2008; Bono and Judge, 2004). Witherspoon (1997) cited in Williams (1999) men assume more task roles give more opinions, are argumentative, and do not disclose personal information. Men tend to take over decision making decisions, and criticizes the opinions and ideas of other people. Conversely, women assume nurturing roles, interrupt for clarification, are disclosive about information and more supportive of other speakers. P. Hare, Koenings and E Hare, (Ibd) described the managers difference as male managers are more task oriented and female managers are more concerned with social-emotional issues. Rosener (1990), classified women leaders use interactive leadership style and men leaders as

command and control leadership style. Managers can be classified based on the level of their masculinity and femininity: male managers are masculine and female managers are feminine (Kent and Moss, 1994).

In Ethiopia, even though it is not supported by formal research, most people talk about gender roles in their day to day activities and consider gender role stereotyping as the main reason why the number of women are few in the managerial position. As cited in the National Policy of Ethiopian Women (1993, p.14), the study done by Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (1988) pointed out that the number of male employed in both public and private sectors was about 82.1 percent of the total work force; whereas women constitute only 17.9 percent. Moreover, the number of women holding high managerial position is negligible. According to the policy manual, this under representation is attributed to the prejudicial attitude prevalent in the country's political, social and economic life. The constitution article 36 (1995) has entitled women the right to equality in employment, promotion, pay and pension. Ministry of women affair's bulletin (2008, p. 64) states that affirmative action is one of the measures taken by the government to encourage women in education and government jobs. However, even though some improvements have been shown, the number of women in the managerial positions is minimum compared to their number in the total population. To this end, investigating the actual factors, which help to understand the perceived differences and types of perceived differences caused by these factors between male and female managers on the job, makes the study appropriate and timely.

Hence, clearly identifying the factors, which helps in understanding the perceived differences, type of differences between male and female managers, and the impact of the differences on performance/ effectiveness will help in developing appropriate policy and leadership development program at country level in general and at organization level in particular.

2. The Research Problem

Various studies were carried out to understand the difference between male and female managers on the job. Some studies show that similarities between male and female managers are more common than their differences. P. Hare Koenings and E. Hare (1997) in their research on “the perception of observed and model values of male and female managers” indicate that male and female managers have the same value system. Later on the existence of differences between male and managers have been revealed by many researchers and they have been trying to explain those differences in terms of leadership emergence, leadership style, effectiveness, speed of advancement to higher managerial positions, and the like. For instance the works of Eagly and Schmidt (2001), Eagly and carli (2003), Druskat (1994), Appelbaum, Audent and Miller (2003) show that male and female managers employ different managerial style: male managers employ transactional leadership style whereas female managers employ transformational leadership style. Other researches consistently show that men more often emerge as leaders than women (Kent and Moss, 1994; Arnold and Shinew, 1997; Mathipa and Tsoka,2001). The study of Patil (2008), Ekore and Attah (2007) shows that sex role expectations have a significant influence on perceived work performance between male and female managers. According to their findings, specifically employees with male expected characteristics were found to perform better than those with female expected characteristics. Regarding career advancements held by male and female managers, the study of Arnold and Shinew (1997), Cuadrado, Morales and Recio (2008), Appelbaum, Audet and Miller (2003) show that women managers are slower than their counterparts in advancing to higher managerial positions. The main question to raise here is that what are the factors used by many researchers to account for these variations? Some researchers especially before 1990s, used biological sex to explain the perceived differences between male and female managers leadership activities (Appelbaum Audet and Miller, 2003; Kent, and Moss, 1994; Schein and Mueller, 1992). Latter on it is proved that gender explains leadership behavior better than biological sex (Kent and Moss, 1994; Appelbuam, Audet and Miller, 2003; Eagly and Carli, 2003). In addition to the above mentioned findings, some researchers concluded that gender stereotyping is worldwide phenomena across cultures except minimum variation (Gibson, 1995; Schein and Mueller, 1992).

However, most of the researches were carried out in developed countries, which have different economic, political, legal and cultural status. As stated in United Nations Development Program (UNDP), (2002), culture is part of the fabric of every society. It shapes the way things are done and our understanding of why this should be. Gender identities and gender relations are essential facets of culture as they determine the way daily life is lived not only within the family, but also in society as a whole. Gender influences economics, politics, social interactions and individual needs. It undergoes variations over time and across culture. It is an active force in the formation of the family, the community and the nation. As a result, it may be difficult to directly apply and generalize that the same problem exists in Ethiopia. Because of this reason, this research was planned to make further investigation to understand the matter in Ethiopian context. The researcher tried to access some of the prior studies conducted by individuals to understand the differences between male and female managers in Ethiopia. To mention some, the research outcomes of Tariku Jebena (2004) and Dugassa Tessema (2004) show that male and female managers employ different leadership style: female managers exhibit more on people orientation whereas male managers exhibit more on task orientation. Jalalie Dereгна (2006) and Danat Gebremedhin (2005) concluded that discrimination based on gender is the main problem faced by female managers in advancing to higher managerial positions. These research outcomes may give some insight about the existence of gender stereotyping in Ethiopia. However, the generalizability of the results is questionable. This is mainly because almost all of the researches were carried out in Addis Ababa by taking bank managers as their subject of study. Except one researcher, all most of all of them are used descriptive statistics to analyze their data and level of statistical significance test was not carried out. The research outcomes of Jalalie revealed that male managers exhibit more transformational leadership styles than female counterparts do, which is contrary to previous research results. Nevertheless, enough justification was not given for why male managers use transformational leadership style more than female managers. In addition, their sample size is very small. For example, one researcher took only 25 participants.

Given the vast amount of research conclude that gender difference do exist, this study was conducted using sufficient sample size taken from different public organizations male and female managers' self evaluation and evaluation from their subordinates to validate the arguments in Ethiopian context. Hence, this study was primarily aimed to answer the following three questions.

Research Question 1. What are the factors and sources of those factors used to account for the perceived difference between male and female managers on the job?

Research Question 2. If differences do exist, what are those perceived differences held by male and female managers?

Research Question 3. If differences do exist, what are the impacts of the perceived differences between male and female managers on effectiveness/performance?

3. Research Objective

The main objective of this survey study was, to examine the perceived differences between male and female managers, the effects of gender on managers' managerial practices and behaviors, and to test the argument held by many leadership, organization behavior, applied psychology, and social role theorists which states that, gender role affects managers' behavior in various forms. To this end, randomly selected three male and three female managers and, on average, four subordinates working under each manager that are working at five public organizations in Addis Ababa were subjects of this study. Gender is selected as an independent variable than biological sex because previous studies proved that gender better explains/predicts managers' behavior than biological sex (Appelbaum, Audet and Miller, 2003; Kent and Moss, 1994; Wu, 2009). Gender role for the purpose of this study is defined as the shared beliefs that apply to individuals based on socially identified sex (Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Hence, gender is socially constructed, differs between and within cultures, and includes variables identifying differences in roles, responsibilities, opportunities, needs and constraints. Where as biological Sex is biologically defined, determined by birth, universal and unchanging.

Gender roles, (Stets and Burke) which are shared expectations of behavior given one's gender:

- Define what is considered appropriate for men and women within the society, social roles and division of labor;
- Involve the relation to power (how it is used, by whom and how it is shared);
- Vary greatly from one culture to another and change over time;
- Vary from one social group to another within the same culture;
- Race, class, religion, ethnicity, economic circumstances and age influence gender roles;
- Sudden crisis, like war or famine, can radically and rapidly change gender roles.

The dependent variable of the study is the perceived difference between male and female managers. The perceived differences between male and female managers can be operationalized by the following constructs: leadership styles such as transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, task-oriented, interpersonally oriented, autocratic, democratic, agentic and communal; sex types: androgynous, masculine, feminine and undifferentiated, outcomes of leadership: extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction.

4. The Research Hypothesis

Based on the previous research outcomes into consideration the following hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis 1. Gender will demonstrate a significant main effect on the degree of emphasis placed on leadership behaviors and styles.

Hypothesis 2 a. Female managers will be rated to exhibit more transformational than transactional leadership behaviors.

Hypothesis 2 b. Male managers will be rated to exhibit more transactional than transformational leadership behaviors.

Hypothesis 3. Comparing female and male managers, female managers will be rated to exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors than male managers.

Hypothesis 4. Women managers will be rated more effective than male managers.

Hypothesis 5. Individuals classified as masculine will emerge as managers more frequently than those low in masculinity.

5. Research Methodology

Sampling Plan

There are nineteen ministries in Ethiopia. The study was planned to conduct the research in five randomly selected ministries found in Addis Ababa. Prior to distributing the survey questionnaire to the randomly selected ministry offices, the researcher has tried to check the existence of at least three female managers in each organization. After checking the existence of the required number of female managers in each organization, the existence of at least four subordinates working under each manager was checked. If the numbers of subordinates working under each manager are more than four, the maximum numbers of subordinates selected were five. After preliminary checking the above mentioned criteria, ministry offices included in this study are: Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Minister of Transport and Communication, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health and Office of Federal Auditor General. During the course of data collection, some organizations were not entirely cooperative. As a result, some organizations were replaced by other organizations. The study was planned to collect data from three male (sample one) and three female male (sample two) managers and, on average, four subordinates working under each male manager (sub sample one) and four subordinates working under each female manger (sub sample two) from each ministry office. Therefore, according to the sampling plan the total number of participants supposed to include in this study was (3 female managers x 5 ministry offices = 15 Female managers, 3 male mangers x 5 ministry offices =15 Male managers, total numbers of mangers= 30, 4 subordinate x 30 managers =120 Subordinates, total participants were 30 managers + 120 subordinates = 150). Subordinates were chosen in such a way that gives them equal chance for male and female subordinates.

Instrument

The Bem sex role inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) is one of the instruments used in this study to conduct independent assessment of masculinity and femininity, in terms of the respondents self reported and subordinates' evaluation of possession of socially desirable, stereotypically masculine and feminine personality characteristics. The questionnaire contains 60 items that measures masculinity, femininity, androgyny, and the

undifferentiated, using the masculinity and femininity scales. The questionnaire has 7 scales ranging from 1= never or almost never true to 7= always or almost always true). The cut off points for androgynous are both masculine and feminine greater than 4.9, for masculine group masculine greater than 4.9 and feminine less than 4.9, for feminine group femininity greater than 4.9 and masculinity less than 4.9, and for undifferentiated both femininity and masculinity less than 4.9. The validity and the reliability of the instrument were proved by Kent and Moss (1994).

The second instrument used in this study with issues of leadership is Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Bass and Avolio (1996, 2003). The MLQ questionnaire measures leadership styles, which may be grouped under three broad categories differentiated by their respective outcome effects and the nature of the influencing process involved. Transformational leadership consists of five factors (five I's): Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individualized Consideration (IC). Transactional leadership-management consists of two factors: Constructive –Contingent Reward (CR), Corrective- Management by Exception Active (MBEA). Passive Avoidant leadership behaviors consist of two factors: Passive-Management by Exception Passive (MBEP), Avoidant-Laissez Faire (LF). The MLQ also measures three outcomes of managers' leadership profile: the followers extra effort, individual unit and organizational effectiveness ratings and satisfaction. Totally, MLQ has 45 items and it was used in its intact form. The rating uses 5 point scale ranging from 0 = not at all to 4 = frequently if not always. The validity of the instrument is proved by Eagly and Carli (2003), Druskat (1994) Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), Smith, Matkin and Fritz (2004), Parry and Procto-Thomson (2001).

Data Collection Procedures

From organization selected for study first, it has been contacted with the Public Relation Officer of each organization and tried to explain the research objective and sampling plan. Then with the assistance of Public Relation Officers in each organization, three male and female managers were randomly selected. The willingness of each manager was

requested before distributing the questionnaire. Some discussion was made with each manager about the purpose of the research, how to fill the questionnaire and the like. The same procedures were applied in choosing subordinates. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher and two assistants. Voluntary individuals were assigned in each office to coordinate the collection of the filled questionnaire. Frequent personal and telephone contacts were made to facilitate respondents' timely response and to maximize the response rate. However, it was not an easy task.

Data Analysis

Based on the number of responses obtained from male and female managers self and subordinates evaluations, analysis of variance (ANOVA) on statistical measures between male and female managers group variances of each organization, inter-group variances among organizations and total group variances all organizations was performed. The significance level of results obtained from the analysis was tested to check whether the results obtained from the sample are statistically significant to make inference and generalize about the total population. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency indicator was used to estimate the reliability of the 45 item MLQ and 60 item BSRI questionnaires and the results are 0.823 and 0.856 respectively. The validity and reliability of the two instruments found in this research can confirm that these survey questionnaires can be used in their intact form in this country. However, regardless of the validity and reliability found in this research some respondents raised some question about the meaning of some items on the BSRI questionnaire. The meanings of few items were frequently asked by respondents. Yielding, athletic, gullible, and conventional are among the items that their meanings are frequently asked. These items require additional explanation that strengthens the understanding of respondents and by doing so; it is possible to improve the validity of the questionnaire. In addition to this, translating the questionnaires into Amharic may improve the validity and reliability.

6. Significance of the Study

Investigating the perceived differences between male and female managers on the job and identifying the true cause of the difference will have a paramount importance to the nation in general and to organizations in particular. Thus, the researcher strongly believes that the result of the study will have the following major significance.

- The study will fill at least some knowledge gap existed in the country regarding the differences between male and female managers and the cause of the difference;
- It will serve as a basis to conduct further and detail study in the area;
- It will help educators to take gender differences into consideration while developing their leadership development policies and programs;
- It will help organizations to understand the difference between male female managers;
- It will help organizations consider the leadership differences of male and female managers and to develop training program accordingly;
- It will help managers to consider, sex- role expectations as important factors in employees work performance.

7. Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is a sample of male and female managers and subordinates working under each manager that were taken from five ministry offices found in Addis Ababa namely: Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Transport and Communication and Federal Auditor General. From each ministry office 6 managers and, on average, 24 subordinates were taken. The total sample size of the study is 150. The major limitation of this study is the study area is limited to Addis Ababa and private organizations are not part of the study.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

2. Leadership and Gender

2.1 An Overview

Whether man and women behave differently in leadership roles is a much debated question. Researches have produced various theories whether or not the approach to leadership differs between men and woman as distinctive biological groups; whether this difference is one of style or substance; whether it is real or perceived; whether one leadership approach is more or less effective than the other and which is more likely to lead to success (Appelbaum, Auedet and Miller, 2003; Eagly and Johannesen-shmidt, 2001; Eagly and Carli, 2003; Kent and Moss, 1994; Druskat, 1994; Schein and Mueller, 1992). Analysis of the situation that, women and men face as leaders provide a rationale for expecting differences and similarities. From the perspective of social role theory of sex differences and similarities (Eagly and Johannesen-schmidt, 2001; Eagly and Carli, 2003; Cuadrado, Morales and Recio, 2008; Druskat, 1994) this analysis begins with the principle that leadership roles, like other organizational roles, are one influence on leaders' behavior. In addition, leaders elicit expectancies based on people's categorization of them as male and female. According to Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001, p.785), "those expectancies constitute gender roles, which are the shared beliefs that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified sex." These roles are assumed to follow from perceivers' observations of men and women as concentrated in different social roles in the family and paid employment.

2.2 Social Role Theory: Gender Stereotypes.

Considerable research has been conducted on gender stereotypes in the leadership domain. Smith, Matkin and Fritz (2004, p. 57-58) had tried to show how the perceptions of subordinates affect the performance of their leaders. According to these authors, these stereotypes have a significant influence on how potential performance of male and female

leaders is perceived by followers regardless of the number of men or women that match the masculine or feminine stereotype. There is a significant amount of research specifically examining whether there are different stereotypes for male and female leaders exhibiting more traditional styles of leadership such as initiating structure and consideration. According to Rasdi, Ismail and Uli, (2003) the distinction between socially constructed male and female, masculine and feminine, is not something people are, whether they are men or women, but it is the gender relations between men and women and something they do at work, and in this case in management. Therefore, gendered structure reflects and reinforces prevailing conceptions of masculinity and femininity. However, Acker (1992) cited in Rasdi, Ismail and Uli, (2003) suggested that gender may be deeply hidden in organizational processes and decisions that appear to have nothing to do with gender. In general, studies “have continued to show that the ‘agentic’ stereotypic male qualities (e.g., competitiveness, daring, assertiveness) are more aligned with stereotypic views of managerial roles, versus ‘communal’ stereotypic female qualities (of kindness, supportiveness, and affection)” (Vecchio, 2002, p. 652 cited in Smith, Matkin and Fritz, 2004). According to Eagly and Johannesen-schmidit (2001, P. 785):

Agentic characteristics, which are ascribed more strongly to men than women, describe primarily an assertive, controlling and confident tendency for example, aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, daring, self-confident and competitive. In employment settings, agentic behaviors may include speaking assertively, competing for attention, influencing other, initiating activity directed to assigned tasks, and making problem focused suggestions. Communal characteristics, which are ascribed more strongly to women than men, ascribe primarily concern with the welfare to other people for example affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturant and gentle. In employment settings, communal behaviors include speaking tentatively, not drawing attention to oneself, accepting others’ direction, supporting and soothing others and contributing to the solution of relational and interpersonal problems.

A meta-analysis by Eagly and Carli, (2003) found out that female leaders were evaluated slightly more negatively than male leaders in studies in which differences could only be

due to the subjects' stereotypes or biases of leaders. Eagly and Karau (2002) cited in Eagly and Carli (2003) suggest that there is a perceived incongruity between the female gender role and typical leader role. They posit that this incongruity creates prejudice towards female leaders. Eagly (1987) discusses "Social Role Theory" as a means to better understand how gender roles (consensual beliefs about the attributes of women and men) and social roles (socially shared expectations that apply to persons who occupy a certain social position or are members of a particular social category) interact to produce sex differences in social behavior. Applied to leadership, this theory says that leaders occupy roles defined by their specific positions in a hierarchy and simultaneously function under the constraints of their gender roles (Eagly and Johannes-Schmidt, 2003).

2.3 Congruence of Leader Roles and Gender Roles.

Female leaders' efforts to accommodate their behavior to the sometimes conflicting demands of the female gender role and their leader role can foster leadership styles that differ from that of men. Gender roles thus have different implications for the behavior of male and female leaders. Because not only the female and male roles have different content, but also because there is often inconsistency between the predominantly communal qualities that perceivers associate with women and the predominantly agentic qualities that they believe are required to succeed as a leader (Eagly and Johannes-Schmidt, 2001). People thus tend to have similar beliefs about leaders and men but dissimilar beliefs about leaders and women. According to Williams and Best (1982) cited in Gibson (1995), suggest that a division of labor assigning a disproportionate share of domestic activities to females and of other activities to males is the cause of the stereotypes. These authors maintain that since communal qualities are important for effective performance of domestic activities and such activities are performed by females more often than males, these qualities tend to be valued more and encouraged in females. The agentic qualities, on the other hand, tend to be more critical for survival outside the home while performing in paid employment. Male development of agentic qualities may result in a tendency for males to emphasize certain leadership behavior and styles more so than others. Likewise, female development of communal qualities may result in a

tendency for females to exhibit certain leadership behaviors and styles more than others (Gibson B., 1995).

The development of gender role stereotyping in the society may result in as an evaluation standard for the judgment of group behaviors rather than the behavior or qualifications of its individual members. In their meta-analysis Eagly and Carli, (2003, P. 818), supported this idea. “When people hold stereotypes about the group, they expect members of that group to possess characteristics and exhibit behavior consistent with those stereotypes.” Perceivers then tacitly assimilate information to their gender stereotypic expectations and spontaneously fill in unknown details of others’ behavior to conform to those expectations. They further explain that the stereotyping influences held by the society yield prejudice against individual group members when stereotypes about their group are incongruent with the attributes associated with success in certain classes of social roles.

Gender role and leader role incongruity tends to produce discrimination by lowering evaluation of such group members as actual or potential occupants of those roles. As Eagly and Karau, (2001) cited in Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, (2001) argued that, perceived incongruity between the female gender role and typical leader roles tend to create prejudice toward female leaders and potential leaders that takes two forms: (a) less favorable evaluation of women’s (than men’s) potential for leadership because leadership ability is more stereotypic to men than women and (b) less favorable evaluation of actual leadership behavior of women than men because agentic behavior is perceived less desirable in women than men. According to these researchers, the first type of prejudice stems from the descriptive norms of gender roles- that is, the activation of descriptive beliefs about women’s characteristics and the consequent aspiration of female stereotypic qualities to them unlike the qualities expected and desired in leaders. The second type of prejudice stems from the injunctive (or prescriptive) norms of gender roles- that is, the activation of beliefs about how women ought to behave. If female leaders violate these prescriptive beliefs by fulfilling the agentic requirements of leader roles and failing to exhibit the communal, supportive behaviors that are preferred in women, they can be

negatively evaluated for these violations, even while they may also receive some positive evaluation for their fulfillment of the leader role.

Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, (2001), have tried to show that female leaders' roles are constrained by threats from two directions: confirming to their gender role can produce a failure to meet the requirements of their gender role, and confirming to their leader role can produce a failure to meet the requirements of their gender role. Particularly consequential for leadership style would be the second form of prejudice—that is, the negative reactions that women may experience when they behave in a clearly agentic style, especially if that style entails exerting control and dominance over others.

2.4 Gender and Leadership Styles.

The examination of gender's impact on leadership style is another area that has been widely researched. Much of this research was conducted on the more common distinction between task-oriented styles (or initiation of structure) and interpersonally-oriented styles (also labeled consideration), and the dimensions of democratic versus autocratic (similar to the dimensions of participative and directive). Previously, Eagly and Johnson (1990) cited in Gibson (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of gender and leadership style that examined studies comparing men and women on task and interpersonal styles as well as democratic and autocratic styles. Evidence was found for both the presence and absence of differences between men and women. While the authors concluded that the overall search for sex differences in leader style was not demonstrated, significant gender differences were reported in the use of democratic or participatory styles of leadership. Their research revealed that women leaders are less directive than men.

The study of Druscat, (1994) on gender and leadership styles of Roman Catholic Church shows that both women and men leaders were rated to exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors than transactional leadership behaviors. However, women leaders were rated to exhibit significantly more transformational behaviors than men leaders and men leaders were rated to exhibit significantly more transactional behaviors than women

leaders. The researcher also added that in all-female contexts, women leaders exhibit feminine styles of leadership.

Eagly, et al. (2003) cited in Smith, Matkin and Fritz, (2004) shows women to be more transformational than men, suggesting that stereotypes associated with transformational leadership may be less negatively biased against women leaders than stereotypes associated with other leadership styles. Additionally, women may favor a transformational leader style because it provides them with a means of overcoming the dilemma of role incongruity—namely, that conforming to their gender role can impede their ability to meet the requirements of their leader role.

2.4.1 Task-oriented, Interpersonally-oriented, and Autocratic-democratic Styles.

In the long-standing tradition of studying leadership style (Bass, 1990, Cited in Eagly and Carli, 2003), most research conducted prior to 1990 distinguished between task-oriented style or initiation of structure and interpersonally oriented style or consideration. A somewhat less popular distinction was between leaders who (a) behave democratically and allow subordinates to participate in decision-making, or (b) behave autocratically and discourage subordinates from such participation. To examine sex differences and similarities in these styles, Eagly and Johnson (1990) reviewed 162 studies that yielded comparisons of women and men on relevant measures. Specifically, in such research, women, more than men, manifested relatively interpersonally oriented and democratic styles, and men, more than women, manifested relatively task oriented and autocratic styles. In contrast, sex differences were more limited in organizational studies, which examined managers' styles. Male and female managers did not differ in their tendencies to manifest interpersonally oriented and task-oriented styles.

Based on analyses of their large database, Eagly and Johnson (1990) concluded that gender-stereotypic sex differences in leadership behavior were less common in organizational studies than in other types of studies because male and female managers

were selected by similar criteria and subjected to similar organizational socialization—forces that tend to equalize the sexes. Among managers, a sex difference was detected only in a narrow range of leadership behaviors assessed by measures of autocratic–democratic (or directive–participative) tendencies, which relate primarily to the exercise of power. These findings illustrate the value of comparing studies of different types: Without the context provided by the laboratory and assessment studies of persons not occupying managerial roles, any conclusion about the lessening of sex differences among managers would not have been convincing.

This meta-analysis included some possible interpretations of the autocratic–democratic sex difference—specifically, (a) the greater social skills of women (vs. men) may have facilitated collaborative, democratic leadership behavior and (b) such behavior may have been especially advantageous for women because it placated subordinates and peers who might otherwise have been resistant to female leadership.

Another significant moderator analysis in Eagly and Johnson’s (1990) meta-analysis established that leaders of each sex were especially task-oriented relative to the other sex when their role was congruent (or congenial) with their gender—that is, defined in relatively masculine terms for male leaders or in more feminine terms for female leaders.

2.4.2 Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Styles.

Debates about the leadership styles of women and men gained momentum in the 1990s because of new research attempting to identify the styles that are especially attuned to contemporary conditions (Eagly and Carli, 2003). The new emphasis was on leadership that is transformational in the sense that it is future oriented rather than present oriented and that strengthens organizations by inspiring followers’ commitment and creativity. As stated by Bono and Judge (2004) transformational leadership style was initially described by Burns (1978) and elaborated by Bass (1985). Transformational leadership entails establishing oneself as a role model by gaining followers’ trust and confidence. Transformational leaders state future goals, develop plans to achieve those goals, and

innovate, even when their organization is generally successful. By mentoring and empowering followers, such leaders help followers to develop their potential and thus to contribute more effectively to their organization. The study of Rosener (1990) shows that men more likely than women to describe themselves in ways that characterize transactional leadership. According to Rosener, men leaders view job performance as a series of transactions with subordinates-exchanging rewards for services rendered or punishment for inadequate performance. Men leaders are described as they are more likely to use power that comes from their organizational position and formal authority. Women leaders in his study described themselves in ways that characterizes transformational leadership-getting subordinates to transform their own self interest in to the interest of the group though concern for a broader goal. Rosener called the leadership styles of women as interactive leadership. The justifications given by Rosener to call women's leadership as interactive leadership is that women leaders actively work to make to make interactions with subordinates positive for every one involved. As stated in Rosener's words, "... women encourages participation, share power and information, enhance other people's self worth, and get others exited about their work." (p. 4).

Leadership researchers (e.g., Avolio, 1999, cited in Eagly and Carli, 2003), contrasted transformational leaders to transactional leaders, as who appeal to subordinates' self-interest by establishing exchange relationships with them. Transactional leadership involves managing in the conventional sense of clarifying subordinates' responsibilities, rewarding them for meeting objectives, and correcting them for failing to meet objectives. In addition, researchers distinguished a *laissez-faire* style that is marked by an overall failure to take responsibility for managing.

In general, Eagly and Carli (2003) meta-analysis revealed that, compared with male leaders, female leaders were (a) more (significant in general and on all but one subscale) and (b) engaged in more of the contingent reward behaviors (i.e., exchanging rewards for followers' satisfactory performance) that are one component of transactional leadership. In addition, male leaders were more likely than female leaders to manifest two other aspects of transactional leadership: active management by exception (attending to

followers' mistakes and failures to meet standards) and passive management by exception (waiting for problems to become severe before intervening). Men were also higher on laissez-faire leadership (exhibiting widespread absence and lack of involvement).

Interpretation of these findings included several possibilities. First, the transformational repertoire (and contingent reward behaviors) may resolve some of the typical incongruity that exists between leadership roles and the female gender role because these styles are not distinctively masculine. Second, gender roles may influence leadership by means of the spillover and internalization of gender-specific norms, which could facilitate women's focus on the more feminine aspects of transformational leadership (e.g., individualized consideration). Third, the glass ceiling and the associated double standard for the selection and promotion of managers may produce more highly skilled female than male leaders.

According to Eagly and Carli, Sex differences in transformational and transactional leadership do have implications for female advantage arguments because researchers defined these styles in an effort to identify effective leadership. Substantiating these claims, a meta-analysis of 39 studies showed positive correlations between effectiveness and all components of transformational leadership as well as the contingent reward component of transactional leadership, the one aspect of transactional leadership on which women exceeded men (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996, cited in Eagly and Carli, 2003). The norming study of the MLQ measure produced similar effectiveness findings (Center for Leadership Studies, 2003), and in addition, showed negative relations between leaders' effectiveness and two of the remaining measures: (a) passive management by exception, which is one of the components of transactional leadership, and (b) laissez-faire leadership.

In view of these findings, the tendency of women to exceed men on the components of leadership style that relate positively to effectiveness (i.e., transformational leadership and the contingent reward aspect of transactional leadership) and the tendency of men to

exceed women on the ineffective styles (i.e., passive management by exception and laissez-faire leadership) attest to women's abilities. Thus, research on transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles does suggest female advantage, albeit a small advantage.

2.5 Femininity and Masculinity.

Femininity and masculinity or one's gender identity (Burke, Stets and Pirog-Good 1988; Spence 1985, cited in Stets and Burke) refers to the degree to which persons see themselves as masculine or feminine given what it means to be a man or woman in society. Femininity and masculinity are rooted in the social (one's gender) rather than the biological (one's sex). Societal members decide what being male or female means (e.g., dominant or passive, brave or emotional), and males will generally respond by defining themselves as masculine while females will generally define themselves as feminine. Because these are social definitions, however, it is possible for one to be female and see herself as masculine or male and see himself as feminine. From a sociological perspective, gender identity involves all the meanings that are applied to oneself based on one's gender identification. In turn, these self-meanings are a source of motivation for gender-related behavior (Burke 1980). A person with a more masculine identity should act more masculine, that is, engage in behaviors whose meanings are more masculine such as behaving in a more dominant, competitive, and autonomous manner (Ashmore, Del Boca, and Wohlers 1986, cited in Stets and Burke). It is not the behaviors themselves that are important, but the meanings implied by those behaviors. Beginning at birth, the self-meanings regarding one's gender are formed in social situations, stemming from ongoing interaction with significant others such as parents, peers, and educators (Marinova, 2003). While individuals draw upon the shared cultural conceptions of what it means to be male or female in society, which are transmitted through institutions such as religion or the educational system, they may come to see themselves as departing from the masculine or feminine cultural model. A person may label herself female, but instead of seeing herself in a stereotypical female manner such as being expressive, warm, and submissive. She may view herself in a somewhat stereotypically masculine fashion such

as being somewhat instrumental, rational, and dominant. The point is that people have views of themselves along a feminine-masculine dimension of meaning, some being more feminine, some more masculine, and some perhaps a mixture of the two. It is this meaning along the feminine-masculine dimension that is their gender identity, and it is this that guides their behavior.

2.5.1 The Development of Femininity and Masculinity

According to Marinova (2003), the development of masculinity and femininity starts with the opening of the eyes of the small baby. She or he understands very quickly the difference to be female or male, to be poor or to be wealthy. Although in different cultures in the world the attitudes toward boys and girls show some nuances, girls are taught since the very early age that they have to obey, and boys – that they have to be strong and to be leaders. Girls are playing with dolls, they are learning to prepare food and clothes and everything that is associated with “women’s duties” and boys are playing with small cars, weapons, are encouraged to practice different sports and are taught to be the “masters of the world”. What is sad is that, these first lessons, children are receiving from their mothers, who are usually “contaminated” by the same stereotypical thinking and it is really difficult to get out of this vicious circle.

Too often, it seems that boys learn early on that their interests are opposed to those of girls and women. This is based partly on a defensive insecurity, but it is also because material relations (access to resources) actually have been structured in a way that benefits men and harms women. Therefore, when women organize for equality, often men react defensively. Manirova further explained schools’ contribution for the development of masculinity and femininity in there conscious socialization process. The reasons given for the above claim is (p. 3):

... looking through the school books from the very beginning gender stereotypes are present and reinforced. The images that small kids receive from these books are women with babies in their hands, or women preparing food, or women working in the field, or, at the high end – women nurses, women teachers. In the

same time men are usually soldiers, playing some prestigious sport, executing some heavy job, and, of course, leaders. Somehow, the perception that being a soldier and carrying weapons is more important than giving birth and taking care of life is induced in the minds since the very beginning of the conscious life of children. In addition, this leads to further divisions, stereotyping and to the perception that women have to give and to accept and men have to take and to impose. Looking again at school manuals, we will find images or small texts, where boys are those, who are good in mathematics: they are “helping” their little sisters in solving the problems and girls – they are good in reading, singing etc. When teaching practical skills boys will be the ones learning to operate machines or computers and girls will be taught to be dactylos or similar.

Stets and Burke identifies three major theories that explain the development of femininity and masculinity: psychoanalytic theory, cognitive-developmental theory and learning theories that emphasize direct reinforcement and modeling. In all of these theories, a two-part process is involved. In the first part, the child comes to know that she or he is female or male. In the second part, the child comes to know what being female or male means in terms of femininity or masculinity. According to psychoanalytic theory, one's gender identity develops through identification with the same-sex parent. This identification emerges out of the conflict inherent in the oedipal stage of psychosexual development. By about age 3, a child develops a strong sexual attachment to the opposite-sex parent. Simultaneously, negative feelings emerge for the same-sex parent that is rooted in resentment and jealousy. By age 6, the child resolves the psychic conflict by relinquishing desires for the opposite-sex parent and identifying with the same-sex parent. Thus, boys come to learn masculinity from their fathers and girls learn femininity from their mothers. A more recent formulation of psychoanalytic theory suggests that mothers play an important role in gender identity development (Chodorow 1978, cited in Stets and Burke). According to Chodorow, mothers are more likely to relate to their sons as different and separate because they are not of the same sex. At the same time, they experience a sense of oneness and continuity with their daughters because they are of the same sex. Consequently, mothers will bond with their daughters thereby fostering femininity in girls. Simultaneously, mothers distance themselves from their sons who

respond by shifting their attention away from their mother and toward their father. Through identification with their father, boys learn masculinity. Cognitive-developmental theory is another psychological theory on gender identity development (Kohlberg 1966, cited in Stets and Burke). As in psychoanalytic theory, this theory suggests there are critical events that have a lasting effect on gender identity development, but they are cognitive rather than psychosexual in origin. Unlike psychoanalytic theory and learning theory that is next discussed, the development of a gender identity comes before rather than follows from identification with the same-sex parent. Once a child's gender identity becomes established, the self is then motivated to display gender-congruent attitudes and behaviors, well before same-sex modeling takes hold. Same-sex modeling simply moves the process along. Kohlberg identifies two crucial stages of gender identity development: 1) acquiring a fixed gender identity, and 2) establishing gender identity constancy. The first stage begins with the child's identification as male or female when hearing the labels "boy" or "girl" applied to the self. By about age 3, the child can apply the appropriate gender label to the self. This is when gender identity becomes fixed. By about age 4, these gender labels are appropriately applied to others. Within a year or two, the child reaches the second critical phase of gender constancy. This is the child's recognition that her gender will not change despite her change in outward appearance or age. The most social of the theories of gender identity development are the learning theories. In these theories, it is the social environment of the child, such as parents and teachers, which shapes the gender identity of a child. Here, the parent or teacher instructs the child on femininity and masculinity directly through rewards and punishments, or indirectly through acting as models that are imitated. Direct rewards or punishments are often given for outward appearance as in what to wear (girls in dresses and boys in pants), object choice such as toy preferences (dolls for girl and trucks for boys), and behavior (passivity and dependence in girls and aggressiveness and independence in boys). Through rewards and punishments, children learn appropriate appearance and behavior. Indirect learning of one's gender identity emerges from modeling same-sex parents, teachers, peers, or same-sex models in the media. A child imitates a rewarded model's thoughts, feelings, or behavior because it anticipates that it will receive the same rewards that the model received.

2.6 Effects of Gender on Leader Emergence.

A vast amount of research has been devoted to understanding the factors associated with individuals emerging as leadership the group. Most of past researches have overwhelmingly associated masculine characteristics with leader emergence (Cuadrado, Morales and Recio, 2008). Fagenson (1993, p. 63) explained women's under representation in managerial positions as "probably the single most important hurdle for women in management in all industrialized countries is the persistent stereotype that associate management with being male". The study of Gedney (1999) shows that feminine traits have a negative impact on leader emergence. He argued that, "Feminine traits did not lend themselves to contributing to the women thinking of themselves as leaders". (p. 6). The study of Kent and Moss (1994), show that masculinity is still an important predictor of leader emergence. Contrary to the above findings, Kent and Moss has identified that androgynous character is also an important predictor of leader emergence. They stated that "The emergence of androgynous suggests that the possession of feminine characteristics does not decrease an individuals chance of emerging as a leader as long as the individual also posses masculine characteristics." (p. 1342). According to Eagly and Carli (2003, p. 829), "The predominantly agentic qualities that people associate with men are similar to the qualities perceived to be needed for success in high status occupations, which would include most managerial occupations".

Other studies show that group composition affects leader emergence. Bunyi and Andrews (19850 cited in Gedney, 1999), pointed out that when males were in the majority, they emerge as leaders 100% of the time. when females were in the majority, they emerge as leaders but not beyond the expectations one would have on the basis of chance. Reidgeway (2001, p. 652), point out the impact of gender status beliefs on determining performance expectations and leader emergence.

When gender status beliefs are effectively salient in a situation, as they are in mixed-sex and gender-relevant contexts, they create implicit performance expectations for women compared to similar men that shape men's and women's

willingness to speak up and assert themselves, the attention and evaluation their performances receive, the ability attributed to them on the basis of their performance, the influence they achieve, and consequently, the likelihood that they emerge as leaders.

When women do assert themselves to exercise authority outside traditionally female domains, gender status beliefs create legitimacy reactions that impose negative sanctions on them for violating the expected status order and reduce their ability to gain compliance with directives. As this suggests, the performance expectations and legitimacy reactions created by gender status beliefs create multiple, nearly invisible nets of comparative devaluation that catch women as they push forward to achieve positions of leadership and authority and slow them down compared to similar men. According to Ridgeway, this unacknowledged network of constraining expectations and interpersonal reactions is the principal cause of the “glass ceiling.” Ridgeway also emphasized how gender status beliefs cumulative effect, often small effects, repeated over many contexts throughout a career, is to substantially reduce the number of women who successfully attain positions of high authority in the work world, especially in occupations and contexts not culturally linked with women.

However, most research on leadership shows that, in the future, women in general will have a bright future to emerge as leaders than men. This idea is supported by the work of Eagle and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001, p. 592), “On the whole, research on leadership style has very favorable implications for women’s increasing representation in the ranks of leaders”. “Given the profound changing takes place in women's roles and in the cultural construal of good leadership, it is clear that women will continue their ascent toward greater power and authority” (Rosener, 1990, p. 9).

2.7 The Impact of Gender on Effectiveness of Leaders.

In reviewing the literature on gender and Full Range Leadership, an important issue that emerged was leader effectiveness. Transformational leadership, along with the use of contingent reward, is a style significantly related to effectiveness as previously mentioned

(Eagly and Carli, 2003; Appelbaum, Auedet and Miller, 2003; Center for Leadership Studies, 2003).

Given these constraints, transformational leadership may be especially advantageous for women (Eagly et al., 2003; Yoder, 2001, cited in Eagly and Carli, 2003) because it encompasses some behaviors that are consistent with the female gender role's demand for supportive, considerate behaviors. The transformational repertoire, along with the contingent reward aspect of transactional leadership, may resolve some of the inconsistencies between the demands of leadership roles and the female gender role and therefore allow women to excel as leaders. Fortunately, for women's progress as leaders, this positive, encouraging, inspiring style appears to have generalized advantages for contemporary organizations. This idea is supported by Appelbaum, Auedet and Miller (2003, p. 49). "Women's styles are not at all likely to be less effective; in fact, they are more effective within the context of team based, consensually-driven organizational structures that are more prevalent in today's world".

Eagly and Carli, (2003) has tried to show how leadership effectiveness vary between men and women leaders in different situations. According to these researchers, women are relatively less effective in leadership roles defined in especially masculine terms and more effective in roles defined in less masculine terms. The following findings were consistent with these expectations: (a) women were less effective than men to the extent that leadership positions were male dominated; (b) women were less effective relative to men as the proportion of male subordinates increased; (c) women were less effective relative to men the greater the proportion of men among the raters of leader effectiveness; (d) women were substantially less effective than men in military organizations, a traditionally masculine environment, but modestly more effective than men in educational, governmental, and social service organizations; (e) women fared particularly well in effectiveness, relative to men, in middle-level leadership positions, as opposed to line or supervisory positions.

The meta-analytic study of Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), regarding on measures of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership style, which were designed to predict effectiveness show similar results to other studies, yet another pattern appeared. According to these researchers, female leaders exceeded male leaders especially on female stereotypic transformational dimension of individualized consideration and were higher than men two additional subscales of transformational leadership as well as on the contingent reward scale transactional leadership. In contrast, men exceed women on the active and passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire subscales. Based on the above findings of their study, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (P. 787) they argue that, “It is likely that the greater effectiveness of female than male in this sample of managers reflected the negative relationships between passive management-by-exception and the laissez-faire styles to effectiveness and the positive relationship of transformational and contingent reward to effectiveness”. The finding of Ekore and Attah (2007, p. 161-162) on Influence of Sex-Role Expectations on Perceived Work Performance among Employees in Multinational Corporations in Nigeria has shown that “Sex role expectations have a significant influence on perceived work performance. Specifically, employees with male expected characteristics were found to perform better than those with female expected characteristic”. Although, not part of the major finding of the research works, the researchers found that experience on the job significantly influences performance among employees used in this research work.

2.8 Evaluation of and Satisfaction with Leaders.

The studies of Smith, Matkin and Fritz (2004), Eagly (2007), Eagly and Carly (2003) about gender and the evaluation of leaders, in general, they found that evaluations for women leaders were less favorable than men. Additionally, they found that the tendency to favor men was more pronounced when the dependent variable was the leader’s competence or the subject’s satisfaction with the leader rather than perceptions of leader style. Moreover, the model for the specific leadership style used as a dependent variable indicated that measures that did not assess specific leadership style produced a stronger bias in favor of male leaders than those style measures that assessed interpersonal

orientation. Autocratic style produced significantly more favorable evaluations of male leaders than did other portrayals that did not include style information. Women's leadership was perceived to be more task-oriented than equivalent behaviors by men. This may reflect a tendency to contrast women's leadership behavior from the female stereotype and, therefore, view this behavior as extreme. Conversely, men leading in a more "feminine" (communal) manner did not create a disadvantage for men relative to women. Thus, it appears that, all other things being equal, men may have greater freedom than women to lead in a range of styles without encountering negative reactions.

Chapter Three

3. Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion

In this chapter, the data collected from different ministry offices is presented, and analyzed by using different statistical tools. The findings of the study will be discussed in the later section of this chapter.

3.1 Biographical Information

Table 1. Academic Level * Sex Cross tabulation.

	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Academic Level Diploma	0	2	2
Bachelors Degree	54	27	81
Masters Degree	19	10	29
PhD	1	0	1
Total	74	39	113

Data was distributed to five organizations namely: Federal Ministry of Education (FMoE), Federal Ministry of Economic Development and Finance (FMoFED), Federal Ministry of Health (FMoH), Federal Ministry of Transport and Communication (FMoTC) and Office of Federal Auditor General (OFAG). The sampling plan of this study was 150 from these, it was able to distribute 134 questionnaires out of which 113 (84.33%) was returned. Out of the 113 respondents, 74 are male and 39 are female. With regard to the academic level of respondents two are diploma holders, eighty one are Bachelor degree holders, twenty nine are Masters degree holders and there is one PhD holder. The number of managers included in this study are 27 (12 male and 15 Female) and the rest 87 are subordinates. The positions these managers assume ranges from Division manager, Core process owners, departments heads, Directors. The numbers of respondents by

organization are presented below in table 2. Out of the 27 managers 14 (51.85%) are masters degree holders. Out of 113 respondents 62 (71%) are under male managers and the rest 24 (29%) are under female managers. The average working experience of these managers is 18 years.

Table 2. Number of response by organization.

	Count	Percent
Organization FMoE	10	8.8%
FMoFED	21	18.6%
FMoH	25	22.1%
FMoTC	32	28.3%
OFAG	25	22.1%
Overall	113	100.0%
Total	113	

3.2 Leadership style and Gender.

Table 3. Leadership style and Gender: F ratios, Sum of squares, Mean square, Degrees of freedom (df) and Level of significance (p).

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership (TL)					
Idealized Attributes (IA)					
Between Groups	4.692	1	4.692	15.375	.000
Within Groups	33.873	111	.305		
Total	38.564	112			
Idealized Behaviors (IB)					
Between Groups	3.222	1	3.222	9.397	.003
Within Groups	38.056	111	.343		
Total	41.278	112			
Inspirational Motivation (IM)					
Between Groups	5.680	1	5.680	14.875	.000
Within Groups	42.386	111	.382		

	Total	48.066	112			
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	Between Groups	5.732	1	5.732	16.149	.000
	Within Groups	39.398	111	.355		
	Total	45.129	112			
Individual Consideration (IC)	Between Groups	3.455	1	3.455	8.645	.004
	Within Groups	44.357	111	.400		
	Total	47.812	112			
Transactional Leadership (TC)						
Contingent Reward (CR)	Between Groups	.363	1	.363	.640	.425
	Within Groups	62.920	111	.567		
	Total	63.283	112			
Management-by- Exception: Active (MBEA)	Between Groups	9.610	1	9.610	11.681	.001
	Within Groups	91.314	111	.823		
	Total	100.924	112			
Management-by- Exception: Passive (MBEP)	Between Groups	21.409	1	21.409	28.945	.000
	Within Groups	82.101	111	.740		
	Total	103.510	112			
Laissez-Faire (LF)	Between Groups	19.052	1	19.052	23.562	.000
	Within Groups	89.756	111	.809		
	Total	108.809	112			
Outcomes of Leadership						
Extra Effort	Between Groups	1.402	1	1.402	3.492	.064
	Within Groups	44.549	111	.401		
	Total	45.951	112			
Effectiveness	Between Groups	1.623	1	1.623	3.544	.062
	Within Groups	50.852	111	.458		
	Total	52.476	112			
Satisfaction	Between Groups	3.877	1	3.877	7.813	.006
	Within Groups	55.087	111	.496		
	Total	58.965	112			

The data collected by Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was analyzed by using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to check the existence of the perceived difference between male and female managers. For Transformational Leadership Style (TL) the model contains five constructs such as Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individual Consideration (IC). For transformational leadership style, the result of the study shows the existence of differences between male and female managers. Female managers exceed male managers by all five factors of transformational leadership style (table 3 and 4). Female managers exhibit more transformational leadership style than male managers: Idealized Attributes (IA) $F(1, 111) = 15.375, P < 0.001$, Idealized Behaviors (IB) $F(1, 111) = 9.397, P < 0.003$, Inspirational Motivation (IM) $F(1, 111) = 14.875, P < 0.001$, Intellectual Stimulation (IS) $F(1, 111) = 16, p < 0.001$ and Individual consideration (IC) $F(1, 111) = 8.645, P < 0.004$. Female managers also exceed male manager on the overall measures of transformational leadership style, $F(1, 111) = 18.954, P < 0.001$ (table 4 and 6). Hypothesis 2a stated that Female managers will be rated to exhibit more transformational than transactional leadership behaviors. This hypothesis was supported.

In addition to the differences observed between male and female managers on transformational leadership styles, female managers also scored higher than research validated benchmarks (Center for Leadership Studies, 2004) on all sub scales of transformational leadership style (Table 4). Where as male managers scored less than research validated benchmarks except for one sub scale, Idealized Attributes. Hypothesis 3 stated that Comparing female and male managers, female managers will be rated to exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors than male managers. This hypothesis was supported.

Table 4. Group means, standard deviations (SD) of Transformational Leadership Sub scales for male and female managers.

Gender		Idealized Attributes (IA)	Idealized Behaviors (IB)	Inspirational Motivation (IM)	Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	Individual Consideration (IC)
Research validated benchmark		2.66	3.21	3.08	3.12	2.87
Male Manager	Mean	2.7531	2.8611	2.7037	2.6296	2.5694
	N	54	54	54	54	54
	Std. Deviation	.63361	.64367	.73823	.67771	.66838
Research validated benchmark		2.66	3.21	3.08	3.12	2.87
Female manager	Mean	3.1610	3.1992	3.1525	3.0805	2.9195
	N	59	59	59	59	59
	Std. Deviation	.46601	.52682	.48249	.50948	.59712
Total	Mean	2.9661	3.0376	2.9381	2.8650	2.7522
	N	113	113	113	113	113
	Std. Deviation	.58679	.60708	.65511	.63478	.65337

Transactional leadership encompasses three leadership behaviors: Contingent Reward (CR), Management by Exception Active (MBEA) and Management by Exception Passive (MBEP). On this leadership behavior male managers exceeds female managers by two factors: Management by Exception Active $F(1, 111) = 11.681, P < 0.01$ and Management by Exception Passive $F(1, 111) = 28.945, P < 0.001$. On Contingent Reward factor male managers scored a little bit lower than female managers although the difference is not significant. Overall, the result of the study shows that male managers use transactional leadership style more than female managers $F(1, 111) = 21.662, P < 0.001$ (Table 6). Hypothesis 2 b stated that Male managers will be rated to exhibit more transactional than transformational leadership behaviors. This hypothesis was confirmed.

The other significant difference between male and female managers revealed in this study is on Laissez Faire leadership behavior. As can be seen from table 3, male managers more than their female counter parts exhibit Laissez Faire leadership behavior $F(1, 111) = 23.562, P < 0.001$. Table 5 in the next page shows that male managers scored higher than

female managers on the two factors of transactional leadership style (MBEA and MBEP) but only MBEP is above the research validated benchmark. On the other hand, female managers exceed male managers on their Contingent Reward scores, (2.975 vs. 2.861).

Table 5. Group means, standard deviations and research validated benchmarks between male and female managers on Transactional Leadership factors.

Gender		Contingent Reward (CR)	Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA)	Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP)
Research validated benchmark		3.08	2.43	1.23
Male Manager	Mean	2.8611	2.0556	1.2824
	N	54	54	54
	Std. Deviation	.91973	.84209	1.05290
Research validated benchmark		3.08	2.43	1.23
Female manager	Mean	2.9746	1.4718	.4110
	N	59	59	59
	Std. Deviation	.55843	.96249	.63443
Total	Mean	2.9204	1.7507	.8274
	N	113	113	113
	Std. Deviation	.75168	.94926	.96135

Table 6. Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership and Gender.

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership (TL)	Between Groups	4.492	1	4.492	18.954	.000
	Within Groups	26.304	111	.237		
	Total	30.795	112			
Transactional leadership (TCL)	Between Groups	5.640	1	5.640	21.662	.000
	Within Groups	28.901	111	.260		
	Total	34.541	112			

3.3 Outcomes of Leadership: Extra Effort, Effectiveness & Satisfaction.

Transformational and transactional leadership are both related to the success of the group. Success is measured with MLQ by how often the raters perceive their leader to be motivating, how effective the raters perceive their leader to be at different levels of the organization and how satisfied the raters are with their leader's methods of working with others. In this regard on the measures of Extra Effort and Effectiveness, male and female managers do not show significant differences. The result in table 3 shows that the existence of some differences between male and female managers on the measures of Extra Effort $F(1, 111) = 3.492, P < 0.064$ and Effectiveness $F(1, 111) = 3.544, P < 0.062$. However, the difference is not significant. On the measures Satisfaction women managers exceed male managers and scored a significance difference $F(1, 111) = 7.813, P < 0.006$. As can be seen on table 7 female managers scored a higher result than male managers on measures of Extra Effort, Effectiveness and Satisfaction. However, the results a little bit lower than research validated benchmarks for Extra Effort and Effectiveness measures. Hypothesis 4 stated that women managers will be rated more effective than male managers. Even though in this research direct measures of effectiveness like financial performance did not used female managers used types of leadership that has positive correlation with effectiveness and their mean score on this construct is greater than male managers and the hypothesis was supported.

Table 7. Group Means, Standard deviation, Research validated benchmarks between male and female managers on measures of Extra effort, Effectiveness & Satisfaction.

Gender		Extra Effort	Effectiveness	Satisfaction
Research validated benchmark		3.03	3.08	2.92
Male Manager	Mean	2.6358	2.7685	2.8241
	N	54	54	54
	Std. Deviation	.70716	.80072	.79002
Female manager	Mean	2.8588	3.0085	3.1949
	N	59	59	59
	Std. Deviation	.55778	.53933	.61600
Total	Mean	2.7522	2.8938	3.0177
	N	113	113	113
	Std. Deviation	.64053	.68449	.72558

Table 8, from the next page shows that transformational leadership has a moderate positive correlation with all the five transformational leadership style components and negative correlation with transactional leadership style ($r = -0.287$, $P < 0.01$). Transformational leadership style has negative correlation with Laissez Faire leadership style ($r = -0.199$, $P < 0.05$). It has also positive correlation with managers Extra Effort, Effectiveness and subordinates Satisfaction with their leader. However, the correlation is significant for only Effectiveness variable of outcomes of leadership ($r = 0.264$, $P < 0.01$). Transactional leadership style has negative correlation with its Contingent Reward factor ($r = -0.021$) and positive correlation with Management by Exception and Management by Exception Passive factors $r = 0.066$ and $r = 0.171$ respectively. Nevertheless, the relation is not statistically significant for all the three factors. Transactional leadership style has also positive correlation Laissez Faire leadership style ($r = 0.140$) and negative correlation with managers Extra Effort, Effectiveness and subordinates Satisfaction with their leader with correlations $r = -0.091$, $r = -0.090$ and $r = -0.065$ respectively. However, the correlations are not statistically significant. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency indicator was used to estimate the reliability of the 45 item MLQ questionnaire and the result is adequate (0.823).

Table 8. Correlations (r), N=113, between types of leadership, constructs within each leadership style and outcomes of leadership.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Transformational Leadership	1													
2	Idealized Attributes (IA)	.180	1												
3	Idealized Behaviors (IB)	.194*	.750**	1											
4	Inspirational Motivation (IM)	.192*	.651**	.773**	1										
5	Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	.256**	.567**	.719**	.682**	1									
6	Individual Consideration (IC)	.189*	.477**	.488**	.519**	.617**	1								
7	Transactional leadership (TCL)	-.287**	.103	.086	-.043	-.146	-.066	1							
8	Contingent Reward (CR)	.039	.405**	.404**	.408**	.399**	.423**	-.021	1						
9	Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA)	.079	-.351**	-.360**	-.382**	-.204*	-.196*	.066	-.130	1					
10	Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP)	-.158	.455**	.510**	.500**	.444**	.306**	.171	.261**	.519**	1				
11	Laissez-Faire (LF)	-.199*	-.522**	-.568**	-.532**	-.513**	-.352**	.140	-.334**	.461**	.777**	1			
12	Extra Effort	.129	.544**	.548**	.483**	.402**	.456**	-.091	.435**	-.196*	-.338**	-.395**	1		
13	Effectiveness	.264**	.581**	.662**	.648**	.599**	.537**	-.090	.419**	-.186*	-.420**	-.500**	.705**	1	
14	Satisfaction	.152	.541**	.695**	.632**	.676**	.577**	-.065	.428**	-.241*	-.448**	-.467**	.599**	.768**	1

*.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** .Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 9. Average scores of male, (N= 62) and female, (N=24) subordinates' evaluation for their corresponding male and female managers.

Subordinate	Leadership Style & Outcomes of Leadership	Manager	
		Male	Female
Male	Transformational Leadership	2.71	2.96
	Transactional Leadership	1.94	1.52
	Laissez Fair Leadership	0.99	0.69
	Extra Effort	2.72	2.77
	Effectiveness	2.78	2.82
	Satisfaction	2.76	3.05
Female	Transformational Leadership	3.0	3.11
	Transactional Leadership	1.98	1.69
	Laissez Fair Leadership	0.94	0.53
	Extra Effort	3.08	3.05
	Effectiveness	3.08	3.25
	Satisfaction	3.25	3.45

The above table shows that the mean scores of male and female managers leadership style and work related issues were analyzed by using the evaluation of male subordinates for male managers, male subordinates for female managers, female subordinates for male managers, and female subordinates for female managers. Consistent to the previous findings of this study, the evaluation of female managers by male and female subordinates shows that female managers were rated to exhibit more transformational leadership style and they exceed male managers on measures of effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction. On the other hand, the evaluation of male and female subordinates for male managers shows that male managers were rated to exhibit more transactional and laissez fair leadership style than female counter parts. It is further inferred that female managers receive similar and favorable evaluation by their male and female subordinates.

3.4. Measures of Masculinity and Femininity.

The 60 item Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was used so as to measure the masculinity and femininity scores based on the respondents' reported possession of socially desirable, stereotypically masculine and feminine personality characteristics of male and female managers. Individual's chance of emerging as a leader will be predicted based on their relative scores of masculinity and femininity. The analysis of the data (table 10) shows that male managers are more masculine than female managers. Their respective masculinity scores are 5.2246, SD=0.77 for male managers and 4.9385, SD=0.62 for female managers. Hypothesis 5 stated that Individuals classified as masculine will emerge as managers more frequently than those low in masculinity. As stated in the introductory section of chapter one the number of women in a managerial position is insignificant compared to their number from the total population. Hence, the finding of the study confirms the hypothesis. However, the androgynous character of female managers shows that female managers have the same chance of emerging as a leader at least in the future. With respect to femininity measures, female managers are more feminine than male counter parts. Their respective femininity scores are 5.0930, SD=0.54 for female managers and 4.7223, SD=0.52 for male managers. In addition to this female managers are found to be possess androgynous characteristics since both their femininity and masculinity scores are greater than 4.9 (research validated cut off point). The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency indicator was used to estimate the reliability of the 60 item BSRI questionnaire and the result is adequate (0.856). Overall, the result of this study shows that there is the perceived difference between male and female managers that can be expressed in terms of leadership style, extra effort, satisfaction and on measures of masculinity and femininity. This result supports hypothesis 1.

Table 10. Masculinity, Femininity and Standard Deviation Scores of Male and Female managers.

Gender		Feminist	Masculinity
Male manager	Mean	4.7223	5.2246
	N	54	56
	Std. Deviation	.52422	.77147
Female manager	Mean	5.0930	4.9385
	N	59	57
	Std. Deviation	.53673	.61700
Total	Mean	4.9093	5.0803
	N	113	113
	Std. Deviation	.56004	.70941

Table 11 from the next page shows the average femininity and masculinity scores of each organization. These data can help to capture some insight about femininity and masculinity environment of each organization. Knowing the relative masculinity and femininity of the organizational environment can help to predict leadership emergence, effectiveness, satisfaction that subordinates associate between male and female managers. In this regard, Ministry of Education has average femininity scores of 5.17 and masculinity scores of 5.0789. This organization has more feminine environment than masculine although the difference is minimum. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development has average femininity scores of 5.0643 and masculinity scores of 5.411. This organization has more masculine culture than feminine. Ministry of Health has average femininity scores 4.6542 and masculinity scores 5.0439. This organization has more masculine culture than feminine. Ministry of Transport and Communication has average femininity scores 4.9152 and masculinity scores 4.9266. This organization has more masculine culture than feminine but the difference is not significant. Office of Federal Auditor General has average femininity scores 4.9093 and femininity scores 5.0803. This organization has more masculine culture than feminine.

Table 11. The average Feminist and Masculinity scores for each Organization.

Organization		Feminist	Masculinity
FMoE	Mean	5.1700	5.0789
	N	10	10
	Std. Deviation	.53083	.45833
FMoFED	Mean	5.0643	5.4110
	N	21	21
	Std. Deviation	.34465	.68555
FMoH	Mean	4.6542	5.0439
	N	24	24
	Std. Deviation	.47087	.59255
FMoTC	Mean	4.9152	4.9266
	N	33	33
	Std. Deviation	.54579	.78253
OFAG	Mean	4.9120	5.0408
	N	25	25
	Std. Deviation	.73133	.77074
Total	Mean	4.9093	5.0803
	N	113	113
	Std. Deviation	.56004	.70941

3.5 Discussion of Results.

The most interesting finding revealed in this research is the presence of gender differences in leadership style. Both male and female managers were rated to exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors than transactional leadership behaviors. However, female managers were rated to exhibit significantly more transformational behaviors than male managers and male managers were rated to exhibit significantly more transactional behaviors than female managers. These findings are consistent with Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), Eagly and Carli (2003), Druskat (1994) research findings. It is also consistent with Rosener (1990) research findings that women leaders exhibit interactive style of leadership conducive to transformational leadership and men leaders exhibit a directive style more conducive to transactional leadership.

These findings suggest that female managers more than male managers manifested attributes that motivated their followers to feel respect and pride by their association with them, showed optimism and excitement about future goals and attempted to develop and mentor followers and attained their individual needs. Female managers also exceeded male managers on the transactional scale of contingent reward. This finding suggests that female managers, more than male managers, gave their followers reward for good performance. According to Eagly (2007) and Eagly and Cari (2003) the transformational repertoire of leadership behavior and contingent reward behavior may help female managers to resolve some of the typical incongruity between leadership roles and the female gender role because these styles are not distinctively masculine and some aspects, especially individual consideration, are relatively feminine.

In contrast, male managers exceeded female managers on active management by exception and passive management by exception sub scales of transactional leadership and laissez faire leadership. These findings suggest that, male managers more than female managers, paid attention to their followers' problems and mistakes, waited until problems became severe before attempting to solve them and were absent and uninvolved at critical times. The variations in leadership style between male and female managers may be attributed to social role theory. According to social role theory leaders elicit expectancies based on people's categorization of them as male and female. These expectancies constitute gender roles, which are the shared beliefs that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified sex. These male and female gender roles are proved to be spill over to the organizational setting and affect managers' behavior, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), Ridgeway (2001).

These findings have implications for the effectiveness of male and female managers. As presented in table 9, a moderate positive correlation with all the five transformational leadership style components and contingent reward scale of transactional leadership style and a negative correlation with two transactional leadership style sub scales, management by exception active passive and a negative correlation with Laissez Faire leadership style suggests that female managers in this study are more effective than male managers. These

finding is supported by the findings of Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), Eagly and Carli (2003), Eagly (2007), and Druskat (1994). Another explanation given by Eagly (2007) for the effectiveness of female managers is that transformational and contingent reward leadership behaviors are more compatible with the female gender role than were older models of leadership, women may adopt these leadership styles and thereby become effective.

Some researchers, Eagly and Carli (2003), Appelbaum, Audet and Miller (2003) and Smith, Matkin and Fritz (2004) stated that the relative success of women and men in leadership roles depends on context. According to these authors, female managers are relatively less effective in leadership roles defined in especially masculine terms and more effective in roles defined in less masculine terms. They further state that female managers were less effective than male managers to the extent that leadership positions were male dominated; female managers were less effective relative to male managers as the proportion of male subordinates increased; female managers were less effective relative to male managers the greater the proportion of men among the raters of leader effectiveness; female managers were substantially less effective than male managers in military organizations, a traditionally masculine environment, but modestly more effective than men in educational, governmental, and social service organizations and female managers fared particularly well in effectiveness, relative to male counterparts, in middle-level leadership positions, as opposed to line or supervisory positions. All organizations in this study, except Ministry of Education, have masculine environment, and they are male dominated. The proportion of male subordinates under female managers where the study sample was taken is high. However, female managers scored higher than male managers on measures of effectiveness.

Another finding in this study, which is contrary to the previous findings, is that transactional leadership style has a negative correlation with its contingent reward sub scale. This finding may suggest that male managers do not discuss in clear terms responsibilities for specific tasks, state performance objectives, clarify performance objectives and punishments and express satisfaction when they get the correct output.

Especially in government organizations, to influence behavior, rewarding good performance, expressing satisfaction when objectives are met and punishing undesired behavior is not a common leadership culture. This culture may contribute to the low scores that male managers got on the contingent reward sub scale of transactional leadership style.

An analysis of gender differences within ratings of satisfaction revealed that the exhibition of transformational leadership made a greater difference to the satisfaction of subordinates for female managers than male managers. The implication of this result is, female managers more than male managers, are warm, nurturing, open, authentic, honest, with good interpersonal and social skills, capable of developing feelings of satisfaction in their followers (Avolio and Bass, 2004). In this study satisfaction with leadership was measured by two items to identify leaders who are able to generate satisfaction in their subordinates. No matter how positive result is revealed, these items may not be enough to capture the overall satisfaction subordinates have with their managers. Evaluation of female managers on the measures of satisfaction, alike to other measures, is not free from gender bias. As stated in the studies of Appelbaum, Audet and Miller (2003), Eagly (2007), Eagly and Carli (2003), Ridgeway (2001), female managers experience favorable evaluation from their subordinates when the task is relatively feminine and unfavorable evaluation when the task is relatively masculine. Hence, in depth study should be required to capture the actual satisfaction subordinates associates to their female bosses from different contexts.

The other significant finding of this study is that male managers are more masculine than female managers and female managers are more feminine than male counter parts. Similar to other research findings masculinity is the best predictor of leader emergence. Hence, male managers in this country have better chance of emerging as a leader than female managers. Importantly female managers in this study are found to be possessing androgynous characteristics. According to Kent and Moss (1994), androgynous individuals have the same chance of emerging as a leader as masculine individuals. According to Bem (1974), the concept of psychological androgyny implies that it is

possible for an individual to be both compassionate and assertive, both expressive and instrumental, both feminine and masculine, depending upon the situational appropriateness of these various modalities. Hence, the emergence of androgynous leaders suggests that the possession of feminine characteristics does not decrease an individual's chance of emerging as a leader as long as the individual also possesses masculine characteristics.

The research findings of Eagly (2007), Eagly and Carli (2003), Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), Appelbaum, Audet and miller (2003), indicate that female managers are advantages due to their leadership style. According to these researchers, women more than men, appear to lead in style that recommended them for leadership. In contrast, men more than women appear to lead in less advantage style by attending to subordinates failure to meet standards, displaying behaviors that entail avoiding solving problems until they become acute and being absent or uninvolved at critical times. However, any female advantage in leadership style might be offset by disadvantage that flows from prejudice and discrimination directed against women as leaders. Prejudice consists of unfair evaluation of a group of people based on stereotypical judgments of the group rather than the behavior or qualifications of its individual members. When people hold stereotypes about a group, they expect members of that group to possess characteristics and exhibit behavior consistent with those stereotypes. Perceivers then tacitly assimilate information to their gender-stereotypic expectations (von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1995, cited in Eagly and Carli, 2003) and spontaneously fill in unknown details of others' behavior to conform to those expectations. These stereotypic inferences yield prejudice against individual group members when stereotypes about their group are incongruent with the attributes associated with success in certain classes of social roles. This incongruity tends to produce discrimination by lowering evaluation of such group members as potential or actual occupants of those roles and may reduce the chance of female managers in advancing to higher managerial positions.

Chapter Four

4. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to investigate the existence of the perceived difference between male managers by using information collected from randomly selected male and female managers self and subordinates evaluation working at different federal organizations. In light of this, the over all procedure and outcome of this study will be summarized in brief. Conclusions drawn from the findings of this study are presented. Recommendations based on the findings of the study and further areas for future research are presented in detail in the later sections of this chapter.

4.1 Summary

The main objective of this survey study was to examine the perceived differences between male and female managers and the factors and sources of those factors used to account for the perceived differences. The study also aimed at to further investigate the effects of gender on managers' managerial practices and behaviors working at different public organizations in Addis Ababa and to test the argument held by many leadership, organization behavior, applied psychology, social psychology theorists that gender role affects managers' behavior in various forms. Hence, this study was primarily aimed to answer the following three questions. Research Question 1. What are the factors and sources of those factors used to account for the perceived difference between male and female managers on the job? Research Question 2. If differences do exist, what are those perceived differences hold by male and female managers? Research Question 3. If differences do exist, what are impacts of the perceived differences between male and female managers on effectiveness/performance?

To answer these questions and test hypothesis developed based on previous literatures, data was collected from five organizations namely: Federal Ministry of Education (FMoE), Federal Ministry of Economic Development and Finance (FMoFED), Federal Ministry of Health (FMoH), Federal Ministry of Transport and Communication (FMoTC) and Office of Federal Auditor General (OFAG). The total number of questionnaires

distributed were 134 out of which 113 (84.33%) was returned. From the 113 respondents 74 are male and 39 are female. The Multi Factor Leadership Questionnaire and Bem Sex Role Inventory questionnaire were used to collect the data. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. The reliability of the questionnaires was checked by using the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency indicator and the results are 0.856 for the 60 item BSRI questionnaire and 0.823 for the 45 item MLQ questionnaire.

The most interesting finding revealed in this research is the presence of gender differences in leadership style. Both male and female managers were rated to exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors than transactional leadership behaviors. However, female managers were rated to exhibit significantly more transformational behaviors than male managers, $F(1, 111) = 18.954, P < 0.001$ (table 6) and male managers were rated to exhibit significantly more transactional behaviors $F(1, 111) = 21.662, P < 0.001$ (table 6) than female managers. Female managers also exceeded male managers on the transactional scale of contingent reward. This finding suggests that female managers, more than male managers, gave their followers reward for good performance. In contrast, male managers exceeded female managers on active management by exception and passive management by exception sub scales of transactional leadership and laissez fair leadership.

A moderate positive correlation with all the five transformational leadership style components and contingent reward scale of transactional leadership style and a negative correlation with two transactional leadership style sub scales, management by exception active passive and a negative correlation with Laissez Faire leadership style suggest that female managers in this study are more effective than male managers.

The other significant finding of this study is that male managers are more masculine than female managers and female managers are more feminine than male counter parts. Male managers in this country have better chance of emerging as a leader than female managers. Importantly female managers in this study are found to be possessing

androgynous characteristics. Individuals with androgynous characteristics have the same chance of emerging as a leader alike individuals having masculine characteristics.

4.2 Conclusion

The main objective of this survey study was to examine the existence of perceived differences between male and female managers and the effects of gender on managers' managerial practices and behaviors. Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions are drawn.

The gender approach allows for clarification of the roles commonly associated with being male or female in public and in private life, and provides a basis for identifying differences and inequalities between women and men in responsibilities assigned, activities undertaken, access to and control over resources as well as decision-making opportunities. These gender roles arise from the division of labor between men and women and encompass normative processes by which other people convey expectations based on gender. Also important are self-regulatory processes that follow from internalized gender roles—that is, people deriving social identity from their gender group. These normative and self-regulatory processes gain power as they are instilled through socialization, elaborated in cultural products, and enacted in daily life. Even though managers occupy roles defined by their specific position in a hierarchy but they also simultaneously function under the constraints of their gender roles.

This spill over of gender roles over managerial roles resulted in the perceived differences between male and female managers. Among the perceived differences revealed in this study are, male and female managers follow different leadership style. Female managers use significantly more transformational leadership style than male managers and male managers use more transactional leadership style than female managers. Male managers exhibit more laissez faire behaviors than female managers. Male managers are more masculine than female managers where as female managers are more feminine than male managers. Similar to other research findings in this country too masculinity is the best

predictor of leader emergence and male managers have better chance of emerging as a leader. However, in this study female managers are found to be androgynous that shows the same chance of emerging as a leader.

With regard to work place issues, female managers are found to be use leadership styles that have positive correlation with effectiveness and satisfaction. Female managers also able to generate extra effort on their followers than their male counter parts.

4.3 Recommendations

Based on the results of the study the following recommendations are forwarded.

Educators and organizations should be aware of the existence of differences between male and female managers that can be expressed in terms of leadership style, effectiveness, leadership emergence and on measures of masculinity and femininity. In relation to this, the researcher wants to recommend the following leadership development steps developed by Smith, Matkin and Fritz (2004):

- An analysis of the organizational culture for evidence of covert or overt gender bias.
- An exploration of the leadership paradigm to determine if it is equally effective for male and female leaders.
- Formal programs that provide support for both female and male leaders (e.g. mentoring programs).
- An examination of support systems for male and female leaders for subtle gender biases.
- Examination of organizational policies and benefits for presence of absence of particular policies that affect female leaders (e.g., child care, maternity leave, flexible working schedules).

Considering the impact or potential impact of each of these could help organizations to ensure that both male and female leaders are receiving the maximum benefit and support from the organization. In addition to benefiting leaders, this could also benefit organizations by maximizing the leadership potential of all leaders. In view of changes in leader roles and organizational practices, female leaders have come to symbolize new types of leadership that connote greater effectiveness and synergy than leadership of the

past (Adler, 1999, cited in Eagly and Carli, 2003). Appointments of women signal an organization's departure from past practices and help it to capture the symbols of innovation and progressive change. Hence, organizations should be aware of this leadership potential mostly used by female managers, properly develop and use it for the effectiveness of their organizations.

The concerned parties, especially, Ministry of Women's Affairs and educators, besides to working towards solving various problems Ethiopian women currently have, should be aware of the distinct qualities women managers have. Moreover, they have to work towards the development of such skills by creating high potential leadership programs that utilize assessment center methodologies to identify strengths and encourages especial assignments help future women leaders grow and develop.

Now days, displaying men's behavior in managerial positions, engaging in those activities, which were mostly performed by men and the like, are among the few things that women use to express equality with men. These are all good things. However, women have to know that they have feminine qualities that are proved by research, which are effective, fit this contemporary business environment and put them in advantageous position than men's way of doing things.

Transformational/Interactive leadership that women managers use is not the exclusive domain given only for women managers, men manager can also learn from them and work towards the common good.

4.4 Areas for Further Research

Since leadership is untouched area in this country, further research will be required on the following areas. Whether or not male managers aware of their leadership style (transformational leadership style) and if they are aware of it, the reasons why they preferred this style will be one major area of research. Due to affirmative action and empowerment, even if their number is few women are found in almost all managerial

levels of government organizations. However, in private organizations it is not common to see women executives. Hence, studying leadership emergence in private organizations may give better insight about stereotyping beliefs hold about male and female managers. Studying the effects of gender in different cultures of the country will be another area of future research.

References

- Appelbaum, S. H., Audet, L. and Miller, J. C. (2003), "Gender and Leadership? Leadership and Gender? A Journey through the Landscape of Theories", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 24(1), 43-51.
- Arnold, M. L. and Shiner, K. J. (1997), "Career Advancement Perceptions held by Female Middle managers Compared to Male Middle Managers", *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 15(3), 40-57.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1996, 2003), *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)*. <http://www.miq.com>.
- Bem, S. L. (1974), *Bem Sex Role Inventory*. <http://www.miq.com>.
- Bono, J. E. and Judge, T. A. (2004), "Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 901-910.
- Cuadrado, I., Morales, F. and Recio, P. (2008), "Women's Access to Managerial Positions: An Experimental study of Leadership and Gender", *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11(10), 55-65.
- Danat Gebremedhin (2005), "Glass Ceiling in Public Sector", MBA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Business and Economics, Addis Ababa.
- Druskat, V. U. (1994), "Gender and Leadership Style: Transformational and Transactional Leadership in the Roman Catholic Church", *Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 99-119.
- Dugassa Tessema (2004), "Leadership Style of Men and Women Managers and Attitude of Subordinates towards Women Leaders" MBA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Business and Economics, Addis Ababa.
- Eagly A. H. (2007), "Female Leadership Advantage and Disadvantage: Resolving the Contradictions", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 1-12.
- Eagly, A. H. and Carli, L. L. (2003), "The Female Leadership Advantage: An Evaluation of the Evidence", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 807-834.
- Eagly, A. H. and Johannesen-schmidt, M. C. (2001), "The Leadership Styles of Women and Men", *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 781-797.

- Ekore, J. O. and Attah, T. (2007), "Influence of Sex Role Expectations on Perceived Work Performance among Employees in Multinational Corporations in Nigeria", *Journal of Social Science*, 14(2), 157-162.
- Fagenson A. (1993), (*Women in Management: Trends, Issues and Challenges in Management and Diversity*), Sage Publication, Vol. 4, USA.
- Gbson, C. B. (2003), "An Investigation of Gender Gifferences in Leadership across Four Countries", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26(2), 255-279.
- Hare, A. P., Koenigs, R. J. and Hare, S. E. (1997), "Perception of Obsoeved and model values of Male and Female Managers", *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 18(5), 437-447.
- Jalalie Deregna (2006), "Women in Management: The Ethiopian Experience", MBA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Business and Economics, Addis Ababa.
- Kent, R. L. and Moss, S. E. (1994), "Effects of Sex and Gender Role on Leader Emergence", *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(5), 1335-1346.
- Marnova, J. (2003), "Gender Stereotypes and the Socialization Process". United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Expert Group Meeting on the Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality, Brasilia, Brazil.
- Mathipa, E. R. and Tsoka, E. M. (2001), "Possible Barriers to the Advancement of women to Leadership positions in the Education Profession", *South African Journal of Education*, 21(4), 324-331.
- Ministry of Women's Affairs Bulletin (March 8, 2008), Especial Edition, Addis Ababa.
- National Policy on Ethiopian Women (1993), Addis Ababa.
- Parry, K. W. and Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2001), "Testing the Validity and the Reliability of the Organizational Description Questionnaire", *International Journal of Organization Behavior*, 4(3), 111-124.
- Patil, S. (2008), "Perception of Female Managers in Male Dominated Industries: Effects of Gender Rarity, Performance, and Diversity Justification", *The Michigan Journal Of Business*,.....39-79.
- Rasdi, M. R., Ismail, M. and Uli, J. (2003), "A Comparative Study between Men and Women managers' Managerial style", University of Putra Press, Malaysia, 1-12.

- Ridgeway, L. (2001), "Gender, Status, and Leadership", *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 637–655.
- Rosener, J. B. (1990, November-December), "Ways Women Lead", *Harvard Business Review*, 119-125.
- Schein, V. E. and Mueller, R. (1992), "Sex Role Stereotyping and Requisite Management Characteristics: A Cross Cultural look", *Journal of Organization Behavior*, 13(5), 439-447.
- Smith-Gina K., Matkin S. and Fritz S. (2004), "A Review of Gender and Full-Range Leadership Research and Suggestions for Future Research", *Journal of Leadership Education*, 3(2), 51- 68.
- Stets, J. E. and Burke, P. J. "Masculinity/ Femininity", *Encyclopedia of Sociology*, Revised Edition. New York: Macmillan, 997-1005.
- Stuff, D. and Coyne, K. (2009),"Educational Leadership: Where are the Women?" *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*, 29(11), 1-7.
- Tariku Jebena (2004), "Gender and Leadership Style Difference: A Comparison of Female and Male Leadership Style", MBA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Business and Economics, Addis Ababa.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (2002), *Gender Approaches in Conflict and Post Conflict Situation*.
- Wu, M. Y. (2009), "Sex, Gender Values, and Expected Leadership Conflict Management Styles in Taiwanese Public Relations Field", *China Media Research*, 5(2), 89-96.

Annex I

Addis Ababa University Faculty of Business and Economics MBA Program

Questionnaire.

My name is Abraham Bekele (Mobile 0911 504811). I am second year MBA student. Currently I am conducting research on “**The Perceived difference between Male and Female Managers**” from five selected Ministry Offices in Addis Ababa as a partial fulfillment for MBA Program.

The objective of the study is to investigate the existence of the perceived difference between male and female managers and the causes of those differences exhibited by male and female managers. The effects of gender role on leadership style, leader emergence, leadership effectiveness, extra efforts exerted by managers and subordinates satisfaction with their leaders are central issues that the researcher wants to investigate.

To make the study fruitful, the respondents’ earnest cooperation in filling the questionnaire is highly valuable. Hence, the researcher highly demands your support to objectively fill the questionnaire. The researcher also wants the respondents to assure that the data to be collected will be used only for the research purpose and the personal data of the respondents will be kept confidential.

Thank you in advance!

Part I: Personal Information

Please encircle your answer.

Sex: (1) Male (2) Female

Age: (1) **Below 25** (2) **25-30** (3) **31-35** (4) **36-40** (5) **41-45** (6) **46-50** (7) **Above 50**

Academic level: (1) **12 complete** (2) **Diploma** (3) **Bachelors Degree** (4) **Masters Degree** (5) **PhD**

Name of the organization you are currently working.....

Your position in the organization.....

Year of service.....

Part II

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

To be filled by Managers.

This questionnaire contains 45 items that measures your full range leadership behavior and each item contains five scales ranging from 0 to 4 (0= not at all, 1=once in awhile, 2=sometimes, 3=fairly often and 4=frequently, if not always) based on how frequently you think you actually do this with associates and followers. Hence you are requested to put tick mark based on how frequently you think that you actually do this with associates and followers.

		Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
		0	1	2	3	4
1	I instill pride in other for being associated with me					
2	I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group					
3	I act in ways that build others' respect for me					
4	I display a sense of power and confidence					
5	I talk about their most important values and beliefs					
6	I specify the important of having a strong sense of purpose					
7	I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions					
8	I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission					
9	I talk optimistically about the future					
10	I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished					
11	I articulate a compelling vision of the future					
12	I express confidence that goals will be achieved					
13	I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate					

14	I seek differing perspectives when solving problems					
15	I get others to look at problems from many different angles					
16	I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments					
17	I spend time teaching and coaching					
18	I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group					
19	I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others					
20	I help others to develop their strengths					
21	I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts					
22	I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets					
23	I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved					
24	I express satisfaction when others meet expectations					
25	I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards					
26	I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures					
27	I keep track of all mistakes					
28	I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards					
29	I fail to interfere until problems become serious					
30	I wait for things to go wrong before taking action					
31	I show a firm believe in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."					
32	I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action					

33	I avoid getting involved when important issues arise					
34	I am absent when needed					
35	I avoid making decisions					
36	I delay responding to urgent questions					
37	I get others to do more than they expected					
38	I heighten others' desire to succeed					
39	I increase others' willingness					
40	I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs					
41	I am effective in representing others to higher authority					
42	I am effective in meeting organizational requirements					
43	I lead a group that is effective					
44	I use methods of leadership that are satisfying					
45	I work with others in a satisfactory way					

Part III
Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSI).

This questionnaire contains 60 items (characteristics) that independently measures your masculinity and femininity and each item contains seven scales ranging from 1 to 7 (1= never, 2=very few times, 3=sometimes but not often, 4=occasionally, 5=often, 6=usually and 7=almost all the time) based on how frequently you think you actually do this with associates and followers. Hence, you are requested to put tick mark based on how much you think you adopt that particular characteristic using the scale below.

I behave this way.....

	Item	Never	Very few times	Sometimes but not often	Occasionally	Often	Usually	Almost all the time
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Self-reliant							
2	Yielding							
3	helpful							
4	Defends own beliefs							
5	Cheerful							
6	Moody (i.e. temperamental)							
7	Independent							
8	Shy							
9	Conscientious (i.e. hard working)							
10	Athletic							
11	Affectionate							
12	Theatrical							
13	Assertive (i.e. forceful, self-confident)							
14	Flatterable							
15	Happy							
16	Strong personality							
17	Loyal							
18	Unpredictable							

19	Forceful							
20	Feminine							
21	Reliable							
22	Analytical							
23	Sympathetic							
24	Jealous							
25	Has leadership abilities							
26	Sensitive to the needs of others							
27	Truthful							
28	Willing to take risks							
29	Understanding							
30	Secretive							
31	Makes decisions easily							
32	Compassionate (i.e. kind)							
33	Sincere (i.e. genuine)							
34	Self-sufficient							
35	Eager to soothe hurt feelings							
36	Conceited (i.e. arrogant)							
37	Dominant							
38	Soft-spoken							
39	Likable							
40	Masculine							
41	Warm							
42	Solemn (i.e. serious)							
43	Willing to take an stand							
44	Tender (i.e. caring)							
45	Friendly							
46	Aggressive							
47	Gullible (i.e. naïve)							
48	Inefficient							
49	Acts as a leader							
50	Childlike							
51	Adaptable							

52	Individualistic							
53	Does not use harsh language							
54	Unsystematic							
55	Competitive							
56	Loves children							
57	Tactful							
58	Ambitious							
59	Gentle							
60	Conventional (i.e. predictable, conservative)							

Thank you very much!

Annex II

Addis Ababa University
Faculty of Business and Economics
MBA Program

Questionnaire.

My name is Abraham Bekele (Mobile 0911 504811). I am second year MBA student. Currently I am conducting research on “**The Perceived difference between Male and Female Managers**” from five selected Ministry Offices in Addis Ababa as a partial fulfillment for MBA Program.

The objective of the study is to investigate the existence of the perceived difference between male and female managers and the causes of those differences exhibited by male and female managers. The effects of gender role on leadership style, leader emergence, leadership effectiveness, extra efforts exerted by managers and subordinates satisfaction with their leaders are central issues that the researcher wants to investigate.

To make the study fruitful, the respondents’ earnest cooperation in filling the questionnaire is highly valuable. Hence, the researcher highly demands your support to objectively fill the questionnaire. The researcher also wants the respondents to assure that the data to be collected will be used only for the research purpose and the personal data of the respondents will be kept confidential.

Thank you in advance!

Part I: Personal Information

Please encircle your answer.

Sex: (1) **Male** (2) **Female**

Age: (1) **Below 25** (2) **25-30** (3) **31-35** (4) **36-40** (5) **41-45** (6) **46-50** (7) **Above 50**

Academic level: (1) **12 Complete** (2) **Diploma** (3) **Bachelors Degree** (4) **Masters Degree** (5) **PhD**

Name of the organization you are currently working.....

Position.....

Year of service.....

Part II

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

To be filled by Subordinates.

This questionnaire contains 45 items that measures your boss's full range leadership behavior and each item contains five scales ranging from 0 to 4 (0= not at all, 1=once in awhile, 2=sometimes, 3=fairly often and 4=frequently, if not always) based on How frequently the manager actually do this with his/her associates and followers. Hence, you are requested to put tick mark based on how frequently you think that your boss actually does this to lead his/her followers.

		Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
		0	1	2	3	4
1	He/she instills pride in others for being associated with him/her					
2	He/she goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group					
3	He/she acts in ways that build others' respect for him/her					
4	He/she displays a sense of power and confidence					
5	He/she talks about our most important values and beliefs					
6	He/she specifies the important of having a strong sense of purpose					
7	He/she considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions					
8	He/she emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission					
9	He/she talks optimistically about the future					
10	He/she talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished					

11	He/she articulates a compelling vision of the future					
12	He/she expresses confidence that goals will be achieved					
13	He/she re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate					
14	He/she seeks differing perspectives when solving problems					
15	He/she gets others to look at problems from many different angles					
16	He/she suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments					
17	He/she spends time teaching and coaching					
18	He/she treats others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group					
19	He/she considers an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others					
20	He/she helps others to develop their strengths					
21	He/she provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts					
22	He/she discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets					
23	He/she makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved					
24	He/she expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations					
25	He/she focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards					
26	He/she concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and					

	failures					
27	He/she keeps track of all mistakes					
28	He/she directs his/her attention toward failures to meet standards					
29	He/she fails to interfere until problems become serious					
30	He/she waits for things to go wrong before taking action					
31	He/she shows a firm believe in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."					
32	He/she demonstrates that problems must become chronic before I take action					
33	He/she avoids getting involved when important issues a rise					
34	He/she is absent when needed					
35	He/she avoids making decisions					
36	He/she delays responding to urgent questions					
37	He/she gets others to do more than they expected					
38	He/she heightens others desire to succeed					
39	He/she increases others willingness					
40	He/she is effective in meeting others' job-related needs					
41	He/she is effective in representing others to higher authority					
42	He/she is effective in meeting organizational requirements					
43	He/she leads a group that is effective					
44	He/she uses methods of leadership that are satisfying					
45	He/she works with others in a satisfactory way					

Part III

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSI).

This questionnaire contains 60 items (characteristics) that independently measures your boss's masculinity and femininity and each item contains seven scales ranging from 1 to 7 (1= never, 2=very few times, 3=sometimes but not often, 4=occasionally, 5=often, 6=usually and 7=almost all the time) based on how frequently the manager actually do this with his/her associates and followers. Hence you are requested to put tick mark based on how frequently you think your boss actually does this with you and his/her associates by using the scale below.

My boss behaves this

	Item	Never	Very few times	Some times but not often	Occasionally	Often	Usually	Almost all the time
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Self-reliant							
2	Yielding							
3	helpful							
4	Defends own beliefs							
5	Cheerful							
6	Moody (i.e. temperamental)							
7	Independent							
8	Shy							
9	Conscientious (i.e. hard working)							
10	Athletic							
11	Affectionate							
12	Theatrical							
13	Assertive (i.e. forceful, self-confident)							
14	Flatterable							
15	Happy							
16	Strong personality							
17	Loyal							

18	Unpredictable							
19	Forceful							
20	Feminine							
21	Reliable							
22	Analytical							
23	Sympathetic							
24	Jealous							
25	Has leadership abilities							
26	Sensitive to the needs of others							
27	Truthful							
28	Willing to take risks							
29	Understanding							
30	Secretive							
31	Makes decisions easily							
32	Compassionate (i.e. kind)							
33	Sincere (i.e. genuine)							
34	Self-sufficient							
35	Eager to soothe hurt feelings							
36	Conceited (i.e. arrogant)							
37	Dominant							
38	Soft-spoken							
39	Likable							
40	Masculine							
41	Warm							
42	Solemn (i.e. serious)							
43	Willing to take an stand							
44	Tender (i.e. caring)							
45	Friendly							
46	Aggressive							
47	Gullible (i.e. naïve)							
48	Inefficient							
49	Acts as a leader							
50	Childlike							

51	Adaptable							
52	Individualistic							
53	Does not use harsh language							
54	Unsystematic							
55	Competitive							
56	Loves children							
57	Tactful							
58	Ambitious							
59	Gentle							
60	Conventional (i.e. predictable, conservative)							

Thank you very much!

Annex III
List of Constructs and Items under each construct.

	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
Idealized Attributes (IA)	0	1	2	3	4
I instill pride in other for being associated with me					
I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group					
I act in ways that build others' respect for me					
I display a sense of power and confidence					
Idealized Behaviors (IB)					
I talk about their most important values and beliefs					
I specify the important of having a strong sense of purpose					
I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions					
I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission					
Inspirational Motivation (IM)					
I talk optimistically about the future					
I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished					
I articulate a compelling vision of the future					
I express confidence that goals will be achieved					
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)					
I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate					
I seek differing perspectives when solving problems					
I get others to look at problems form many different angles					
I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments					
Individual Consideration (IC)					
I spend time teaching and coaching					
I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group					
I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others					
I help others to develop their strengths					
Contingent Reward (CR)					
I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts					

I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved					
I express satisfaction when others meet expectations					
Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA)					
I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards					
I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures					
I keep track of all mistakes					
I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards					
Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP)					
I fail to interfere until problems become serious					
I wait for things to go wrong before taking action					
I show a firm believe in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”					
I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action					
Laissez-Faire (LF)					
I avoid getting involved when important issues arise					
I am absent when needed					
I avoid making decisions					
I delay responding to urgent questions					
Extra Effort					
I get others to do more than they expected					
I heighten others desire to succeed					
I increase others willingness					
Effectiveness					
I am effective in meeting others’ job-related needs					
I am effective in representing others to higher authority					
I am effective in meeting organizational requirements					
I lead a group that is effective					
Satisfaction					
I use methods of leadership that are satisfying					
I work with others in a satisfactory way					

Appendix IV

Constructs for BSRI Questionnaire and items under each construct.

<u>Construct</u>	<u>Items</u>
Masculinity	1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 37, 40, 43, 46, 49, 55, 58
Femininity	2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50, 53, 56, 59
Undifferentiated	3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, 33, 36, 39, 42, 45, 48, 51, 54, 57, 60

