

Women Leadership in Organization

R. Bala Subramanian

BIMTECH Bhubaneswar, India

I.S.F.Irudayaraj

S. George S.J.

XLRI School of Business and Human Resources, India

Abstract

Earlier approaches to leadership ignored the feminine qualities of leaders. The focus was on the masculine aspect ('great man theory of leadership'.) Women leaders remained unexplored by research scholars till 60s. As women started to occupy influential positions in academia, organizations and politics; the feminine aspects of leadership drew attention from scholars. This paper reviews studies done in women leadership in the context of the Full Range Theory of leadership. It was found that the gender of leaders, gender of organizations and gender of followers influence leadership styles. This gender aspect has an impact on women leaders and their style of leadership in organizations. In this paper, the leadership styles exhibited by men and women are compared. The differences in the leadership styles of men and women in gendered organizations and reasons for differences are discussed followed by directions for future research.

Keywords: Women leadership, full range theory of leadership, gendered nature of organizations, feminine leadership and masculine leadership.

In primitive society, men and women held equal roles. But in the course of the evolution of the economy from simple to complex; the new roles (mining, smelting of iron ore, lumbering, and warfare) required training, displacement and energy expenditure in which there was a hierarchy of gender and men gained power over women. Women became confined to household work (Hartley, 1914). Later with increased investment of social capital on women, they were able to come out to compete with men for all positions. Some essential leadership traits such as ambition, self reliance and assertiveness were also acquired by women without compromising on their gender traits. Their emotional intelligence level has also been found to be higher than men (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Leadership roles have traditionally been held by men. The characteristics of leadership were also perceived

as masculine in nature. There has been a general agreement that women face much more challenges and barriers in reaching leadership positions (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995). Subordinates, by and large, were found to be reluctant to accept a female as a leader or as a Manager since they perceived women to be incapable of performing the leadership or managerial role and/or they seemed to have looked at women as people not fully qualified for the role (O'Leary, 1974; Riger & Galligan, 1980; Terborg, 1977).

The term "Glass ceiling" was a metaphor originally coined by Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt in a Wall Street Journal article (March, 1986). It indicates the invisible barrier that women face when aspiring to attain top leadership positions. It is so even in female dominated occupations. This is contrary to the "Glass escalator" that white men ride in masculine, feminine and gender neutral organizations. The term 'Glass ceiling' is revised and termed as "Leadership Labyrinth" (Eagly & Carli, 2007) which means that women face multiple barriers right from their entry. This term is applicable to other non-dominant groups such as ethnic and racial minority women also.

The gradual entry of women into the labor force during the last few decades and their trickling into the top management and corporate ladders attracted researchers in the area of women leadership (Van Engen & Willemsen, 2004). Women work force adds diversity of value when employed in the nontraditional sector (Desvaux, Devillard-Hoellinger & Meaney, 2008). There is also positive relationship between presence of women and the performance of the organization (Desvaux et al.2008).

In this paper, literature on women leadership is reviewed. The gendered nature of organizations, leadership style exhibited by men and women and reasons for the difference in the leadership style are discussed followed by directions for future research in the context of South Asian culture.

Full range theory of Leadership style

The most common styles of leadership are the task oriented and the interpersonally oriented styles (Bales, 1950). This was further developed by the Ohio studies on leadership (Hemphill & Coons, 1957) which labeled the task oriented style as initiation structure and the interpersonally oriented as consideration.

In the 1980s and 1990s came another type: the Full range theory that consists of Transactional and Transformational leadership styles (Bass 1998). The term 'Transformational' was coined by Downton in 1973. Subsequently, it was popularized by James MacGregor Burns in his book published in 1978. It emphasizes the follower's development, intrinsic motivation and affective component of leadership. It is more oriented towards the future than the present context and it inspires followers' commitment and creativity.

Transformational leaders are characterized by dominance, desire to influence, self-confidence and strong moral value. The performance of the followers goes beyond expectation whereas in transactional leadership, only the expected outcome happens. Transformational Leaders are said to be possessing the four 'T's: Individualized Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation and Idealized Influence. It is not similar to charismatic leadership in which the leader possesses some special personality characteristics (House, 1976). Burns also contrasted these leaders with transactional leaders, who establish exchange relationships with their subordinates.

Transactional style of leadership was first described by Max Weber (1947) and then by Bernard Bass (1985). Transactional leadership refers to the exchange between the leaders and followers. The leader rewards the followers in monetary or non-monetary terms for the work done. There are three components: Contingent Rewards (Transactional leaders link the goals to rewards), Active Management by Exception (Transactional leaders monitor the work of their subordinates and take corrective action to prevent mistakes), and Passive Management by Exception (i.e. Transactional leaders intervene only when the standards are not met) (Bass, 1991).

In the mid-1980s, Bass extended the work of Burns by giving more attention to followers' rather than leaders'

needs and also by describing the transactional and transformational styles on a single continuum (Bass & Bass, 2009).

Transactional leadership is a style of leadership in which the leader promotes compliance by his followers through both rewards or punishments (for every transaction) whereas transformational leaders influence the followers by giving individualized consideration, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation to them.

A transactional leader focuses on the role of supervision, organization, individual performance and rewards relationship, and group performance; whereas Transformational leadership accomplishes this by challenging and transforming individuals' emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals through the process of charismatic and visionary leadership (Northouse, 2007).

Bass (1985) also wrote that transformational leaders inspire the followers by raising their levels of consciousness for the organizational goals, rising above their own self-interest for the sake of the organization and addressing the latter's higher level needs.

While charisma of the leader is an important factor to achieve the organizational needs, other conditions are motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. By acting as 'ideal influence', they set the right example for the followers.

Apart from the four 'T's and transactional components, Full Range Theory of Leadership Styles contains the gender aspect as well which is explained below.

Gender orientation in the context of Full range theory of leadership styles

Men are instrumental, competent, rational and assertive while women are sensitive, warm, tactful and expressive (Broverman I.K, Vogel, Broverman D.M, Clarkson & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Williams & Best, 1982).

The typical female and male behavior are also termed as Communal and Agentic behaviors respectively in literature. Communal behaviors are characterized as kind, affectionate, helpful, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturing and gentle. Agentic behaviors are characterized as aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent and self-confident (Ashmore,

Del Boca & Wohlers, 1986)

These gender stereotypic characters give rise to respective leadership styles: Autocratic or transactional leadership style exhibited by Men and Democratic or transformational leadership style exhibited by Women (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani & Longo, 1991; Eagly, A. H., & Karau, 2002; Eagly & Koenig, 2006). Generally all the leadership traits reflect either femininity or masculinity dimensions of gender stereotypes.

Hence, it is proposed that:

P1: Gender would moderate leadership style (in the context of full range theory).

In a study among MBA students (UK) it was found that women's orientation is interpersonal and attentional to people while men give attention to task (Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Berpard M. Bass et al, 1996). Similar findings emerged in the study of the US congregation of the Roman Catholic Church (Druskat, 1994).

As per the perception of the subordinates, the components of transformational leadership style (Democratic) are more aligned with the feminine gender role and the components of transactional leadership style (Autocratic) are more aligned with the masculine gender role (Hackman, Furness, Hills & Paterson, 1992; Ross & Offermann, 1977). Meta-analysis also showed that women scored high on all the four components of transformational leadership and contingent reward aspects of transactional leadership (Eagly, Jahannensen, Schmidt & Van Engen, 2003). They differ from men in being less hierarchical, more cooperative, more collaborative and more inclined to enhance others' self-worth (Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1995).

These results support the claim that components of transformational leadership style are in correspondence with feminine leadership and components of transactional leadership style are more aligned with masculine gender role (Gibsonm, 1995; Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995).

From the above findings it is proposed that:

P2a: Women are transformational leaders as the components of transformational leadership style are more aligned with feminine gender role.

P2b: Men are transactional leaders as the components of

transactional leadership style are more aligned with masculine gender role.

P3: Women develop more nurturing relationships compared to men. Hence, women are expected to display more transformational leadership behavior than men.

Not only the leader, but the organization also has gender orientation which is explained below.

Gendered nature of Organization

No organization has a very significant advantage for women in terms of work culture. The social environment of any organization is more masculine in nature as it is traditionally and predominantly occupied by men. The earlier gendered management style debate had the view that the characteristics of a successful manager is due to the characteristics of men (Schein, 1975; Schein, Mueller, & Jacobson, 1989; Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Schein, 1989). As the entry of female managers increases, they adopt traits and behaviors typical of male managers in order to succeed in a masculine work environment (Powell & Butterfield, 1979). This is one of the barriers faced by women when they enter any organization for a leadership role (Eagly, Karau, Miner & Johnson, 1994). They "fail" to gain inclusion as they are evaluated in a work culture set up by men which has typical male standards and criteria (Oakley, 2000).

There is substantial advantage to men in military and police. The roles of these organizations were found to be particularly masculine as they are dominated traditionally by males on a numerical basis (Arkin & Dobrofsky, 1978).

Women also have such substantial advantage in organizations like education and social service (Eagly, Karau and Makhijani, 1995). Teaching is perceived as aligning with their family role. Research and publication becomes mandatory to excel in academics. But when compared to men, women academicians are traditionally less published (Priola, V., 2007) as women are still expected to bear the major responsibility for the nurturing of children.

Women Leaders in Men dominated organizations

A women leader when performing a leadership role, tends to reduce her gender stereotype (feminine traits) in order to survive (Eagly, & Johnson, 1990). It reduces the role conflict (Eagly, Mahakijini & Klonsky, 1992).

Otherwise, she invites prejudice in the form of biased performance evaluations and negative preconceptions which may diminish her performance (Geis, 1993; Miller & Turnbull, 1986; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Male leaders are at an advantage compared to female leaders in terms of prejudices (Eagly, 1987).

This role adjustment has an impact on women's health. When they work in their traditional style (interpersonally oriented), they have not complained of any pressure or mental health ill whereas they feel mentally ill when they need to alter their leadership style (Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999). This need to alter their leadership style arises when they work in male dominant industries such as military. Masculine organization (such as military and police) differ from other organizations because male leaders are favored in such organizations and the roles of military or police officers are highly masculine in nature. The feminine gender characteristics are in sharp contrast to the skill requirements of masculine organizations. To be a successful cadet in masculine organizations, women are expected to possess typical masculine gender characteristics (Ebbert & Hall, 1993; Francke, 1997).

Those women who have worked in the other male dominant industries (automotive and timber) also stated that they were task oriented where as those in female dominant industries (beauty parlor, education and nursing) said that they were interpersonally oriented (Engen, Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001). Generally women who choose military as career adopt the military culture (male dominant) and fit in to survive by compromising in the female style of leadership. Those who are unable to adapt, leave the organization. Adaptations create homogenous organizational culture and minimize diversity (Kelley, 1997).

Herbert (1998) describes how women in military adopt an 'in between role' or blending strategy (not too feminine and not too masculine). In terms of appearance and self presentation, they meet their gender expectations and in terms of work situations they are competent, rational and impersonal. Thus they try to perform better without any compromise on their gender role.

A finding closer to this was found in the study of

Israel's women police force. They had a role conflict of "feminine and inappropriate (for organizational role)" or "unfeminine and atypical (of gender)". They did not reject their gender identity. Rather they adjusted their gender identity by including selected masculine traits which are not in conflict with traditional feminine attributes (assertive, independent, dominant) and by reducing selected feminine traits (shy, soft spoken, warm and gullible) which are considered as hindrance to performing their organizational roles (Moore, 1993; Moore, & Gobi, 1995). Thus, women, though they are transformational in nature, wherever the situation requires, they adopt masculine characteristics.

Eagly and Carli (2003), in their updated meta-analysis found more support for this claim. They state that contemporary context demands both masculine and feminine gender characteristics (mentoring, collaboration, cooperation) of leadership. This was termed as "Androgynous identity" (Bem, 1977) which is a blending of male (dominance, assertiveness and competitiveness) and female styles (collaborative, cooperativeness and concern for people). Androgynous individuals are more independent and nurturing (Bem, 1977), have high self esteem (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975), have successful social skills with social poise and intellect (Berzing, Welling & Wetter, 1978). They have higher involvement in academic competitions (Kleinke & Hinrichs, 1983). Hence Androgynous identity is preferred as it facilitates them to express either 'instrumental' or 'expressive' behavior, depending on the demands of the situation.

Adopting an androgynous leadership style may help women to overcome gender stereotypes that have prevented them from being viewed as leaders in the past (Korabik, 1990). Moreover women perceive their leadership role as androgynous (both agnetic and communal) compared to men (Schein, 2001).

Human being are gifted with the ability to survive in a given environment as gender roles are continuously evolving depending on the requirements of the environment (here - masculine or feminine). Hence women, without compromising in their gender role, are able to sustain in any environment (Fincher, 1993).

Hence, it is proposed that:

P4: Gender of the organization would moderate the leadership style, at least for women.

P4a: Women exhibit androgynous type of leadership style in masculine organization to overcome the gender bias and meet the gender expectation as well.

While the context of the organization and/or the gender composition of the work environment influences the behavior style of the leader, it influences the leadership effectiveness as well.

Leadership effectiveness with reference to gender orientation

The effectiveness of leadership depends upon the leadership style exhibited by the appropriate gender. Though women faced barriers in moving up the official hierarchy, they were able to perform equally effective compared to their male counterparts (Eagly, Mahakijini & Klonsky, 1992). The implication of the women work force is that they add diversity of value when employed in the nontraditional sectors (Desvaux, Devillard-Hoellinger & Meaney, 2008). There is also positive relationship between presence of women and the performance of the organization (Desvaux et al. 2008). This is supported by a study conducted among recreation clubs, government agencies, public transport companies and students of Germany showing that women leaders are evaluated as more effective and as producing more satisfaction than their male counterparts (Anette Rohmann, Jens Rowold, 2009).

Women have been found to be effective leaders in stereotypic feminine organizations such as service sectors while men are effective leaders in masculine organizations such as technical and manufacturing sectors (Eagly, Karau & Makhijani, 1995; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

Research advocates that women will make it to the top because of their unique and different characteristics (Peters, O'Connor, Weekley, Pooyan, Frank, & Erenkrantz, 1984; Rosener, 1990) such as higher EI than men (Caruso, Mayor & Salovey, 1999; Mayer & Geher, 1996), feelings or caring attitude and friendship (Perrault, 1996).

P5: Women leaders are effective when their gender traits are aligned with their leadership style they exhibit and gender of the organizations.

The reasons for different leadership styles

There are two answers: One is matching of the leader's gender and gendered nature of organizations (role

congruence). The other is the traditionally dominant role of men in the creation of the organization.

Role incongruence

While it is true that both the leadership styles are effective, it creates conflict when they are not adopted by their respective gender. It needs a perfect match between gender of the leader and the organization. This matching of leader's gender and gender of the organization is termed as 'role congruence'. It means that a group will be positively evaluated when its characteristics are recognized as aligning with that group's typical social roles (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005). Role congruity theory is rooted in social role theory but the scope extends beyond that as it matches the gender with the occupational role.

Biased gender preference in the organizational role is the major impact of role congruence. For example, men were preferred over women in masculine jobs (auto sales person, Manager for heavy industry) and gender neutral jobs where as women were preferred only in feminine jobs (Carli & Eagly, 2007).

Leaders of each sex excel in task accomplishment only when their role is congruent with their gender. Otherwise they may experience conflict (role incongruity) between their gender role and organizational role (Bass, 1981; Bayes & Newton, 1978; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Kruse & Wintermantel, 1986; Learly, 1974; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984). The consequences of such conflict leads to reduction in ability to organize people and resources for goal achievement. This explains the facts that women are less effective when they lead military organization than when they lead in education or social service organizations (Eagly, Karau & Makhijani, 1995; Lowe et al., 1996).

The foremost consequence of role incongruence is the negative reaction of subordinates. They are reluctant to accept a female leader or manager as the latter (women Leader or Manager) can't perform the role or are not fully qualified for the role (O'Leary, 1974; Riger & Galligan, 1980; Terborg, 1977). Subordinates perceive feminine personality attributes as similar to the components of transformational style (Hackman, Furness, Hills & Paterson, 1992; Ross & Offermann, 1977).

As a result, women face resistance or negative reactions

when they exercise power and authority in the line of autocratic leadership style (Eagly et al, 1992; Carli & Eagly, 1999; Rudman & Glick, 2001). When women fail to temper the agentic behaviors required by a leader with sufficient display of female typical communal behavior, they incur a backlash. They may be passed over for hiring and promotion (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Carli & Eagly, 1999; Heilman, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2001). To avoid such backlash women exhibit more communal behavior (more collaborative and less hierarchical). They try to placate the subordinates, collaborate with them and allow them in the decision making.

The prejudice against female leaders and role conflict is stronger particularly when they lead in male dominant organizations and their evaluators are men as men perceive that their position is threatened by the female work force (Eagly et al., 1995).

The findings of a study of the Australian Police Force supports this. Themale police force experienced more negative emotions towards women ("aversive sexism") in the presence of men than in the presence of women and more positive emotions towards men when in the presence of women (Melgoza & Cox, 2006).

This analysis suggests that gender and role congruence does matter for achieving greater effectiveness.

"The history of the world is but the biography of Great Men" (Thomas Carlyle, 1888)

While a masculine organization is a great advantage to men, there is also claim that the socio-cultural environment of any organization is more of masculine in nature. This is because the creation and nurturance of an organization and its culture were conventionally and predominantly carried out by men. In this context, the discussion of the "great man theory" given by Thomas Carlyle (1993) would be more meaningful. This theory was popular in the 19th century. This was the earliest approach to leadership. According to

Thomas Carlyle, great leaders were men and born with innate leadership qualities. This is one of the reasons for the earlier management literature's stereo typical definition of the successful manager or leader in terms of the masculine gender (Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Schein, 1989; Schein, 1975; Schein, Mueller, & Jacobson, 1989). The concept of 'glass ceiling' (for women) and 'glass escalator' (for men) can be traced back to the earlier entry of men in the organizations.

Studies in South Asian culture

In Hofstede's study of cultural differences (1980), he studied five dimensions: Power distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty avoidance and Long term orientation. These cultural dimensions did not differ by age, gender, education or occupation (except the Masculinity dimension) but differed for the countries. There are gross variations across regions and continents.

In the Masculine dimension, values such as assertiveness, performance, success and competition are measured to see to what degree they have feminine vis-a-vis masculine orientation. In countries where there is high masculinity, their leaders are performance, success and competitivion oriented. On the other hand, countries with low masculinity have leaders with the need for personal relationships, quality of life, and care for the elderly (Hofstede, 1980).

Hofstede lists numerical values for different countries. Western countries such as US (62), Australia (61), Germany (66) and Great Britain (66) have high masculinity oriented culture whereas India (56) and Pakistan (50) have a less masculine culture.

In case of power distance, Asian countries (India (77), Pakistan (55)), scored high compared to US (40), Canada (39), Great Britain (35) and Germany (35).

Both of the above two dimensions and their variance across the continents necessitates the need for more context specific studies. For example, in the literature

Table 1: Numerical values of different countries on Hofstede's cultural dimension

Hofstede's Dimension	US	Australia	Germany	Great Britain	India	Pakistan
Masculinity	62	61	66	66	56	50
Power Distance	40	36	35	35	77	55

(Source: Geert, H., & Jan, H. G. (1991). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. McGraw-Hill, New York.)

on women leadership, Helgesen (1990) and Rosener (1995) suggest that the leadership style of women differs from men in being less hierarchical, more cooperative, more collaborative and more inclined to enhance others' self-worth. Thus, when women occupy leadership positions, there may be less power distance in the organizational culture.

Similarly, Williams and Best (1990)'s study of 14 countries shows that men and women in traditional cultures (e.g. Pakistan and Nigeria) stress the sex role difference, whereas western cultures (Netherlands and Finland) do not emphasize them. Such differences tend to have an impact on the leadership style of women.

Gender stereotyping in South Asia

Gupta, Koshal, & Koshal's (1998) study of Indian women managers reveals that gender still remains a consideration in terms of salary raises, promotions or advancement decisions. Exclusion of women from informal networks of communication and women's commitment to family responsibilities are some major barriers that prevent women from advancing to top managerial positions. Traits such as relationship orientedness, more attention to procedures, collaboration with followers and supporting change and innovation (Gupta et al., 1998), sensitivity towards employees' family lives, domestic issues (Nath, 2000), concern for personal situations, willingness to share ideas and information with others (Budhwar et al, 2005) align with the components of transformational leaders. One study is not enough to conclude that women are transformational leaders in South Asian context.

Gupta et al. (1998) suggest that women managers are less competitive and less aggressive than their male counterparts in modern organizations. But should the "ideal managers" necessarily be more aggressive and competitive? Some traditional South Asian feminine values such as submissiveness and unobtrusiveness may be some of the reasons for less aggressiveness or less competitiveness (Thanacoody et al., 2006).

In a study of the US IT workforce, Adya (2008), found that South Asian women display aggressive skills to counteract gender stereotypes while western women managers rebel against the system. Western women managers hold that they did experience gender stereo-

typing in the IT field while majority of the South Asian women replied in the negative. The reason is interesting. For American women, IT is a masculine industry where as for the South Asian women, it is not so. For them, electrical and mechanical are the masculine fields in contrast to IT. They also experience more discrimination in the Indian work place than in western workplace. This is also supported by Thanacoody et al.'s (2006) study of academics in Mauritius and Australia which shows that South Asian women are more tolerant of gender stereotyping than women in the West. It is because such gender differences in South Asia are accepted as part of the cultural values and sometime it is also attributed to fate which is beyond one's control.

From the above studies, it is proposed that:

P10: Culture moderates the perception of gender discrimination in the workplace among the women managers.

Almost all the studies were so far conducted in western cultures (UK, US, Canada and Australia). There are very few studies in the South Asian context (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka or Bhutan) particularly in masculine or male dominated organizations. These countries have witnessed the rise of women leaders (Indira Gandhi, Benazir Bhutto and Sirimavo Bandaranaike) in politics as early as the 1980s. All the three leaders had a tough time during their ruling period and acted in autocratic ways in their respective Nations. Benazir Bhutto successfully led the politically and economically unstable Pakistani government. She is known for the tough stand she took against the trade unions, her domestic political rivals, and her survival in the unsuccessful coup d'état attempt by her army in 1955.

The Indian Prime Minister (Indira Gandhi) is also known for her bold political stand and unprecedented centralization of power. During her tenure, India went to war with Pakistan supporting East Pakistan's independence movement, conducted the operation blue star to wipe out the Sikh extremists and also undertook a state of emergency. She, along with her Pakistani counterpart Benazir Bhutto, earned the nick name of 'iron lady' for their masculine leadership style.

Sirimavo Bandaranaike, the world's first women head of the government, served as the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka thrice between the years 1960 to 2000. She took bold measures such as nationalizing key sectors of the

economy (banking, insurance and schools).

In the post 90s, India witnessed the rise of regional women leaders like Mamta Banerjee (West Bengal) and J Jayalalitha (Tamil Nadu). Both of them are known for their autocratic style of leadership. By sex, though they are women, by gender, they are Masculine. Such case studies pose the question whether leadership (particularly political leadership) itself is masculine in nature?

More case studies on South Asian business women leaders (such as Kiran Mazumdar shaw, Chanda Kochhar, Naina Lal Kidwai and Indira Nooyi) will clarify the type of way they lead in contrast to western women leaders. To have a broader understanding of women leadership (styles), more studies need to be done in these cultures particularly in various industries.

Directions for future research

Apart from their (leaders') gender, there are other factors that have a substantial influence on their effective functioning. They are: gender orientation of the organization and of the subordinate or colleague. The interaction of these factors leads to gender stereo typing and role congruence which affects the effectiveness of the leadership style. Following are some of the areas that need to be explored further.

Firstly, the concept of "Gendered" organization needs empirical support. There is no literature that perfectly defines the terms "masculine organization" or "feminine organization". The authors in their respective literature merely mention that "masculine organization like military..." or "feminine organization such as education, beauty parlor" (Eagly et al., 1995; Eagly et al., 2001; Eagly & Carli, 2003). The culture of masculinity is characterized by three factors: Number of male employees, type of task required in majority of the jobs and characteristics required to perform the jobs. Thus police or military organizations are characterized as masculine because majority of the workers are male, type of job is high risk, use of physical force is required to protect the civilians during crisis and the skills required to perform the job are a strong sense of articulating power and authority, dominance and forcefulness (Moore, 1993). But there are no such criteria discussed for feminine organizations in any of the referred literatures.

Lack of clear cut criteria for gender based categorization of organizations questions the basic assumption that leadership styles differ for different types of organizations for both the genders. The most popular Hofstede's model of cultural dimensions theory (1983) was based on a study of 117,000 IBM employees across 40 large countries and later extended to 50 countries and three regions. Hence large scale study of organizational culture of different organizations is needed to validate the claims of gender based categorization of organizations. This will help to alleviate the confusion of such gender based categorization (masculine, feminine and gender neutral).

Secondly, there is no detailed discussion of masculine leaders in feminine or gender neutral organizations as masculine leaders in leadership position were never questioned. But they are perceived as most suitable. A male leader in a top position is conventional too. Traditionally men dominated in all positions and there is no 'role incongruence' Moreover the question of 'role incongruence' arises only when there is a female leader and her subordinates are men. When women started occupying leadership positions in organizations, they exhibited a different kind of style known as transformational leadership. The components of transformational leadership are correlated with feminine gender traits as discussed above. Female leaders, when leading female dominant organizations, exhibit transformational leadership (Eagly et al., 1995; Lowe et al., 1996). Hence, the leadership style of masculine leaders leading in feminine or gender neutral organizations can be probed empirically.

Both the leadership styles (transactional and transformational) need to be compared to know their effectiveness. This needs empirical support across sectors to come to a valid conclusion. The anticipated finding would be that masculine leaders would exhibit transactional leadership style as per the available literature (Gibsonm, 1995; Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995). But effectiveness may differ when compared to feminine leaders.

A feminine organization is dominated by female employees. A woman leader can understand the problems of their women subordinates and they will be able to motivate them better than their male counterparts (Peters, 1990; Rosener, 1990; Hare, 1996;

Caruso, Mayor & Salovey, 1999; Mayer & Geher, 1996; Perrault, 1996). So a women leader will be expected to be effective in a feminine organization but there is no literature on the leadership effectiveness of men leaders in the feminine organizations.

Another area of research is how the women subordinate perceives (rates) the masculine leaders in their domain? The notion of 'gender' itself a social construct (i.e. expected behavior). In this context, it is expected behavior from the subordinates. The 'role incongruence' is due to the imperfect match between the gender of the leader and gender of the organization as expected by the subordinates (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005). Hence it is a question whether male leaders also face 'role incongruence' when they lead in feminine organizations and their subordinates are women.

The leadership style of women leaders is transformational. They are effective when they exhibit transformational leadership style in feminine organizations (Gibson, 1995; Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995). They face role conflict (feminine and inappropriate) or gender conflict (masculine and appropriate) in masculine organisations. Hence they need to alter their leadership style in order to avoid the role conflict by adopting 'transactional leadership style' (Eagly et al., 1992) or adjusting their gender identity in order to avoid gender conflict or adopting an androgynous leadership style (Korabik, 1990). The need to alter their typical leadership style arises only when they have to avoid prejudice from their (male) subordinates. If their subordinates are female, then there is no need to alter their leadership style. But this remains a hypothesis unless investigated empirically. Hence the leadership style of female leaders and effectiveness of their leadership style in masculine organizations when their subordinates are women can be explored. The anticipated finding would be that female leaders would exhibit transformational leadership style as per the available literature support. This is also due to the fact that their subordinates are female. Hence if they exhibit transformational leadership, they will not be resisted or invite any prejudice.

Conclusion

The paper has reviewed the literature on women leadership. The studies were done in the context of Full range theory of leadership (Downton, 1973; Burns

1978). On comparing the leadership styles of feminine and masculine leaders, it was found that feminine leaders exhibit transformational style and masculine leaders exhibit transactional style (Hackman et al., 1992; Ross & Offermann, 1977).

The findings suggest that while there is no change in the way masculine leaders lead, there is difference in the style of feminine leadership. It is not only the gender of the leader that influences the leadership style but also there are other factors such as gender of the organization and gender of the subordinate that influence the leadership style of women leaders. The reason for the difference is 'role (in) congruence'. While this study does not offer a conclusive answer to the question of role conflict or gender conflict faced by women leaders, it does give a picture about how they respond to those situations.

This is important for the study of leadership as it helps to understand the leaders' behavior and the differences in their leadership styles. The increased participation of women workforce, cultural diversity in the organization and boundary less organizations necessitate the gender diversity in leadership roles irrespective of the type of organization. The research raises important questions about the gender of the organization as there is no empirical support or clear definition of such claims.

As mentioned in the direction for future research, it would be fruitful to pursue further research about how masculine leaders lead in feminine organizations and feminine leaders in masculine organizations when their subordinates are females, in order to understand the broader aspect of leadership behavior and gender.

References

- Adalsteinsson, G. D., Gudmundsdottir, S., & Gudlaugsson, T. (2013). Gender differences in relation to Hofstede's national cultural dimensions. *Journal of International Management Studies*, 13(3).
- Adya, M.P. (2008), "Women at work: differences in IT career experiences and perceptions between South Asian and American women", *Human Resource Management*, 47(3), 601-35.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1995). An investigation of female and male constructs of leadership and empowerment. *Women in Management Review*, 10(2), 3-8.
- Arkin, W., & Dobrofsky, L. R. (1978). Military socialization and masculinity. *Journal of Social issues*, 34(1), 151-168.

- Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Wohlers, A. J. (1986). Gender stereo types. The social psychology of female-male relations: *A critical analysis of central concepts*, 69-119.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?. *American psychologist*, 52(2), 130.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2009). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. Simon and Schuster. com.
- Bayes, M., & Newton, P. M. (1978). Women in authority: A socio psychological analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 14(1), 7-20.
- Bem, S. L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 45(2), 196.
- Berzins, J. I., Welling, M. A., & Wetter, R. E. (1978). A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the Personality Research Form. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46(1), 126.
- Brenner, O. C., Tomkiewicz, J., & Schein, V. E. (1989). The relationship between sex role Stereo types and requisite management characteristics revisited. *Academy of management journal*, 32(3), 662-669.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal. *Journal of Social issues*, 28(2), 59-78.
- Budhwar, P.S., Saini, D.S. and Jyotsna, B. (2005), "Women in management in the new economic environment: the case of India", *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 11 (2), 179-93.
- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5(3), 665.
- Burke, S., & Collins, K. M. (2001). Gender differences in leadership styles and management skills. *Women in Management Review*, 16(5), 244-257.
- Carlyle, T. (1888). On heroes, hero-worship, and the heroic in history (Vol. 1). University of California Press
- Costa Jr, P., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 81(2), 322.
- Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1984). Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(5), 991.
- Desvaux, G., Devillard-Hoellinger, S., & Meaney, M. C. (2008). A business case for women. *The McKinsey Quarterly*, 4, 26-33.
- Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process*. Free Press.
- Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 99-119.
- Eagly, A. H. (2013). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Psychology Press.
- Eagly, Alice H. & Carli, Linda L., (2007). *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth about How Women Become Leaders*, Harvard Business School Press
- Eagly, A. H., & Diekmann, A. B. (2005). What is the problem? Prejudice as an attitude-in-context. *On the nature of prejudice*, 50, 19-35.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 233.
- Eagly, A. H., Ashmore, R. D., Makhijani, M. G., & Longo, L. C. (1991). What is beautiful is good, but...: A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Psychological bulletin*, 110(1), 109.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological bulletin*, 129(4), 569.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 60(5), 685.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological review*, 109(3), 573.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., Miner, J. B., & Johnson, B. T. (1994). Gender and motivation to manage in hierarchic organizations: A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 135-159.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(1), 125.
- Eagly, A. H., & Koenig, A. M. (2006). Social Role Theory of Sex Differences and Similarities: Implication for Prosocial Behavior.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 111(1), 3.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 46(4), 735.
- Ebbert, J., & Hall, M. B. (1993). Crossed currents: Navy women from WWI to Tailhook. Brassey's (US).
- Engen, M. L., Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(5), 581-598.
- Fincher, M. S. (1993). Gender-role orientation of female cadets at the United States Air Force Academy (No. AFIT/CI/

- CIA-93-075). Air force inst of tech wright- pattersonafb oh.
- Francke, L. B. (1997). *Ground zero: The gender wars in the military*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gardiner, M., & Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender differences in leadership style, job stress and mental health in male?and female-dominated industries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(3), 301-315.
- Geis, F. L. (1993). *Self-fulfilling prophecies: A social psychological view of gender*.
- Gibson, C. B. (1995). An investigation of gender differences in leadership across four countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 255-279.
- Gupta, A., Koshal, M. and Koshal, R.J. (1998), "Women managers in India challenges and opportunities", *Equal Opportunities International*, 17(8), 14-18.
- Hackman, M. Z., Furniss, A. H., Hills, M. J., & Paterson, T. J. (1992). Perceptions of gender-role characteristics and transformational and transactional leadership behaviours. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 75(1), 311-319.
- Hartley, C. G. (1914). *The Position of Woman in Primitive Society: A Study of the Matriarchy*. Library of Alexandria.
- Helgesen, S.: 1990, *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership* (Doubleday, New York).
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of social issues*, 57(4), 657-674.
- Hennig, M. & Jardin, A. *The Managerial Women*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977
- Herbert, M. S. (1998). *Camouflage isn't only for combat*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of international business studies*, 14(2), 75-89.
- Jain, N. and Mukherji, S. (2010), "The perception of glass ceiling in Indian organizations: an exploratory study", *South Asian Journal of Management*, 17(1), 23-42.
- Kelley, M. J. (1997). *Gender Differences and Leadership*. Retrieved March, 18(2012), 97-104.
- Kleinke, C. L., & Hinrichs, C. A. (1983). College adjustment problems and attitudes toward drinking reported by feminine, androgynous, and masculine college women. *Psychology of women quarterly*, 7(4), 373-382.
- Korabik, K. (1990). Androgyny and leadership style. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9(4-5), 283-292.
- Kruse, L., & Wintermantel, M. (1986). Leadership Ms.-qualified: I. The gender bias in everyday and scientific thinking. In *Changing conceptions of leadership* (pp. 171-197). Springer New York.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.
- Mayer, J. D., & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. *Intelligence*, 22(2), 89-113.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence.
- Miller, D. T., & Turnbull, W. (1986). Expectancies and interpersonal processes. *Annual review of psychology*, 37(1), 233-256.
- Moore, D. (1999). Gender traits and identities in a "masculine" organization: The Israeli police force. *The Journal of social psychology*, 139(1), 49-68.
- Moore, D., & Gobi, A. (1995). Role conflict and perceptions of gender roles (the case of Israel). *Sex Roles*, 32(3-4), 251-270.
- Moss, S. E., & Kent, R. L. (1996). Gender and gender-role categorization of emergent leaders: A critical review and comprehensive analysis. *Sex Roles*, 35(1-2), 79-96.
- Nath, D. (2000). Gently shattering the glass ceiling: experiences of Indian women managers. *Women in Management Review*, 15(1), 44-52.
- Northouse, P. G (2007) *Leadership: Theory and Practice*.
- Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: understanding the scarcity of female CEOs. *Journal of business ethics*, 27(4), 321-334.
- O'Leary, V. E. (1974). Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(11), 809.
- Perreault, G. (1996). Metaphors for leadership: Military battle and friendship. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 3(1), 49-63.
- Peters, L. H., O'Connor, E. J., Weekley, J., Pooyan, A., Frank, B., & Erenkrantz, B. (1984). Sex bias and managerial evaluations: A replication and extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(2), 349.
- Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: have the times changed?. *Journal of Management*, 28(2), 177-193.
- Priola, V. (2007). Being female doing gender. Narratives of women in education management. *Gender and Education*, 19(1), 21-40.
- Ramirez-Melgoza, A., & Cox, J. W. (2006, August). Aversive sexism and emotion regulation in a masculine organization. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2006, No. 1, pp. C1-C6). *Academy of Management*.
- Riger, S., & Galligan, P. (1980). Women in management: An exploration of competing paradigms. *American Psychologist*, 35(10), 902.
- Rohmann, A., & Rowold, J. (2009). Gender and leadership style: a field study in different organizational contexts in Germany. *Equal opportunities international*, 28(7), 545-560.

- Rosener, J. B.: 1990, 'Ways Women Lead', *Harvard Business Review* 68, 119-125.
- Ross, S. M., & Offermann, L. R. (1997). Transformational leaders: Measurement of personality attributes and work group performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(10), 1078-1086.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of social issues*, 57(4), 743-762.
- Schein, V. E. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of applied psychology*, 60(3), 340.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social issues*, 57(4), 675-688.
- Schein, V. E., Müller, R., & Jacobson, C. (1989). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among college students. *Sex roles*, 20(1-2), 103-110.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 32(1), 29.
- Terborg, J. R. (1977). Women in management: A research review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(6), 647.
- Thanacoody, P.R., Bartram, T., Barker, M. and Jacobs, K. (2006), "Career progression among female academics; a comparative study of Australia and Mauritius", *Women in Management Review*, 21(7), 536-53.
- Wentworth, D. K., & Anderson, L. R. (1984). Emergent leadership as a function of sex and task type. *Sex Roles*, 11(5-6), 513-524.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1982). Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage publications.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). Sex and psyche: Gender and self-viewed cross-culturally. Sage Publications, Inc.
- R. Bala Subramanian** is working as Assistant Professor (OB & HR) in Birla Global University (formerly BIMTECH) Bhubaneswar, India. He has 10 years of academic and industrial experience. He is pursuing Executive FPM in XLRI. He teaches OB and HRM. He can be contacted at r.bala@bimtech.ac.in.
- I.S.F.Irudayaraj**, is associated with, XAVIER LABOUR RELATIONS INSTITUTE (XLRI) for more than 20 years. He worked with Loyola College (Madras), Centre for organization Development (Hyderabad) and Academy of Human Resources development (Hyderabad). Rendered consultancy services to many public and private organizations. A life member of NHRD network. Areas of interest include organization Development and Change, Developing vision, mission and value congruence, Building Organization Culture, personality Development through Transactional Analysis, Leadership, Team Building and Counselling. He can be contacted at isfraj@xlri.ac.in.
- S. George S.J** is working with XAVIER LABOUR RELATIONS INSTITUTE (XLRI). His area of specialisation is OB and HR. He can be contacted at sgeorge@xlri.ac.in.