

Gender Differences in Leadership Styles as a Function of Leader and Subordinates' Sex and Type of Organization

ISABEL CUADRADO¹ AND
MARISOL NAVAS
University of Almería
Spain

FERNANDO MOLERO
Spanish Open University (UNED)
Spain

EMILIO FERRER
University of California

J. FRANCISCO MORALES
Spanish Open University (UNED)
Spain

The main purpose of this study is to investigate gender differences in leadership styles and in organizational outcome variables, together with the influence of organizational/contextual variables on leadership styles in female and male participants in Spain. The sample comprised 226 participants (35 leaders and 191 subordinates) belonging to 35 work teams. The general findings show that only 2 of the 10 tested leadership styles are different for female and male leaders. Specifically, subordinates rate female leaders as more autocratic and negotiating than men, and this evaluation varies according to the subordinates' sex. We also found that some differences in the rating of female and male leaders depend on whether the organization is stereotypically feminine or masculine.

In spite of the progress in the last few years, statistics clearly show that the presence of women in managerial positions is still far from equaling that of men. This increases progressively the highest when going up in the hierarchy of the organizational pyramid. In 2009, women accounted for an average of just 3% of the presidents of the largest companies in each of the European Union States members and less than 11% of board members (European Commission, 2010). The term “glass ceiling” was coined at the end of the 1980s to describe the existence of a set of invisible barriers that impede many qualified women from reaching positions of responsibility in organizations (Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987).

¹Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Isabel Cuadrado, Departamento de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, Área de Psicología Social, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Almería, Cañada de Sacramento s/n., 14120 Almería, Spain. E-mail: icuadrado@ual.es

This phenomenon, which is observable all over the world, cannot be properly explained (at least in developed countries) by the existence of discriminatory labor legislation, or the lack of women's training, or by women's possible inferior professional experience (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Powell & Butterfield, 1994). However, some arguments that try to attribute women's barriers to managerial positions to psychological factors, such as women's lack of skills, interest, or ambition, have not been empirically confirmed (Heilman, 1983; Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989; Lefkowitz, 1994; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Schein & Mueller, 1992).

Studies performed in recent years to find out what factors explain this phenomenon have shown that women face more obstacles than men when they try to occupy positions of responsibility in organizations (Bass, 1990). However, psychosocial explanations must be provided for the glass ceiling by performing studies that include persons of both sexes who already hold these positions. These explanations are important because of the need to consider the joint influence of psychological and sociocultural factors on the behavior of women and men.

One approach to the explanation of women's underrepresentation in managerial positions is to find out whether male and female leaders use different leadership styles. There is a great debate in the literature about the value of this research line (e.g., see the debate between Eagly and Carli vs. Vecchio: Eagly & Carli, 2003a, 2003b; Vecchio, 2002, 2003). However, Eagly and Carli (2003a) rightly point out that "job candidates' leadership styles are surely among the attributes given special scrutiny in interviews of candidates for managerial positions, and managers fired from their positions are often critiqued for their leadership styles" (p. 813). These authors make clear that, in some cases, these studies have been carried out to investigate whether the scarcity of women in high positions can be explained by women's use of less effective leadership styles. Regardless of their original hypothesis, the importance of studying this issue is beyond discussion, although reaching firm conclusions may be more complicated (see Eagly & Johnson, 1990, where they deal with the divergence of opinions voiced in popular and social scientific writings).

We agree with Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) that "the possibility that women and men differ in their typical leadership behavior is important because leaders' own behavior is a major determinant of their effectiveness and chances for advancement" (p. 569). In fact, in recent decades, many researchers have recognized its importance and have compared the leadership styles of men and women (Cuadrado, Morales, & Recio, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2003a, 2003b; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Wood & Eagly, 2010). In the following section, we describe the main styles analyzed by these researchers.

Leadership Styles

Leadership style is defined as “relatively stable patterns of behavior that are manifested by leaders” (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 781), or “the alternative ways that leaders pattern their interactive behavior to fulfill their role as leaders” (Bass, 1990, p. 27).

The main styles of classic research on leadership are autocratic versus democratic and task- and relationship-oriented (Bass, 1990; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Karau, 2002). *Autocratic* leadership is characterized by the leader’s making decisions unilaterally, not allowing the group members to participate (see De Cremer, 2007, for a review). On the other hand, *Democratic* leadership is participative, consultative, and involves the group, and the leader allows and encourages group members’ participation in the decisions (Bass, 1990; Gastil, 1994). The well-known studies conducted by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) showed that the same group could behave differently depending on the type of leadership exerted. These results in turn led the authors to strongly support the democratic style because it enhanced autonomy, satisfaction, and group effectiveness. However, more recent meta-analyses (Foels, Driskell, Mullen, & Salas, 2000; Gastil, 1994) have revealed the influence of certain variables that could moderate these initial results.

Leaders who use a *task-oriented* style are mainly concerned with achieving the group goals—emphasis on achieving the task—whereas *relationship-oriented* leaders are basically concerned with their followers’ well-being and satisfaction—emphasizing the quality of relations with others—(Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fiedler, 1967; Halpin, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Likert, 1961).

Some of the most important models developed under this focus are those of the Ohio State Leadership Studies (consideration and initiating structure; e.g., Halpin, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957), the University of Michigan Leadership Studies (task-oriented behavior, relationship-oriented behavior, and participative leadership; e.g., Likert, 1961), and the Blake and Mouton (1964) Managerial Grid, which contains two axes: concern for people and concern for production. In general, sufficient theoretical and empirical evidence has been gathered from these approaches to show that leadership effectiveness is greater when leaders adopt both leadership styles at the same time (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004; Powell & Butterfield, 1984). Nevertheless, situational models emphasize the fundamental role that contextual variables play in the effectiveness of leadership (Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Until the 1980s, the notion of leadership based on exchange was predominant within social psychology. From this viewpoint, it was assumed that when leaders or supervisors were able to provide their subordinates with

adequate rewards, the subordinates would give them their support and work in return. However, for Bass (1985), the theories and studies based on exchange cannot explain “high-level leadership” (capable of achieving really important changes, both in the followers and in the organization). Thus, based on the distinction proposed by Burns (1978) between transformational and transactional political leaders, Bass (1985) developed a model in which he distinguished transformational leadership—leaders who, through their personal influence, produce changes in the scale of their followers’ values, attitudes, and beliefs—from transactional leadership—characterized by establishing some sort of transaction between the leader and the group members. Bass also developed the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ), the first (and the most widely used) instrument designed to measure these two styles and the *laissez-faire* style (Hogg, 2010).

The many studies carried out with the MLQ (see the meta-analysis performed by Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996) have consistently shown that transformational leadership leads to higher subordinate performance and satisfaction levels than transactional leadership. Transactional leaders also produce positive effects on these variables, but such effects are always lower than those achieved by transformational leaders (e.g., Molero, Cuadrado, Navas, & Morales, 2007). Lastly, *laissez-faire* is negatively correlated to effectiveness and satisfaction.

Differences Between Women and Men in Leadership Styles

Autocratic vs. Democratic and Relationship- and Task-Oriented Styles

As indicated by Eagly and Johnson (1990) in regard to these styles, “leadership research provides an excellent opportunity to determine whether the behavior of leaders is gender stereotypic” (p. 236). Men are generally considered more autocratic and task oriented because of their relationship with the components of the “instrumental” dimension of gender stereotypes (e.g., aggressive, enterprising, independent, self-sufficient, dominant, competent, or rational). In contrast, women tend to be considered more democratic and relationship oriented because of their relationship with the components of the “communal” dimension (e.g., being concerned about others, generous, sensitive, understanding, affectionate, or compassionate). Two studies performed by Cann and Siegfried (1990) offer empirical support for this relationship between gender stereotypes and leadership styles. In the first study, respondents rated sex-typed traits on a scale ranging from “more like consideration” to “more like structuring.” Masculine traits were perceived to be consistent with structuring, whereas feminine characteristics were perceived

to be consistent with consideration. In the second study, subjects rated leader behaviors on a scale ranging from masculine to feminine. Consideration behaviors were perceived to be feminine, whereas structuring behaviors were perceived to be masculine.

Thus, consideration, leading democratically, and being interpersonally oriented are often referred to as feminine leadership styles, whereas being instrumental, task oriented, and autocratic are considered masculine leadership styles (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999; Klenke, 1996).

The meta-analysis carried out by Eagly and Johnson (1990) on gender differences in these styles revealed that women led with more democratic and participative styles than men. However, men were more autocratic or directive than women. It was also found that women were slightly more relationship oriented than men and that there were no differences in task-oriented styles. Yet, these last findings were moderated by the type of study performed (laboratory, assessment, and organizational studies). Thus, in the organizational studies—with real leaders—there were no differences between men and women. In the other two types of studies, where the participants did not have leadership roles, the differences were greater and gender stereotyped. In the autocratic and democratic styles, the differences remained consistent in all three types of studies.

Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Styles

In recent decades, research has drawn attention to gender differences in transformational and transactional leadership. As Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001, p. 787) indicate, transformational leadership contains “communal” aspects, especially the *individualized consideration* factor, which makes it a style more related to women. Van Engen, van der Leeden, and Willemsen (2001) also point out that transformational leadership can be considered a “feminine” style due to the emphasis that this type of leadership places on *intellectual stimulation* of the leader and the *individualized consideration* given to subordinates (characteristics related to the stereotypical attributes of women). They add that “many authors refer explicitly to this style as a feminine leadership style” (p. 583).

Until the publication of Eagly et al.’s (2003) meta-analysis, there were inconsistent and contradictory findings about these styles. Their results showed that women are more transformational and are more committed to contingent reward behavior (a transactional leadership component) than men. Male leaders display a behavior representing passive leadership styles more often than women: management by exception (active and passive) and *laissez-faire*. These differences were small, but Eagly et al. point out that they

prevailed in the overall meta-analysis as well as in auxiliary analyses. They also argue that small effects in methodological terms can have practical importance in natural settings. Examination of the study characteristics as moderators of the female advantage in transformational leadership yielded relatively few significant models. It is important to mention the relatively large sex difference in female management in educational and miscellaneous other organizations (health care, sports). According to Eagly et al., this result may reflect differences in organizational culture with some types of organizations providing a more congenial context for women's display of transformational leadership.

Subsequently, van Engen and Willemsen (2004) carried out another meta-analysis—with the studies published between 1987 and 2000—concerning gender differences in all leadership styles. Their findings confirm that women tend to use democratic and transformational leadership styles to a greater extent than men. They did not find any gender differences in the rest of the styles. The meta-analysis also reveals that context (both the type of organization and the work setting) is a moderator of sexual leadership style differences.

Summarizing, the meta-analytical results (Eagly et al., 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004) show that women adopt democratic and transformational leadership styles to a greater extent than men. Men adopt autocratic and passive leadership styles (*management by exception* and *laissez-faire*) more frequently than women. These and other meta-analyses (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992) also reveal the existence of variables that moderate these results.

The Present Research

The general purpose of this study is to clarify the debate on leadership styles, gender, and organizational outcome variables related to the scarce female presence in managerial positions. The study explores the differences between men and women's leadership styles, the effects of these styles on organizational outcome variables (effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort), as well as the influence of some organizational/contextual variables on the results (e.g., size and type of organization, sex typification of the main activity of the organization, numerically male- or female-dominated organizations).

Thus, we attempt to overcome some of the limitations detected in previous studies and to accomplish four goals:

1. To investigate gender differences in the main leadership styles studied from psychosocial and organizational approaches (auto-

- cratic vs. democratic, task- and relationship-oriented, transformational, transactional, and *laissez-faire*) to avoid misunderstanding from conclusions based on partial studies with different styles (see comments about this in Eagly & Johnson, 1990).
2. To consider the influence of important organizational/contextual variables on these results (e.g., type of activity, numerical predominance of persons of one or the other sex), because the review of the literature clearly reveals their influence (see, e.g., the meta-analyses of Eagly et al., 2003, and van Engen & Willemsen, 2004).
 3. To verify the existence of gender bias, based upon the meta-analysis carried out by Eagly et al. (1992, 1995), and the role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002), which showed that male evaluators rated female leaders less favorably than the counterpart male leaders, whereas female evaluators did not display gender bias.
 4. To measure both self-rating and subordinate rating of leadership style. It is important because of the tendency to self-rate favorably pointed out by Bass (1990). Furthermore, as many authors have indicated (Carless, 1998; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993; Lewis & Fagenson-Eland, 1998), self-report measurements tend to be more stereotyped than assessments made by others. In addition, a few studies have included both leader and subordinate gender as variables (Ayman, Korabik, & Morris, 2009; Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; Druskat, 1994; Komives, 1991a, 1991b; Maher, 1997).

According to the reviewed literature, our major prediction is that female leaders would be evaluated as more democratic, relationship oriented, and transformational than male leaders. In turn, male leaders would be evaluated as adopting more autocratic, task-oriented, transactional, and passive leadership styles than female leaders. More specifically, we predict that the gender of the subordinates and other contextual and organizational variables will moderate these results. Beyond these general predictions, our purposes are primarily descriptive and exploratory. Rather than set forth a series of speculative hypotheses, we prefer to present our study and to discuss and interpret our findings.

Method

Participants

Description of the Organizations. To avoid the results being due to a leadership style specific to the type of organization, we selected the work

teams according to the following criteria: activities developed by the organizations and whether these organizations were “numerically male-dominated, female-dominated, or gender-balanced.” We also tried to use approximately the same number of male and female leaders and to have the teams comprise at least four persons in addition to the leader.

The sample comprises a total of 226 participants belonging to 35 work teams (9 educational organizations, 4 health care organizations, 5 private bureaucratic organizations, 11 public bureaucratic organizations, 5 production organizations, and 1 citizen protection firm²). Of the work teams, 23 (65.7%) correspond to public organizations and 12 (34.3%) to private ones. The organizations were small—fewer than 20 persons (8; 22.9%), medium—from 21 to 300 persons (14; 40%), and large—over 300 persons (13; 37.1%).

Description of the Leaders. The sample included 16 men (45.7%), with an average age of 42.69 ($SD = 6.6$), and 19 women (54.3%), with an average age of 41.67 ($SD = 10.32$). About 62% of the leaders considered to develop mid-level management (40% men vs. 78% women) and 38% high-level management (60% men vs. 21.1% women). The average time in their respective organizations was 15.75 years ($SD = 7.62$) for men and 13.76 years ($SD = 9.04$) for women. The men had also held management positions for a longer time than the women ($M = 10.56$, $SD = 5.95$ and $M = 8.19$, $SD = 5.58$ for men and women, respectively). The average number of subordinates was 16.73 in the case of men and 48.12 for women, although there is great variability in this regard ($SD = 12.79$ and $SD = 17.64$, respectively). The majority of the participants had a university degree (40% diplomas and 31% bachelor’s degrees) and 20% of the leaders had completed secondary education (high school or vocational training).

Description of the Subordinates. A total of 191 people in subordinate positions participated, 69 were men (36.1%) and 118 were women (61.8%),³ with an average age of 35 years in both cases ($SD = 6.65$ and $SD = 7.89$, respectively). The average time they had been working under the person to be evaluated was 4 years in both cases ($SD = 4.14$ and $SD = 3.89$ for men and women, respectively).

Procedure

Before the final study was carried out, we administered the instrument to four work teams with characteristics similar to those of the people who would

²This type of organization was selected because it was exclusively male dominated, although it does not meet the criterion for including it in any of the above classifications.

³Four participants did not indicate their sex (2.1%).

subsequently respond to the questionnaire. We asked the participants to indicate any doubts or problems that arose during its completion. The final version of the instrument was based on these suggestions and comments.

Once the conditions for selecting the sample had been established, we contacted directly several persons in different organizations. In some cases we had to request official permits in order to perform the study. We contacted the leader and his/her subordinates, explained our goals to them, and provided instructions on how to complete the questionnaires. We told them that the information they were going to gather would remain confidential, and demonstrated this by having the questionnaires submitted inside an envelope. Later on, we asked the contact person or the leader himself/herself for relevant information about the organization (see the section on Measures) and we negotiated 2–3 weeks' time for picking up the completed questionnaires.

In all cases, the questionnaires were self-administered, and took an average of 30–45 minutes to fill out. Not all the contacted members of the work teams completed the questionnaires, nor were all the organizations we first contacted willing to let us carry out the study. We contacted 49 work teams of which 35 replied, a response rate of 71%. Thus, it took 7 months to collect the data in this study.

Measures

We designed two types of questionnaires. The first one was filled out by the leaders (Version L), and the second one was completed by the subordinates (Version S). The following instruments were used to measure the variables:

Leadership Styles. The autocratic vs. democratic and task- and relationship-oriented styles were measured using 20 items, 5 items per leadership style (see Appendix A). The items to evaluate autocratic and democratic styles were selected from classic (Lewin, 1939/1964; White & Lippitt, 1960) and contemporary definitions (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Luthar, 1996) in the literature. The items to evaluate task- and relationship-oriented styles were based on Yukl's (1999) definitions. Concretely, we selected the five items with the highest eigenvalues in the factor analysis obtained in his study (see Cuadrado, 2002, for a detailed description of the selection procedure for these items.)

To measure transformational, transactional, and *laissez-faire* styles, we used the MLQ-5R (Bass & Avolio, 1990). The Spanish version of the questionnaire, demonstrating good psychometric properties, was first

validated by Molero (1994) and has been used in several studies in Spain (Molero et al., 2007; Molero, Recio, & Cuadrado, 2010).

In Version L of the questionnaire, the participants were requested to indicate the frequency with which their management style was described in the items; in Version S, the subordinates were requested to say how often their superior behaved like the descriptions in the items. In all cases, the response scale varied from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost always*).

Leaders' Effectiveness. Following Bass and Avolio (1990), four questions related to the leader's effectiveness were posed, using a 5-point scale (1 = *not at all effective*; 5 = *extremely effective*). The three first items of Version L measured how effective the leader perceived himself/herself to be in different situations ("when representing your group to higher authority," "when fulfilling the job-related needs of supervising," and "when meeting the organization's needs or goals"), and in Version S, how effective the subordinate perceived his/her superior to be in those same situations. The fourth item measured the degree of general effectiveness perceived by the leader or the subordinates in their corresponding unit or department.

Subordinates' Extra Effort. This 3-item scale was embedded in the MLQ and answered with the same 5-point scale. It included the following items (Form S): "He/She gets me to do more than I thought I could," "He/She motivates us to do more than we thought we could," and "He/She raises our motivation to succeed."

Subordinates and Leaders' Satisfaction. There was one question about subordinates' satisfaction (Version S) or leaders' satisfaction (Version L): "How satisfied are you with the leadership methods used by your manager to get your group's job done?" (Version S), which was rated on a 5-point scale (1 = *very dissatisfied*; 5 = *very satisfied*). Another item included in Version L measured the leader's perception of "Subordinates' satisfaction with the way he/she manages them" (1 = *very dissatisfied*; 5 = *very satisfied*).

Sociodemographic and Organizational/Contextual Variables. Sociodemographic questions included in both questionnaires are age, sex, marital status, number of children, and type and level of education. Organizational questions included in Version L were position held, time with current employer and in managerial positions, number of hours worked per week, and number of persons under their supervision. In Version S, questions related to the organization were time with the current employer and time working with the superior who was evaluated, number of persons in his/her department or unit, and number of hours worked per week. Furthermore, for each one of the

groups that participated in the study, we filled out a sheet regarding several organizational aspects the groups belonged to (type of organization, whether public or private, size, main activity developed by the company, and gender-typed activity—male, female, or neutral—and number of men and women in the organization, both in positions of responsibility and as subordinates).

Data Analysis

Several factor and reliability analyses were conducted with the items used to measure each leadership style. The factor analyses for leadership styles were performed on the subordinates' sample. We did this for three main reasons: (a) as there were two different types of evaluation (that is, evaluation of subordinates vs. self-evaluation by leaders), the whole sample could not be included; (b) it is possible to obtain the leaders' self-ratings and the ratings by their subordinates in the same factors; and (c) when comparing the number of leaders participating ($n = 35$) with the number of items used (e.g., 70 for the MLQ), factor analysis would not have sufficient statistical guarantees.

In order to study the possible differences in the leadership styles of male and female leaders as well as effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction, both from their point of view and from the point of view of their subordinates, Student's t tests were performed. Lastly, several analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were carried out to study the influence of sociodemographic and organizational/contextual variables on the leadership styles adopted by men and women (from their point of view and from that of their subordinates).

Results

Factor Structure and Estimated Reliability of the Items to Measure Leadership Styles

Table 1 shows the results of the factor analysis (number of items and percentage of variance of each factor) and Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients. As observed, the autocratic factor was made up of four items.⁴ Although the alpha value for the autocratic factor was lower than for the democratic style, all of the items that comprise it were highly correlated with the total scale ($r = .68, p < .001$). The factor analysis performed with the ten items of task- and relationship-oriented styles confirmed the existence of two factors that explained 66% of the variance.

⁴All the items were included in this style except for "I refuse to allow group members to participate in decision making," which did not load on this factor.

Table 1
Factors, Number of Items, Percentage of Variance Extracted, Reliabilities, and Sample Items

Factors	Number of items	% variance	Alpha reliability coefficients	Sample items (Version S)
Autocratic	4	20	.63	Manages the group with an iron hand.
Democratic	5	39	.84	Encourages my participation in decision making.
Task	5	30	.83	Plans in detail how to accomplish an important task or project.
Relationship	5	36	.90	Provides encouragement and support when subordinates have a difficult or stressful task.
Transformational	32	28.96	.97	He/She emphasizes the use of intelligence to overcome obstacles.
Charisma (trust and respect)	4	4.64	.91	I feel good when he/she is around me.
Contingent reward I (reinforcing)	6	10.02	.90	When I do good work, he/she commends me.
Contingent reward II (negotiating)	7	5.59	.77	I get what I want in exchange for my cooperation.
Management by exception	5	4.15	.56	He/She does not try to make improvements as long as things are going smoothly.
<i>Laissez-faire</i>	4	3.21	.58	He/She avoids making decisions.

The factor analysis performed with the MLQ was forced to seven factors, which was the number in the original factor structure obtained by the authors of the questionnaire. One of the factors obtained was deleted due to its low reliability, leaving six interpretable factors that conjointly explain 56.5% of the variance: transformational, charisma (trust and respect), contingent reward I (reinforcing), contingent reward II (negotiating), management by exception, and *laissez-faire*. In general, the factor structure in this study is relatively similar to the one obtained by Bass and Avolio (1990): A clear distinction was observed between transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and *laissez-faire*. In this case, all the transformational leadership factors in the original structure were clustered together (as in Molero, 1994; and in Molero et al., 2010), except for some items regarding charisma that saturated on a differentiated factor (trust and respect). The factor contingent reward was divided into two: reinforcing leadership and negotiating leadership. This division, found in the studies by Cuadrado and Molero (2002) and Molero (1994), seems to indicate that, in Spanish samples, there is a more detailed and differentiated perception of the typical behaviors contained in this factor. Lastly, and in consonance with the original structure, there was one factor related to management by exception and another one related to *laissez-faire*.

The reliability of some factors was very good (.90 or higher for three of them) and adequate in general, as even in the factors that had a lower Cronbach's alpha, such as management by exception or *laissez-faire*, the correlations between the items and the total factor were high (management by exception: $r = .60$, $p < .001$; *laissez-faire*: $r = .67$, $p < .001$). These values are similar to those found by Bass and Avolio (1990) with a sample of 1,006 subordinates: higher reliabilities for transformational factors and contingent reward (from .84 to .90; in our study, from .77 to .97) and lower reliabilities for management by exception and *laissez-faire*, as also occurs in other studies (e.g., Molero, 1994). In view of these considerations, the factors obtained in this study are those used in subsequent analyses.

The Leadership Styles of Men and Women

*Self-Rating by Leaders.*⁵ The scores that male and female leaders assigned themselves in the different styles included in this work are shown in Table 2. No statistically significant differences were found in self-rating by male and

⁵Both the opinions of subordinates and leaders' self-ratings are usually used to determine the leadership style of leaders. Although the subordinates' opinions are more reliable and not as biased (Bass, 1990, p. 889; Bass & Avolio, 1990, p. 21), it is also important to determine the leaders' own opinions of the way they manage, because it enables us to know whether men and women differ in their perceptions of their leadership styles.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Leaders' Self-Evaluation of the Leadership Styles

Leadership factors	Female leaders		Male leaders	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Autocratic	3.08	.60	2.72	.79
Democratic	3.70	.58	4.06	.66
Task oriented	4.11	.61	4.25	.46
Relationship oriented	4.38	.38	4.38	.47
Transformational	3.73	.33	3.79	.36
Charisma	3.78	.64	3.92	.62
Reinforcing	3.89	.57	3.92	.60
Negotiating	2.78	.86	3.05	.60
Management by exception	3.74	.52	3.55	.67
<i>Laissez-faire</i>	2.61	.70	2.92	.78

Note. Scores could range from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost always*).

female leaders in any of the factors or styles measured. Leaders of both sexes believed their behavior was more typical of democratic than autocratic leadership, $t(33) = 4.92, p < .001$, and of the relationship-oriented more than the task-oriented style ($M = 4.40$ and $M = 4.17$, respectively, $t(33) = 2.36, p < .05$). The MLQ factor scores that leaders assign themselves showed that, regardless of their sex, they considered their behavior sufficiently reinforcing, charismatic, transformational, and frequently typical of management by exception (in all cases, the mean scores exceeded the theoretical middle point of the scale, $p < .001$). The lowest scores that male and female leaders assigned themselves were for *laissez-faire* (the only one in which male and female leaders gave themselves significantly less points than the theoretical mean of the scale, $p = .05$) and negotiating leadership. Below, the evaluation by subordinates is presented.

Evaluation by Subordinates. The scores that male and female subordinates assigned to the leaders in the leadership styles are shown in Table 3. In the subordinates' opinions, the behaviors of female leaders were more often typical of autocratic leadership than were men's behaviors ($M = 2.87$ and $M = 2.64$ for women and men, respectively, $t(184) = 1.94, p = .05$). Furthermore, this was significant only when the ratings were made by male

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Evaluation by Subordinates of the Leadership Styles

Factors	Subordinates' sex ^a	Female leaders		Male leaders	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Autocratic	Male	3.06	.69	2.55	.86
	Female	2.80	.90	2.64	.69
Democratic		3.56	.99	3.60	.92
Task oriented		3.68	.80	3.67	.93
Relationship oriented		3.74	1.00	3.67	1.05
Transformational		3.30	.74	3.30	.91
Charisma		3.98	1.02	3.85	1.06
Reinforcing		3.54	.98	3.36	.97
Negotiating	Male	2.82	.89	2.61	.78
	Female	2.72	.75	2.20	.78
Management by exception		3.78	.64	3.76	.66
<i>Laissez-faire</i>		3.08	.75	2.96	.96

Note. Scores could range from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost always*). ^aOnly shown when the subordinates' sex produces statistically significant differences.

subordinates ($M = 3.06$ and $M = 2.55$ for female and male leaders, respectively, $t(61.53) = 2.67$, $p < .05$). Also, coinciding with the leaders' perceptions, regardless of sex, subordinates evaluated their superiors as adopting the democratic leadership style more frequently than the autocratic style ($M = 3.59$ and $M = 2.76$, respectively, $t(173) = 8.06$, $p < .001$). Therefore, although the behavior of the autocratic style was not adopted too frequently (the mean scores were below the theoretical mean for the scale), women were evaluated as more autocratic than men due to the male subordinates' evaluations. With regard to task- and relationship-oriented styles, no statistically significant differences were found between the evaluations made for male and female leaders, either in general or depending on the subordinate's sex. Furthermore, the subordinates believed that the leaders' behaviors were highly representative of both styles. In all cases, the scores widely exceeded the theoretical middle point of the scale ($p < .001$).

With regard to the styles measured with the MLQ, the leaders in the study were rated by their subordinates as quite transformational and, above all,

charismatic. Furthermore, male and female leaders received similar evaluations in these styles, both by male and female subordinates. These results indicate that, in the subordinates' opinions, there was "good leadership" in the work teams that comprise our sample. Concerning transactional leadership, the subordinates considered that management by exception was the leadership style more frequently adopted by their leaders, regardless of their sex, followed by reinforcing leadership, and negotiating leadership, which was considered the leaders' least frequent leadership style (in contrast to the other factors, all the scores for this factor were below the theoretical middle point of the scale). This last factor (negotiating leadership) was the only one in which there were statistically significant differences between the evaluations for male and female leaders. The ANOVA of this style resulted in a leader's sex effect, $F(1, 149) = 7.46, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$, along with a subordinate's sex effect, $F(1, 149) = 3.81, p = .05, \eta^2 = .02$. Thus, in general, female leaders were rated by their subordinates as more frequently displaying a behavior typical of this style than did men ($M = 2.75$ vs. $M = 2.42$ for women and men, respectively, $t(149) = 2.59, p < .01$), and particularly when they were evaluated by women ($M = 2.72$ vs. $M = 2.20$ for female and male leaders, respectively, $p < .01$). Furthermore, male subordinates evaluated their male superiors as more negotiating than did the female subordinates ($M = 2.61$ vs. $M = 2.20, t(70) = 2.20, p < .05$). Finally, the results show that, according to their subordinates, male and female leaders display the same degree of *laissez-faire* behavior, with scores around the middle point of the scale.

To summarize the findings for the different leadership styles, subordinates definitely believed that, in general, men and women do not differ in the way they manage. The only differences found were in the styles that leaders adopt less frequently, that is autocratic and negotiating leadership. In both cases, subordinates believed that female leaders adopt a behavior that is typical of these styles more often than their male counterparts, and the ratings by male and female subordinates were different in these cases.

Effectiveness and Extra Effort

A common approach in determining which leadership styles are the "best" or "good" is to determine their relationships with different organizational outcome variables. Usually, their relationship is studied in terms of the effectiveness of the leader and of the managed team, and team member satisfaction (the more effectiveness and satisfaction, the "better" the style). In our study, another variable was included to provide information on how "appropriate" a particular leadership style is: the extra effort (inserted in the MLQ) that is achieved from subordinates (positive relationship expected with the "best" leadership style).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Leaders' Self-Evaluations and Evaluation by Subordinates of the Effectiveness and "Extra Effort"

	Female leaders		Male leaders	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Leaders' self-evaluations				
I represent group	4.17	.71	4.19	.54
I meet needs	3.67	.59	3.60	.74
I meet goals	3.89	.76	4.07	.46
Effectiveness of department	4.00	.69	4.07	.26
Total: overall perceived effectiveness	3.93	.51	3.97	.35
Extra effort	3.90	.59	3.57	.63
Subordinates' evaluations				
Represents group	4.08	.99	3.95	.97
Meets needs (satisfaction of needs)	3.79	.96	3.43	1.13
Meets goals	4.12	.91	3.92	.90
Effectiveness of department	4.00	.94	3.94	.82
Extra effort	3.13	1.12	3.08	1.05

Note. Scores could range from 1 (*not effective*) to 5 (*very effective*) in all the cases, except for extra effort, which could range from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost always*).

Concerning effectiveness, the items that measure this variable are clustered, giving rise to a new variable that we call "overall perceived effectiveness" ($\alpha = .69$ in the sample of leaders and $\alpha = .87$ in the subordinates). The three items that measure "extra effort" have reliability coefficients of .65 in the sample of leaders and of .88 in the sample of subordinates.

Leaders' Self-Evaluation. As shown in Table 4, the scores that male and female leaders assigned themselves in effectiveness are practically identical: Both considered themselves *rather effective* in carrying out their functions (in all cases, the scores exceeded the theoretical middle point of the scale, $p < .001$). Something similar occurred with the variable extra effort: The leaders of both sexes believed they were able to motivate their subordinates to work beyond their expectations.

Evaluation by Subordinates. As shown in Table 4, in general, subordinates also considered the male and female leaders *rather effective* in

carrying out their functions. However, statistically significant differences were observed between them with regard to satisfaction with work requirements of the team members, whereby, according to their subordinates, female leaders met these requirements better than did the males ($M = 3.79$ and $M = 3.43$, $t(169.25) = 2.26$, $p < .05$). Moreover, the analyses performed showed that neither male nor female subordinates considered the leaders of either sex more effective in the effectiveness measured by the first three items, but female subordinates had a better opinion of the effectiveness of the department managed by female than did the male subordinates ($M = 4.12$ and $M = 3.64$, $t(97) = 2.27$, $p < .05$).

To determine the rating difference by male and female subordinates concerning the "overall perceived effectiveness" by the leaders of different sex, we analyzed this variable based on the sex of the leader and of the subordinates. The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences (male subordinates: $t(65) = -.04$, $p = .97$; female subordinates: $t(112) = 1.44$, $p = .15$).

As shown in Table 4, the variable *extra effort* had the lowest scores (around the theoretical middle point of the scale) and the highest standard deviations, indicating that, in contrast to the results in the sample of leaders, the subordinates did not think that their superiors motivated them to work beyond their own expectations. There were no statistically significant differences in this variable either as a function of the sex of the leader or of the subordinate.

Satisfaction

Leaders' Self-Evaluation. Male and female leaders scored similarly in satisfaction with their own leadership methods ($M = 3.26$, $SD = .45$ and $M = 3.69$, $SD = .87$, respectively, for male and female leaders, $t(21.63) = -1.76$, $p = .09$), and also in their subordinates' perceived satisfaction with the way they managed ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .59$ vs. $M = 3.81$, $SD = .66$, $t(32) = -.68$, $p = .50$).

Evaluation by Subordinates. Subordinates' satisfaction with leadership methods of their male and female supervisors was similar both in general ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.04$ vs. $M = 3.28$, $SD = 1.15$, $t(189) = 1.38$, $p = .17$) and when considering the subordinate's sex.

Sociodemographic and Organizational/Contextual Variables

The results concerning the influence of the many sociodemographic and organizational/contextual variables included in this study (see the section on

Measures) on the leadership styles adopted by men and women far exceed the scope of this paper. However, we briefly present the most outstanding findings in this respect (for a detailed analysis, see Cuadrado, 2002). In general, the most influential variable is the *size of the organization* (small, medium, or large). In the opinion of the subordinates, the largest differences in leadership styles between male and female leaders are found in small companies, where, in all cases, women scored significantly higher than men in autocratic ($M = 3.28$ vs. $M = 2.41$, $F(2, 182) = 5.25$, $p < .01$), task-oriented ($M = 3.85$ vs. $M = 3.00$, $F(2, 179) = 3.61$, $p < .03$), relationship-oriented ($M = 3.99$ vs. $M = 3.19$, $F(2, 177) = 3.85$, $p < .03$), transformational ($M = 3.52$ vs. $M = 2.66$, $F(2, 146) = 3.60$, $p < .03$), reinforcing ($M = 3.88$ vs. $M = 2.88$, $F(2, 172) = 4.97$, $p < .01$), and negotiating ($M = 3.17$ vs. $M = 2.42$, $F(2, 148) = 4.07$, $p < .02$) styles.

Classifying the organizations in the study according to gender criteria provided interesting results. Specifically, they were classified according to their *activity* ("male sex-typed," "female sex-typed," or "gender-balanced") and the *percentage of men and women* in managerial positions in each of them ("numerically male-dominated" or "numerically female-dominated"). Thus, based on the literature (Bass, 1990; Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999), we considered "male sex-typed organizations" to be those that were involved in activities traditionally carried out by men (e.g., construction, transportation, finance, etc.), and "typically female" to be those involved in activities traditionally considered typical of women (e.g., health care, education, social services, etc.), and "gender-balanced" to be those involved in activities that are not performed mainly by either sex (e.g., public bureaucracy).

Following the suggestion of Kanter (1977), if women in a particular organization constitute less than 15% of both the general and management level workforce, it was deemed to be a "male-dominated organization." Similarly, if men constituted less than 15% of both the general and management level workforce of a particular organization, it was deemed to be a "female-dominated organization." We followed this criterion only on the managerial level and we concentrated on the results found when considering both criteria together (for a detailed analysis, see Cuadrado, Navas, & Molero, 2004).

According to the subordinates (regardless of their sex), male leaders in "numerically male-dominated" organizations and in "male sex-typed" activities adopted the following leadership styles less frequently than did female leaders in "numerically female-dominated" organizations and in "typically female" activities: democratic ($M = 3.51$ vs. $M = 4.01$, $t(41.45) = -2.30$, $p < .05$), reinforcing ($M = 3.08$ vs. $M = 3.72$, $t(50) = -2.55$, $p < .05$), and management by exception ($M = 3.43$ vs. $M = 3.88$, $t(53) = -2.58$, $p < .05$). These differences were not detected in the leaders' self-evaluations.

Discussion and Conclusions

The results show that, in general, male and female leaders who participated in the study perform leadership in similar ways. Thus, in leaders' self-evaluations, there are no statistically significant differences between men and women in any of the leadership styles. Likewise, in the subordinates' ratings, significant differences were only found in two of the styles analyzed: autocratic and negotiating leadership.

With regard to the autocratic leadership, we observed that male subordinates rated female leaders as adopting the autocratic leadership style significantly more often than male leaders. This result is contrary to our prediction and to those found in the literature (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004), where female leaders are evaluated as being more democratic than men, and in turn, men are more autocratic than women. It is also contrary to traditional gender stereotypes and the expectations for women as being more docile and, consequently, less assertive than men. Female leaders who participated in our study adopted (according to their subordinates) a style more in accordance with the traditional role of the leader—male stereotyped—more frequently than did their male counterparts, perhaps in an attempt to gain the respect of their subordinates, mainly men, who may still find it “strange” that their superior is a woman. Nevertheless, male subordinates may also perceive the same behavior displayed by a woman as much more autocratic than if it is displayed by a man, from whom they expect management. In any case, these results are in line with the phenomenon “*think manager-think male*” verified in various studies in different countries (see Bosak & Sczesny, 2008; Schein, 2001; Sczesny, 2003).

The absence of differences between male and female leaders in both types of evaluation (leaders' self-ratings and ratings by subordinates) in task- and relationship-oriented styles confirms the results found in the meta-analyses performed on this issue (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004), but it does not match the traditional gender stereotypes suggesting that women are more relationship oriented and less task oriented (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Wohlers, 1986; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Steffen, 1984). Both male and female leaders who participated in our study grant the same importance to task-related aspects as to aspects that create a working environment in which good relations among the team members predominate.

Lastly, evaluation both by leaders and subordinates shows that male and female leaders adopt a typical behavior of the transformational and transactional leadership styles with similar frequency. This confirms the results of some studies in which men and women do not differ in the frequency with which they adopt these styles (Komives, 1991a, 1991b; Maher, 1997; van Engen et al., 2001), but it does not coincide with the results of the

meta-analyses about this issue (Eagly et al., 2003; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004), in which, along general lines, female leaders are evaluated as more transformational than their male colleagues. However, women are evaluated by their subordinates as displaying a behavior that is significantly more typical of negotiating leadership (a style adopted infrequently in our study) than do male leaders. Specifically, women perceive their female superiors as significantly more negotiating than men, and furthermore, they consider male leaders significantly less negotiating than male subordinates do. These results, taken together, suggest that male and female leaders perceive that they negotiate to the same extent with their male subordinates, but the female subordinates perceive that female leaders negotiate with them more often than do male leaders.

To summarize our findings, the only statistically significant sex differences between leaders are observed in the evaluation by subordinates. Thus, female leaders are rated as more autocratic and negotiating than their male colleagues. This finding may be a contradiction, which could be explained on the basis of the subordinates' sex (men in the first case, and women in the second one).

That female leaders (in their subordinates' opinions) adopt more frequently than their male counterparts the leadership styles most related to power—which is traditionally male—may be due to their need to achieve success in their organizations. That is, just as reported in numerous other studies (Druskat, 1994; Eagly et al., 1992; Rosener, 1990), women who occupy positions of leadership in “traditional” organizations (such as those included in this study) may conform to male norms and stereotypes that have traditionally dominated in these positions in order to avoid being perceived as inadequate to the role of a leader (García-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006, 2009). Men, however, manage as they see fit. Women may also need to reaffirm their power more than men do and, therefore, they employ traditionally male styles more often than their male counterparts. In any case, these results are not in harmony with the predictions that are derived from the role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002), according to which women would avoid the use of typically male styles more frequently than men.

According to Eagly and Johnson (1990), men and women may not differ in their leadership styles because they are presumably subjected to similar selection criteria, or because organizational socialization matches their styles. That is, everyone who holds these positions has a series of characteristics that lead them to adopt similar leadership styles, or the fact that they hold these positions in a certain organization matches their styles. These could be the reasons that justify a good part of the results obtained in our study. In the second place, Eagly and Johnson (1990) explain that women's adaptation to

male leadership models prevailing in organizations cancels out the differences between men and women. In our case, it is possible that this argument caused the opposite effect: The adoption by women of more stereotypically masculine styles could explain the only differences found in autocratic and negotiating leadership styles.

In general, the male and female leaders who participated in this study seemed to be quite effective in carrying out their functions, both from their own point of view and from that of their subordinates. With regard to gender differences in this variable, male and female leaders evaluate themselves similarly, but their subordinates find that female leaders are significantly more effective than men in satisfying the needs of the team members, which is consistent with the traditional female role (women are more "concerned with others"). Furthermore, female subordinates, in comparison to their fellow male workers, consider that departments managed by women are significantly more effective. These results contradict, to some extent, Eagly et al.'s (1995) findings in their meta-analysis about gender and effectiveness of leaders, according to which men consider same-sex leaders to be more effective, whereas women do not prefer one sex to the other in their evaluation of effectiveness. Our results show an opposite tendency: Female subordinates, but not male subordinates, tend to show in-group bias.

Lastly, the results in regard to satisfaction and extra effort reveal that there are no differences between male and female leaders in these variables, either in leaders' self-evaluation or in evaluation by subordinates.

Therefore, in our study, female leaders were not rated worse than men when their styles were stereotypically male (e.g., autocratic), nor is there any biased tendency in male subordinates in favor of leaders of their own sex, as Eagly et al. (1992) found in their meta-analysis. Possible explanations for this finding may be that whereas the in-group bias in men may have been alive and well in 1992, society has evolved in many ways since then, and perhaps men now accept women as leaders. Along this line, as we have observed, some of our results question the existence of this in-group bias in men, having found the opposite tendency. That is, there appears to be an effect of "gender solidarity" among the women in our study that may be a product of gender (the situation of women as a group dominated rather than dominating leads them to define themselves, and to be defined in relation to the opposite sex and to favor persons of their own sex), status (the greater "gender solidarity" is due to positions with lower status in organizations than they normally hold), or as a reflection of common processes under which the above variables and others exert their effects (see Fajak & Haslam, 1998).

Ultimately, it seems that women in small companies develop certain leadership styles more often than men, perhaps because they feel they are freer to carry out their roles in the way they deem best. But when both the

gender criteria are used to classify the organizations in the study (“type of activity developed by the organization” and “numerical male- or female-domination in managerial positions”), it may be observed that the congruence between the leader’s sex (female), the type of organization (feminine), and the numerical predominance in managerial positions (women) produces a stronger adoption of leadership styles congruent with feminine stereotypes (“democratic” and “reinforcing”). This result supports those defending a relationship between the type of organization and a leadership style more “typical” of women (Druskat, 1994; Eagly et al., 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999; Rosener, 1990; van Engen et al., 2001), as well as the role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002). However, in none of these studies did women adopt a more passive style of leadership than men, as observed in our work with respect to management by exception.

The implications of these results are clear. When female leaders work in contexts in which women predominate in managerial positions (that is, in decision making), and whose main activity is considered female sex typed, they show a more congruent style with the feminine stereotype. These contexts may correspond to the ones that Druskat (1994) calls “non-traditional” or to those that Rosener (1990) refers to as “flexible,” in which a “natural” style, typical of women, may appear in management. Therefore, here is where women will not experience any conflict between the performance of their role as a leader and the expectations associated with their sex, defended by the role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002). However, in the present study, we do not include “non-traditional” organizations, so we cannot confirm these statements. Other limitations of our study are the unequal distribution of the work teams as a function of the activity they perform (e.g., educational, health care, production), as well as the reduced number of leaders in the sample. Future research should examine the leadership styles of men and women in the attempt to overcome these limitations.

In view of our results, it is difficult to explain women’s underrepresentation in managerial positions just because their leadership style is clearly different from men’s (the differences are found in 2 out of 10 styles or factors measured). Nor could we explain it by supposedly lower levels of satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort achieved by female leaders from their subordinates.

It seems, nevertheless, that the organizational context may be one of the factors that impede access of women to positions of management insofar as a rather large number of organizations still promote certain leadership styles (generally male). Eagly and Karau (2002) point out the prejudice toward female leaders as coming from the incongruence between the predominantly

“communal” qualities that perceivers associate with women and the predominantly “agentic” attributes that are supposed to be necessary to be successful as a leader. Therefore, this pattern of findings is consistent with the results obtained in other English language studies, and it suggests general cross-cultural patterns. It remains to be seen whether this generality, as well as other results found in this study that are not in accordance with the literature, extends to nations and cultures more dissimilar than Spain and Anglo-American countries and cultures.

From this viewpoint, “appropriate” leadership positions for women would be limited to organizations involved in traditionally feminine activities and/or contexts in which there is a predominance of women in managerial positions. It seems obvious that there are few organizations that can meet both criteria.

However, and partly due to the difficulties they must face, some women develop a process of self-exclusion when trying to gain access to managerial positions, as they are not willing to break the stereotype and the traditional female expectations and deal with the personal and social difficulties encountered in such professional advancement. This phenomenon has recently been labeled the *labyrinth metaphor* (Eagly & Carli, 2007), in reference to the sum of many obstacles along the way faced by women.

The solution, as pointed out by Eagly and Karau (2002; see also Eagly, 2003, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2007), would entail a change in gender roles, in those of leadership, or in both. Joining the optimistic viewpoint of these authors, changes in the organizational settings and valuing of stereotypically female styles will favor the presence of women in future managerial positions (see Cuadrado et al., 2008). Doubtless, both men and women can make significant contributions to organizations, although we must be aware that the required shifts will not come about as quickly as we would like.

Acknowledgment

The authors wish to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions to improve the paper.

References

- Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Wohlers, A. J. (1986). Gender stereotypes. In R. D. Ashmore & F. K. Del Boca (Eds.), *The social psychology of female-male relations: A critical analysis of central concepts* (pp. 69–119). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

- Ayman, R., Korabik, K., & Morris, S. (2009). Is transformational leadership always perceived as effective? Male subordinates' devaluation of female transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*, 852–879.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45*, 5–34.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Bosak, J., & Sczesny, S. (2008). Am I the right candidate? Self-ascribed fit of women and men to a leadership position. *Sex Roles, 58*, 682–688.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cann, A., & Siegfried, W. D. (1990). Gender stereotypes and dimensions of effective leader behaviour. *Sex Roles, 23*, 413–419.
- Carless, S. A. (1998). Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Roles, 39*, 887–902.
- Cuadrado, I. (2002). *Estilos de liderazgo y género: Una perspectiva psicosocial* [Leadership styles and gender: A psychosocial perspective]. Doctoral dissertation. Published in electronic edition. ISBN 84-8240-597-7. Almería: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Almería.
- Cuadrado, I., & Molero, F. (2002). Liderazgo transformacional y género: autoevaluaciones de directivos y directivas españoles [Transformational leadership and gender: Spanish managers' self-ratings]. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 18*, 39–55.
- Cuadrado, I., Navas, M. S., & Molero, F. (2004). El acceso de las mujeres a puestos directivos: género, contexto organizacional y estilos de liderazgo [Women's access to managerial positions: Gender, organizational context and leadership styles]. *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada, 57*, 181–192.
- Cuadrado, I., Morales, J. F., & Recio, P. (2008). Women's access to managerial position: An experimental study about leadership styles and gender. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 11*, 55–65.

- De Cremer, D. (2007). Emotional effects of distributive justice as a function of autocratic leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*, 1385–1404.
- Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *Leadership Quarterly, 5*, 99–119.
- Dumdum, R. U., Lowe, K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (pp. 35–66). New York: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H. (2003). The rise of female leaders. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie, 34*, 123–132.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 1–12.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003a). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 807–834.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003b). Finding gender advantage and disadvantage: Systematic research integration is the solution. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 851–859.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston: Harvard University Business School Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *The Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 781–797.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 233–256.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573–598.
- 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*, 735–754.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 3–22.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 125–145.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 569–591.

- European Commission. (2010). *More women in senior positions—Key to economic stability and growth*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fajak, A., & Haslam, S. A. (1998). Gender solidarity in hierarchical organizations. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 73–94.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foels, R., Driskell, J. E., Mullen, B., & Salas, E. (2000). The effects of democratic leadership on group member satisfaction: An Integration. *Small Group Research*, 31, 676–701.
- García-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles*, 55, 51–61.
- García-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2009). Causal attributions about feminine and leadership roles: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40, 492–509.
- 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, 301–315.
- Gastil, J. (1994). A meta-analytic review of the productivity and satisfaction of democratic and autocratic leadership. *Small Group Research*, 25, 384–410.
- Halpin, A. W. (1957). *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Heilman, M., Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 935–942.
- Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 269–298). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its descriptions and measurement* (pp. 6–38). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hogg, M. A. (2010). Influence and leadership. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 1166–1207). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755–768.
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones?: The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 36–51.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Klenke, K. (1996). *Women and leadership: A contextual perspective*. New York: Springer.
- Komives, S. R. (1991a). Gender differences in the relationship of Hall Directors' transformational and transactional leadership and achieving styles. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 155–165.
- Komives, S. R. (1991b). The relationship of same- and cross-gender work pairs to staff performance and supervisor leadership in Residence Hall units. *Sex Roles, 24*, 355–363.
- Korabik, K., Baril, G. L., & Watson, C. (1993). Managers' conflict management style and leadership effectiveness: The moderating effects of gender. *Sex Roles, 29*, 405–420.
- Lefkowitz, J. (1994). Sex-related differences in job attitudes and dispositional variables: Now you see them. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 323–349.
- Lewin, K. (1939/1964). Experiments in social space. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers by Kurt Lewin* (pp. 71–83). New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271–301.
- Lewis, A. E., & Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (1998). The influence of gender and organization level on perceptions of leadership behaviors: A self and supervisor comparison. *Sex Roles, 39*, 479–502.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385–425.
- Luthar, H. K. (1996). Gender differences in evaluation of performance and leadership ability: Autocratic vs. democratic managers. *Sex Roles, 35*, 337–361.
- Maher, K. J. (1997). Gender-related stereotypes of transformational and transactional leadership. *Sex Roles, 37*, 209–225.
- Molero, F. (1994). *Carisma y liderazgo carismático: una aproximación empírica desde las perspectivas de Bass y Friedman*. [Charisma and char-

- ismatic leadership: An empirical approach from the perspectives of Bass and Friedman*]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Madrid: UNED.
- Molero, F., Cuadrado, I., Navas, M., & Morales, J. F. (2007). Relations and effects of transformational leadership: A comparative analysis with traditional leadership styles. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *10*, 358–368.
- Molero, F., Recio, P., & Cuadrado, I. (2010). Liderazgo transformacional y liderazgo transaccional: un análisis de la estructura factorial del MLQ en muestras españolas [Transformational and transactional leadership: An analysis of the factor structure of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in a Spanish sample]. *Psicothema*, *22*, 495–501.
- Morrison, A., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *The American Psychologist*, *45*, 200–208.
- Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Powell, G., & Butterfield, D. (1994). Investigating the “glass ceiling” phenomenon: An empirical study of actual promotions to top management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 68–86.
- Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (1984). The “high-high” leader rides again! *Group & Organization Studies*, *9*, 437–450.
- Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, *68*, 119–125.
- Schein, V., & Mueller, R. (1992). Sex role stereotyping and requisite management characteristics: A cross cultural look. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*, 439–447.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women’s progress in management. *The Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 675–688.
- Szesny, S. (2003). A closer look beneath the surface: Various facets of the think-manager-think-male stereotype. *Sex Roles*, *49*, 353–363.
- Van Engen, M. L., & Willemsen, T. K. (2004). Sex and leadership styles: A meta-analysis of research published in the 1990s. *Psychological Reports*, *94*, 3–18.
- Van Engen, M. L., Van Der Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T. K. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74*, 581–598.
- Vecchio, R. P. (2002). Leadership and gender advantage. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 643–671.
- Vecchio, R. P. (2003). In search of gender advantage. *Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 835–850.
- White, R. K., & Lippitt, R. (1960). *Autocracy and democracy: An experimental inquiry*. New York: Harper.

- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2010). Gender. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 629–667). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 33–48.

Appendix A: Items Used to Measure Leadership Styles

Autocratic vs. Democratic Leadership

Autocratic style	Democratic style
1. The leader determines all policies regarding group activities and procedures (adapted from Lewin, 1939/1964; White & Lippitt, 1960).	1. Policies are a matter of group decision and discussion with active encouragement and assistance by the leader (adapted from Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Luthar, 1996).
2. The leader manages the group with an iron hand (adapted from White & Lippitt, 1960).	2. The leader encourages group members' participation in decision making (adapted from Lewin, 1939/1964; White & Lippitt, 1960).
3. Techniques and activity steps are communicated by the leader (adapted from Lewin, 1939/1964; White & Lippitt, 1960).	3. The leader shares information with the group (adapted from Lewin, 1939/1964; White & Lippitt, 1960).
4. The leader takes responsibility for assigning the work activities and the fellow workers of each group member (adapted from White & Lippitt, 1960).	4. The leader tries to encourage group members to make choices (adapted from Lewin, 1939/1964; White & Lippitt, 1960).
5. The leader refuses to allow group members to participate in decision making (adapted from Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Luthar, 1996).	5. Everyone is free to work with whomever he or she chooses, and the division or responsibility is left up to the group (adapted from Lewin, 1939/1964; White & Lippitt, 1960).

Task- and Relationship-Oriented Leadership

Task-oriented style	Relationship-oriented style
1. Plans in detail how to accomplish an important task or project.	1. Provides encouragement and support when you have a difficult or stressful task.
2. Provides a clear explanation of your responsibilities with regard to a task or project.	2. Backs you up and supports you in a difficult situation.
3. Clearly explains what results are expected for a task or project.	3. Gives you credit for helpful ideas and suggestions.
4. Determines what resources are needed to carry out a project.	4. Consults you to get your reactions and suggestions before making a decision that affects you.
5. Determines how to organize and coordinate work activities to avoid delays, duplication of effort, and wasted resources.	5. Provides opportunities to develop your skills and show what you can do.