
Leadership

Why Gender and Culture Matter

Roya Ayman
Karen Korabik

Illinois Institute of Technology
University of Guelph

For decades, understanding of leadership has been largely based on the results of studies carried out on White men in the United States. We review major theories and models of leadership as they pertain to either gender or culture. We focus on 3 approaches to leadership: trait (including leadership categorization or implicit leadership theory), behavioral (including the two-factor, transformational–transactional leadership, and leader–member exchange models), and contingency (i.e., contingency model of leadership effectiveness and normative decision making). We discuss how dynamics related to either culture or gender (e.g., stereotypes and schemas, ingroup–outgroup interaction, role expectations, power and status differentials) can have an important impact on many aspects of leadership.

Keywords: leadership, gender, culture, diversity, ethnicity

Almost two decades have passed since the *American Psychologist* highlighted the importance of diversity in leadership (e.g., Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). However, although interest in the role of diversity in leadership persists, the nature of the issues has changed since then. For example, during the 1990s the glass ceiling was a widespread metaphor used to explain why women and ethnic-cultural minorities often lacked access to leadership roles. Today, women and ethnic-cultural minorities still confront many leadership-related challenges. However, Eagly and Carli (2007) characterized these as taking the form of a labyrinth or maze consisting of many barriers that they must negotiate.

The articles in the recent special issue on leadership in the *American Psychologist* (Sternberg, 2007), although recognizing the contributions of individual men and women leaders from various cultural backgrounds, were largely founded on the assumption that leadership and its effectiveness are universal. Although for the most part the authors acknowledged the general importance of situational contingencies (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Zaccaro, 2007) and culture (Avolio, 2007) as contextual circumstances in determining leadership, they presented leadership as a phenomenon that is primarily gender and culture neutral. Thus, their focus was on the similarities, rather than the differences, among the situations faced by men and women leaders and leaders from various cultures and ethnic backgrounds. Taking this stance, however, fails to acknowledge that additional factors related to the labyrinth (e.g., stereo-

types and schemas, ingroup–outgroup dynamics, role expectations, power and status differentials, and differential attributions made about and rewards given for similar behavior) can have an important impact on many aspects of leadership. Moreover, because these factors privilege those in majority groups, they can create obstacles that women and ethnic-cultural minorities need to overcome if they are to attain positions of leadership or be successful once they have done so.

We contend that studying leadership without the specific inclusion of the role of gender and culture limits the scope of knowledge in this area. At a practical level, a lack of attention to these factors and the dynamics that they produce can create problems (Chin & Sanchez-Hucles, 2007) in the development of the leaders of tomorrow. If leaders are to be effective in a diverse society, they need to understand their own preferred style and behaviors and how these may differ from those preferred by others. Otherwise, their interactions with others are likely to be fraught with misattributions, misunderstandings, and misinterpretations. At a basic scientific level, failure to include diverse groups in research limits the validity and generalizability of findings and the inclusivity of theories. By contrast, culturally inclusive research has many benefits, including expanding on theories, increasing the range of variables, unconfounding variables, and understanding the context in which behavior occurs (Triandis & Brislin, 1984).

The purpose of this article is to illustrate why gender and culture matter in our understanding of leadership. We first briefly define each concept. We then review the major mainstream theoretical approaches to the study of leadership, presenting the key findings pertaining to gender and culture. We acknowledge that gender and culture coexist in a symbiotic relationship. In addition, we argue that gender and culture have parallel dynamics in relation to leadership. However, because in the leadership literature very few studies have examined their joint effects, we discuss gender and culture separately.

Roya Ayman, Institute of Psychology, Illinois Institute of Technology; Karen Korabik, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Roya Ayman, Institute of Psychology, Illinois Institute of Technology, 3101 South Dearborn, Life Science Building, Room 252, Chicago, IL 60616. E-mail: ayman@iit.edu



Roya Ayman

Definitions

Culture

Many have debated the definition of culture (Triandis, 1996). Overall, most agree with Kluckhohn's (1951) definition that culture is an acquired and transmitted pattern of shared meaning, feeling, and behavior that constitutes a distinctive human group. There are two reasons why it is necessary to distinguish among the definitions of culture, ethnicity, and gender. First, different leadership researchers have used different definitions when referring to these concepts. Second, leaders in a diverse and multicultural society need to become aware of these distinctions.

Although phenomenological discussions continue, culture primarily can be operationalized in two different ways, based on existing leadership research. The first is by means of characteristics that are visible and on the surface, such as country boundaries (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997) or individuals' physical characteristics (e.g., skin color, hair texture, eye shape). These visible characteristics allow for categorization of people into social groups (e.g., by country or nationality).

The second operationalization is in terms of more invisible and deeper differences among people (e.g., their values and personalities). For example, Hofstede (2001) identified four cultural values that can define cultural categories at the country level (i.e., individualism–collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity–femininity). The underlying assumption tying together these two operationalizations of culture is that people who look alike, have similar languages, or live within the same geographic boundaries will have similar cultural values. In today's global village, however, this is not always the case. In a diverse and pluralistic society, many groups of people live

together. These groups may vary in their appearance, in their cultural values, or in both—as do members of various ethnic groups.

Connerley and Pedersen (2005) proposed a more integrated definition of culture. They considered it to be a complex (multidimensional and multilevel) and dynamic phenomenon consisting of both visible and invisible characteristics that may influence leadership. Their categories of culture include demographic characteristics (e.g., place of residence and physical gender), status characteristics (e.g., economic and educational variables), ethnographic characteristics (e.g., nationality, ethnicity, and language), and affiliations. These cultural categories are socially constructed and become imbued with meaning. Therefore, people who differ from one another on these categories can “experience the world in different ways whether those differences are based on internal differences, external differences in the way they are treated by others, or a combination of the two” (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005, p. 4).

In leadership research, cultural differences are often studied with either a single visible or invisible cultural marker. Among these markers, national boundary, gender, and ethnicity are the subsets of culture that have been examined most often. In this article we include the research pertaining to national boundary, ethnicity, and cultural values in the section on culture. Because there is a large volume of research that has been directed specifically at gender and leadership, we have chosen to dedicate a separate section to gender.

Gender

Since the 1970s researchers have noted the need to differentiate between gender and sex (Bem, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975), and they have defined gender (i.e., whether someone is a woman or man) as pertaining to the psychosocial ramifications of biological sex (i.e., whether they are female or male; Unger, 1979). Most often researchers operationalize gender by either observing the behavior of men and women or by asking them to self-report whether they are male or female. In this article we use the term *sociodemographic gender* to refer to this aspect of gender.

Gender, however, consists of much more than sociodemographic gender. Gender is a multidimensional and multilevel phenomenon with many different facets (Korabik, 1999). These include intrapsychic aspects such as gender schemas and stereotypes; gender-role identity; and gender-role traits, attitudes, and values (Bem, 1993). They also include the manner in which men and women interact with one another (Deaux & Major, 1987) and the social roles that they are expected to, and frequently do, enact in a society (Eagly, 1987). Moreover, gender is an ascribed status characteristic. Men's higher social status means that they have more access to power and resources than women do and, consequently, they are accorded greater privilege (Ridgeway, 1992). Thus, gender is both “a hierarchical structure of opportunity and oppression as well as an affective structure of identity and cohesion” (Ferree, 1995, p. 125).



**Karen
Korabik**

Gender, Culture, and Leadership

A direct parallel exists between the dynamics that are due to culture and those that are due to gender. Both culture and gender have physical (visible) and value (invisible) components. Both affect identity and group cohesion, interpersonal interactions, and access to power and resources. The cultural and ethnic values that people hold are learned intrapsychic beliefs in the same way that gender-role beliefs and attitudes are. The physical characteristics that differentiate people into different cultural and ethnic groups act as markers of status that prime stereotypes and endow privilege in the same manner that gender does. We now present an overview of how these dynamics operate in a leadership context, with gender as an example. Similar dynamics would be expected to occur for culture.

Perspectives on gender and leadership.

When one examines research on gender and leadership, it is important to distinguish between the manner in which the research has been carried out and the manner in which it has been interpreted. Most research on gender and leadership has been carried out by applying the sociodemographic definition of gender. Thus, a plethora of studies have been conducted examining how men and women differ from one another in their leadership style, behavior, and effectiveness. The authors of some of these studies did not specify a theory about why gender is expected to have an impact on leadership, whereas those of the remainder drew upon a number of different theoretical perspectives when interpreting their findings. These include androgyny theory (Bem, 1974), social role theory (Eagly, 1987), expectation states theory (Berger, Wagner, & Zelditch, 1985), and status characteristics theory (Ridgeway, 1992). To bring some conceptual clarity to the literature, Korabik and Ayman (2007) have delineated three of the most common

theoretical positions that underlie the study of gender and leadership. These are the intrapsychic perspective, the social structural perspective, and the interpersonal perspective, respectively.

Research done from the intrapsychic perspective focuses primarily on the internal intrapsychic characteristics of the leader. Here gender encompasses such things as gender schema; gender identity; and gender-role traits, attitudes, and values that are acquired through gender-role socialization. According to the intrapsychic perspective, the leader's intrapsychic gender-role characteristics (e.g., instrumentality/masculinity/agency and expressivity/femininity/communion) matter because they affect the leader's preferred style, behavior, and outcomes regardless of whether the leader is a man or a woman. Research done from this perspective might, for example, examine the impact that a leader's gender-role orientation (i.e., instrumentality, expressivity, or androgyny) has on his or her behavior and the outcomes achieved.

Some theorists who have adopted the social structural perspective focus on the different social roles that men and women are expected to play in society (Eagly, 1987). According to this formulation, the qualitative differences in men's and women's normative roles affect their leadership behavior and outcomes. Here, gender is important because the perception that men's roles are more congruent with the leadership role than are those of women can result in prejudice against women leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Other theorists who have adopted the social structural perspective have emphasized the status differences between men and women (Ridgeway, 1992). They have viewed sociodemographic gender as a visible status marker that affects others' perceptions, observations, and evaluations of leaders.

According to the social structural perspective, different outcomes will be attained by men and women leaders under certain conditions. This is because men are attributed higher status and privilege, and they are more likely to be in leadership roles that are congruent with their sociodemographic gender. In contrast, women are perceived as having lower status and less privilege, and the leadership role is seen as being incongruent with their sociodemographic gender. Meta-analytic findings support this perspective by indicating that women leaders are viewed as being less effective when they are in male-dominated settings or leadership roles that are defined as more masculine (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995).

The interpersonal interaction perspective focuses on how leaders interact with their superiors, coworkers, and subordinates. This approach incorporates aspects of both the intrapsychic and social structural perspectives because interactions are viewed as a function of both sociodemographic gender cues, which are more visible and overt, and gender-related beliefs and expectations both about the self (schemas) and about others (stereotypes), which are less visible and more covert. In addition, these processes are influenced by situational cues (e.g., gender-typed tasks, skewed gender ratios in groups) that make gender more or less salient and induce priming. According to the interper-

sonal interaction perspective, gender makes a difference because men and women leaders will have different types of social interactions with their men and women supervisors, peers, and subordinates, and these interactions will influence the outcomes experienced by each party (Ayman, 1993; Korabik & Ayman, 2007).

Korabik and Ayman (2007) proposed an integrative model of gender and leadership that combines elements from each of these three perspectives. Here leadership is seen as a social interaction between leaders and their supervisors, peers, and subordinates. The nature of this interaction is influenced by intrapsychic processes (e.g., gender-role orientation, gender-role attitudes and values) in all of the parties. However, these processes are not as salient and observable as is someone's sociodemographic gender. Therefore, sociodemographic gender acts as a marker of status and privilege, as well as of expectations about prescribed role behaviors. As such it is a cue that activates stereotypes and attributions that affect initial judgments and evaluations. These processes are moderated by a variety of contextual cues (e.g., gender-typed tasks, skewed gender ratios in groups). The literature on gender and leadership supports this model by demonstrating that the following play an important part in the leadership process: gender-role socialization; gender-role beliefs, attitudes, and expectations; gender stereotypes; gender-based status differentials; group gender composition; and the gendered nature of tasks.

Culture and leadership. In a diverse workforce, people from different cultural or social groups must constantly interact with each other. In such settings, people's own cultural identities and their assumptions about and perceptions of others from different social groups (e.g., White and African American, Latino and Asian) relate to ingroup-outgroup dynamics, and these assumptions and perceptions may have an impact on the leadership experience (Ayman, 2004a). In these types of situations, the composition of dyads or work groups based on their gender or culture matters because it can affect a leader's ability to be successful. For example, in an experiment in which a Japanese leader behaved either as an American leader would or as a Japanese leader would, his American followers did not consider him to be as trustworthy when he was behaving like an American leader compared with when he behaved like a Japanese leader (Thomas & Ravlin, 1995).

Moreover, the increasing diversity in today's workforce means that to be effective, leaders need to develop a multicultural perspective and an understanding of the points of view of those who differ from themselves (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). Doing so involves two things: (a) eliminating ethnocentrism (i.e., the belief that one's cultural values are the same as everyone else's, regardless of the evidence) and (b) increasing isomorphic attributions or the extent that people from culturally diverse social groups are able to reach a similar assessment of a given situation or action (Triandis, 1995). The elimination of ethnocentrism, by reducing the imposition of one's frame of reference on others, can result in less hostile judgments toward those in outgroups (Duckitt, Callaghan, & Wagner,

2005). In addition, by reducing the ethnocentrism present in leadership research, leadership models can become more inclusive of other cultures and representative of all social groups.

Gender, culture, and leadership. To develop more inclusive theories of leadership, both emic and etic perspectives (Berry, 1997; Gelfand, Raver, & Ehrhart, 2002) need to be included. The emic approach means studying leadership from within a culture or a social group, whereas the etic approach allows for validation of theories and models of leadership across genders and cultural settings. A version of the etic approach, imposed etic, is when a theory or a measure developed within one social group is validated in another. In leadership, most theories have been developed in North America and embody a primarily ethnocentric viewpoint. One of the effects of this situation is that the theory can privilege certain types of scientific knowledge and marginalize other viewpoints (McIntosh, 2003). Leadership researchers rarely have done cross-cultural studies to learn the limitations of their theories. Moreover, when validating their theories on other groups or in other countries, they rely on an imposed etic approach. Their interest has not been to understand how the theories worked, but only in seeing that they worked. To form an allocentric theory, as Triandis (1995) advised, researchers need a more inclusive effort where scholars from various countries using differing methods come together to share and gradually put together the pieces of the puzzle.

Furthermore, it is important to examine whether existing leadership constructs have similar equivalence of meaning across gender and cultures, as well as across sources (e.g., leader's self-report and subordinates' reports). As Raju, Laffitte, and Byrne (2002, p. 517) said, "Without measurement equivalence, it is difficult to interpret observed mean score differences meaningfully." Findings from meta-analyses on gender or cultural differences in leadership, therefore, can be construed as representing true between-groups mean differences only once equivalence of meaning (i.e., measurement equivalence) has been established for these groups.

Gender and Culture in Leadership Research

Both culture and leadership and gender and leadership have been studied using an emic approach. For example, Misumi (1985) and Sinha (1984) have approached leadership from Japanese and Indian perspectives, respectively. Moreover, feminist researchers have explored women's leadership experiences (see Chin, Lott, Rice, & Sanchez-Hucles, 2007). These studies have addressed the issue of whether women or people from different ethnocultural groups have unique ways of leading. In this article, however, we focus on the imposed etic approach to leadership as it pertains to gender and culture. We do so because we wish to address a different question: To what extent do North American models, which have been developed primarily by men and mostly validated on men leaders, apply to women and people from other cultures? Furthermore, we made this

choice because these theories are currently the focal approaches to leadership in fields such as psychology, management, political science, and education. In addition, these theories served as the framework for the 2007 special issue on leadership in the *American Psychologist* (Sternberg, 2007). Our intention in this article is to highlight the role of gender and culture in the research that has been done within these paradigms, something that was lacking in the previous special issue.

Before doing so, however, it is important to acknowledge some previous leadership theorists (e.g., Ayman, 1993; Chemers, 1997; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) who have emphasized the important role that gender and culture specifically play in the leadership experience. Ayman (1993) did so by drawing from the cross-cultural approach and methodology. She argued that because leaders' and subordinates' gender or culture influences their frame of reference, these factors affect how leaders' behaviors are described and evaluated.

Chemers's (1997) integrative model of leadership explicitly acknowledged a role for culture and gender. In his model, gender and culture influence the leadership relationship in multiple ways (e.g., through social norms and the leader's and subordinates' interpretation of the situation). Both of these scholars have viewed gender and culture as leadership contingencies that are omnipresent in a diverse society and that cannot be ignored when leadership is studied.

The primary focus of the 62-country GLOBE research project (House et al., 2004) has been on establishing a universal model of leadership. Although specific findings about the interface of culture, gender, and leadership are still emerging, the picture that has been painted thus far is very complex. While some universals (such as value-based charismatic leadership) have been found, there is also extensive evidence that these universals are manifested in different ways in each region of the world. It may be that, as Graen (2006) has suggested, the research questions and approach used by GLOBE were too limited to portray a global picture of leadership. In support of this, van Emmerik, Euwema, and Wendt (2008) reviewed other research that indicates that certain leadership behaviors (e.g., the use of superiority, power, and close supervision) vary as a function of culture.

In the latest edition of *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, Bass (1991) mentioned that leadership has many definitions. In this article we do not put forth a particular definition but rather acknowledge the variety of approaches to the way that leadership has been studied through existing theories and models. The main theories and models that we review include the following: trait approach (including leadership categorization or implicit leadership theory), behavior approaches (including the two-factor, transformational leadership, and leader-member exchange models), and contingency approaches (i.e., the contingency model of leadership effectiveness and the normative decision-making model). For each theoretical approach to leadership, we provide examples from the literature that illustrate why culture and gender matter.

In any discussion of the intersection of gender or culture with leadership it is particularly important to recognize that just because someone holds a leadership position, it does not imply that they are an effective leader. Likewise, the absence of individuals from certain groups (e.g., women or people of color) in leadership positions does not mean that they would be ineffectual leaders. It is also critical to point out that many of the studies on gender and leadership in the workplace have examined a selected group of women leaders who have attained leadership positions by meeting the expectations of the majority. The results of that research may not be generalizable to women in general. Similarly, because most cultural studies have examined people functioning in their own culture, we do not know how they would perform in cross-cultural situations.

The Trait Approach

In the interest of brevity we do not review the historical evolution of the trait approach, the oldest domain of investigation in leadership research (see Zaccaro, 2007; Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004). Likewise, we do not deal with the many traits that have been associated with leadership emergence or effectiveness (see Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhart, 2002). Instead, we discuss only those traits that are both important to leadership and relevant to gender or culture.

Implicit leadership theory. To understand the traits associated with leaders, we first examine the literature on implicit leadership theory or leadership categorization. Implicit leadership theory examines the layperson's understanding of leadership. Overall, the results of studies in this area have demonstrated strong context effects. That is, the traits associated with leadership vary depending on whether the leader is, for example, a manager, military officer, or politician (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). Studies of culture and implicit leadership are limited, but those that do exist show a variation in the content of implicit leadership across cultures (Ayman & Bassari, 2009; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Ling, Chia, & Fang, 2000). Much research has demonstrated that across raters' age, work experience, and culture, the image of a leader is strongly associated with men and masculinity (Ayman-Nolley & Ayman, 2005; Heilman, 2001; Leffler, Ayman, & Ayman-Nolley, 2006; Schein, 2002). Furthermore, research shows that this stereotyped image develops as early as kindergarten (e.g., Ayman-Nolley & Ayman, 2005). However, these studies also have indicated that girls and women are not as likely to hold this masculine image of a leader as are boys and men. By and large, the fact that these stereotypes exist is detrimental to women's ascent into leadership positions (Korabik, 1997).

Cultural intelligence (CQ). Recently scholars have focused on the relationship between CQ and leadership. CQ is related to enhanced effectiveness in dealing with both those from foreign cultures and those from different subcultures within one's own culture (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). Thus, it helps individuals meet the challenges of managing both globalization and workforce diversity. CQ has been shown to contribute to team, leadership, and

managerial effectiveness in a number of settings (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). Among the specific traits and competencies associated with CQ are self-monitoring, holding non-ethnocentric attitudes (Abbe, Gulick, & Herman, 2008), and being open to experience (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008), all of which are discussed individually below.

Self-monitoring. One trait that has been related to both leadership emergence and effectiveness is self-monitoring (Day, Schleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002). Self-monitoring is the extent to which individuals regulate their self-presentation to achieve a desired public appearance (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). In leadership research, self-monitoring is seen as an indicator of flexibility and responsiveness to social situations. Day et al.'s (2002) meta-analysis showed that self-monitoring was related to leadership ability by demonstrating that high self-monitors are promoted most often. Day et al. also reported, however, that women scored lower on self-monitoring than men. Based on this finding, it appears that women may have less chance of attaining leadership positions than do men. The results of a small group experiment supported this concept by demonstrating that self-monitoring was positively associated with leadership emergence more for men than for women (Ellis & Cronshaw, 1992). Further research on gender, leadership, and self-monitoring is needed to explore this explanation and to establish whether interventions aimed at enhancing women's level of self-monitoring could help them overcome the barriers they face in achieving leadership positions. Because we know little about self-monitoring cross-culturally or across ethnic groups, more research on culture and self-monitoring is also warranted. Moreover, the measurement equivalence for gender or culture for self-monitoring, to the best of our knowledge, still needs to be established.

The Big Five. The Big Five (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness; Hofstede & McCrae, 2004) are considered to be superordinate, universal personality traits (Marsella, Dubanoski, Hamada, & Morse, 2000). Costa, Terracciano, and McCrae (2001), using studies from several countries across several years, while finding some similarities, did find some gender and cultural differences on the Big Five. Overall, the results pertaining to gender and culture (i.e., defined by country or cultural values) do not indicate conclusive evidence for the universality of the Big Five (Marsella et al., 2000). In a meta-analysis of the relationship of the Big Five to leadership, Judge et al. (2002) found that extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience had significant relationships with leadership effectiveness and emergence. Agreeableness was related to leadership effectiveness but not emergence. However, this meta-analysis did not include culture or gender as moderators. Nonetheless, Eagly and Carli (2007), using Costa et al.'s (2001) findings, demonstrated that men and women differed on some of the facets that make up the Big Five traits. For example, women scored lower than men on the assertiveness aspect of extraversion, but they scored higher than men on the warmth and positive emotion aspects of extraversion.

Gender and leadership emergence. Two lines of research have been conducted on gender and leadership emergence. The most prominent one looks at the sociodemographic gender of the person who is chosen as the leader. The results of a meta-analysis of studies in this area (Eagly & Karau, 1991) are consistent with Eagly and Carli's (2007) findings regarding extraversion and showed that men and women tended to emerge as leaders in situations that were congruent with their social roles. The implication of this for women is that their leadership may be constrained to more stereotypically feminine areas.

A smaller, yet very significant, line of research has demonstrated that gender-role orientation, more than sociodemographic gender, matters in terms of who emerges as a leader. For example, a meta-analysis found that along with intelligence, agentic traits such as masculinity and dominance were most characteristic of those who emerged as leaders (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986). Similarly, other research has indicated that a masculine (i.e., high instrumentality, low expressivity) gender-role orientation was most related to leadership emergence (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989). In contrast, in more recent studies, where group gender composition and the nature of the task were incorporated as variables, there is more evidence that androgyny (i.e., high instrumentality, high expressivity) is important for leader emergence. For example, one study demonstrated that in groups composed of women, those who were intelligent and androgynous were more likely to emerge as leaders (Gershenoff & Foti, 2003). But, in groups of mixed sociodemographic gender, the results are not as clear and seem to depend on the nature of the task. Overall, a trend has been observed in which androgynous individuals have the same chance as masculine individuals to be identified as leaders (Kent & Moss, 1994; Moss & Kent, 1996). These findings are encouraging for women's leadership prospects. Androgyny may offer women a way out of the double bind they are put in when they are expected to have the instrumental qualities that are associated with leadership ability but also the expressive qualities associated with their prescribed gender role. Thus, adopting an androgynous leadership style may help women to negotiate their way through the labyrinth.

Summary. As the research cited indicates, the traits related to leadership are not culturally universal. Moreover, because traits have an impact on the way that men and women are perceived as leaders, gender can affect access to leadership positions. This is important because competency modeling is frequently used for the selection of managers. This approach relies heavily on inferences about which leadership traits and skills are the most effective. These inferences are susceptible to being influenced by implicit leadership stereotypes. Moreover, these traits and skills are assumed to function similarly for people regardless of their culture and gender. However, much more empirical evidence is necessary to validate this assumption.

The Behavioral Approach

This approach constitutes the largest body of literature in leadership research. Since the 1950s, the majority of researchers, regardless of their theoretical orientation, have primarily examined leaders' behaviors through self- or others' perceptions. In this section we highlight three behavioral approaches (the two-factor, transformational leadership, and leader-member exchange models) that have paid some attention to gender or culture.

The two-factor approach. Some researchers (e.g., the Ohio State and Michigan studies) have categorized leadership behaviors as falling into two factors: considerate-people oriented or initiating structure-task oriented, respectively (Bass, 1991). A meta-analysis (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004) demonstrated that both types of behaviors were associated with effectiveness. But consideration was more related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, whereas initiating structure was more related to performance and profit. The measurement equivalence of the two-factor theory for culture and gender is not well documented.

In terms of gender, the intrapsychic leadership perspective predicts that leadership behavior will be more a function of the leader's gender-role characteristics than of the leader's sociodemographic gender. We have carried out a series of studies (Korabik, 1996; Korabik & Ayman, 1987, 1989) with managers that provided support for this perspective. We found that gender-role orientation accounted for greater variance in self-reported leadership behavior than sociodemographic gender. We also consistently found instrumental (masculine) gender-role traits to be related to initiating structure, expressive (feminine) personality traits to be related to consideration, and androgyny to be related to both structure and consideration. Korabik (1981, 1982a, 1982b, 1990) and Zugec and Korabik (2003) replicated and extended these findings in a series of small group studies. They demonstrated not only that androgynous individuals had the ability to display both task- and person-oriented leadership behaviors but also that they were able to switch roles in a flexible, adaptive manner to take on whatever leadership function was lacking in a group.

The vast majority of studies on gender and leadership behavior have been conducted from the social structural and social interaction leadership perspectives. This research has compared the leadership behaviors of men and women (i.e., used the sociodemographic operationalization of gender). The results of these studies have been summarized in meta-analyses on gender and leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), gender and evaluations of leadership (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992), and gender and leadership effectiveness (Eagly et al., 1995). The results show that when studies are conducted in the field with actual leaders (who are presumably more equivalent in role definition and status), men and women do not differ in their considerate or structuring behavior (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). However, despite the lack of differences in the way that men and women leaders behaved, there were differ-

ences in their effectiveness and in the manner in which others evaluated them.

The social structural leadership perspective predicts that leadership behavior will be a function of the congruence between the leadership role and the leader's prescribed gender role, attributed status, or both. Consistent with this view, women leaders were particularly likely to be devalued when they adopted stereotypically masculine leadership styles, when they were in male-dominated leadership roles, or when they were evaluated by men (Eagly et al., 1992). Furthermore, men were more effective in male-dominated situations and in masculine leadership roles. In contrast, women were more effective in more feminine leadership roles (Eagly et al., 1995).

The interpersonal interaction leadership perspective predicts that differential effects will occur as a function of the gender of the leader or subordinate, or both, and that these will be moderated by the context and type of task. In support of this view, we (Becker, Ayman, & Korabik, 2002) found that in corporate, compared with educational, settings there were greater discrepancies between women leaders' ratings of the extent to which they engaged in both task- and person-oriented leadership behaviors and their subordinates' ratings of the extent to which the women used these behaviors.

For decades researchers have examined the two-factor approach across cultures. One study (van Emmerik et al., 2008) was able to establish measurement equivalence, but the findings from other studies (Ayman & Chemers, 1983; Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Peterson, & Bond, 1989) have been inconclusive. In particular, Ayman and Chemers (Ayman & Chemers, 1983; Chemers, 1969) referred to two studies: In both cases the subordinates were Iranians, but in one study the leaders were Americans (Chemers, 1969), whereas in the other they were Iranian (Ayman & Chemers, 1983). The results showed exactly the same factor structure, making it likely that they were more a function of the implicit leadership theory of the subordinates than of the leader's behavior. Additionally, Ayman and Chemers (1983) found evidence for a benevolent paternalistic leadership dimension in Iran (before the Islamic revolution). This included both consideration and initiating structure behaviors on a single factor. While defined a bit differently in different cultures, this same dimension has shown up in many Asian countries, such as India (Sinha, 1984) and China (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, & Farh, 2004). Thus, the cultural evidence questions whether the distinction between these two behaviors is universal.

We could find only one study (van Emmerik et al., 2008) that examined the joint effects of gender and culture in the context of the two-factor model. That study included data from 42 countries grouped into 10 cultural categories. Overall, women were found to be higher in both initiating structure and consideration than men. However, there were few gender differences outside of Western countries. Both initiating structure and consideration were found to vary as a function of culture. Moreover, culture exerted more of an impact on leadership behavior than gender, particularly when it came to initiating structure.

The transformational leadership approach. Transformational leadership theory assumes that a leader who is perceived as behaving in a transformational manner inspires subordinates to high levels of effort and dedication. The dimensions of transformational leadership behavior are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1993b). Multiple meta-analyses have provided strong support for this leadership theory as it relates to various effectiveness indices (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003) demonstrated that the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (the most frequently used measure; Bass & Avolio, 1993a) had measurement equivalence for gender when subordinates of the same sociodemographic gender as the leader did the ratings. However, the measurement equivalence was compromised for heterogeneous dyads and in some other contexts. Therefore, any gender differences or lack thereof reported in the literature should be considered in light of this important information.

Research from the intrapsychic leadership perspective has demonstrated that gender-role orientation is related to transformational leadership behavior (Korabik, Ayman, & Purc-Stephenson, 2001). Gender-role instrumentality was predictive of higher self-ratings on all four subdimensions of transformational leadership. Gender-role expressivity was predictive of higher self-ratings on idealized influence, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation. Thus, androgyny was related to transformational leadership. In addition, the more leaders reported being androgynous and transformational, the more both they and their subordinates reported lower job stress and higher job satisfaction.

In a meta-analysis, Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) examined the differences between men and women on transformational leadership. Women were found to be slightly more transformational than men as assessed both by self- and others' reports. As well, women scored higher than men on contingent reward and lower on active and passive management by exception and *laissez faire* leadership. However, transformational leadership may not be as effective when used by women leaders as when used by men. For example, Ayman, Korabik, and Morris (2009) found that the higher women's transformational behavior was in terms of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, the less effective their men, but not their women, subordinates thought they were as leaders. These findings provide support for both the social structural leadership perspective and for role congruence theory.

In most cultures, although the three styles of *laissez faire*, transactional, and transformational leadership have been found, the behaviors defining them are not the same (e.g., Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). Bass (1997) affirmed this point by providing an example that in Indonesia boasting about one's competence is inspirational and builds confidence in subordinates, but in Japan this behavior is considered to be unseemly. On the whole,

however, many cross-cultural studies have demonstrated the validity of transformational leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Nonetheless, the limited evidence for the measurement equivalence of transformational leadership across culture and gender suggests that caution must be used when recommending specific behaviors for individuals in specific social groups. This becomes critical when we move from validation studies to implementation and training. Overall, this very valuable leader behavior may not work as effectively for those in heterogeneous work groups. Further research may help identify the limitations of this paradigm and the processes that impede its generalizability.

The leader-member exchange (LMX) approach. This dyadic leadership model assumes that leaders treat their subordinates distinctly and that some employees feel included whereas others do not (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Those who experience high LMX feel part of the ingroup and describe their leaders as transformational and trustworthy. Those who experience low LMX feel like they are not closely connected to the ingroup and describe the leader's behavior as transactional and contractual (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). This construct assesses the subordinates' perceptions of their leader's ability, benevolence, and integrity. Scandura and Dorfman (2004) stated that trustworthiness, honesty, and supportiveness, major components of LMX, are universal characteristics of leadership. Because this paradigm maintains that the leader treats each subordinate differently, it has high potential for understanding the role of diversity and leadership (Scandura & Lankau, 1996).

Meta-analyses have established a positive relationship between LMX and leadership effectiveness (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2006). However, a number of ways of measuring leader-member relationships have been proposed (Gerstner & Day, 1997), and not much has been done to establish the measurement equivalence of LMX over culture or gender. Nevertheless, in response to Scandura and Lankau's (1996) call for a need to study LMX with diverse dyads, investigations of the effects of culture or gender on LMX have been carried out. The majority of the studies on diversity and LMX have compared dyads in which the members are similar to one another in sociodemographic gender or ethnicity, or both, with dyads in which the members are different from one another (e.g., Green, Anderson, & Shiver, 1996; McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2005). The results are mixed and inconclusive. Studies seem to show that in heterogeneous dyads of employed individuals, the quality of LMX suffers (e.g., Green et al., 1996; Vecchio & Brazil, 2007; Vecchio & Bullis, 2001). In particular, women managers experience lower LMX when they have men rather than women subordinates (Green et al., 1996). In addition, Ayman, Rinchuso, and Korabik (2004) found that gender dyad composition moderated the relation between LMX and employee satisfaction. As the number of these studies is small and their methodologies and results are inconsistent, future research is warranted.

A few studies have examined LMX in countries other than the United States, such as Germany (Schyns, Paul,

Mohr, & Blank, 2005), Turkey (Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2005), and China (Aryee & Chen, 2006; Chen & Tjosvold, 2007). In these studies, similar to those done in the United States, LMX was related to positive outcomes, such as higher subjective performance, job satisfaction, and commitment. However, some differences were also found. For example, in China organizational climate was a moderator between LMX and outcomes, and in Germany tenure did not affect LMX, whereas span of supervision did. Chen and Tjosvold's (2007) study is one of the very few that have incorporated cross-cultural dyads (i.e., an American manager with Chinese subordinates). It also included the Chinese concept of *guanxi* (personal relationship). Their results demonstrated that *guanxi* had a major impact on the openness of the interaction between the subordinate and the manager. These international studies do show some support for the LMX paradigm, but they also provide evidence for the need for this model to expand and incorporate contextual factors. The future development of research in this area is promising.

Summary. Research from all three behavioral approaches demonstrates that leadership behaviors are not necessarily culturally universal. Thus, there needs to be more examination of cultural values as well as country boundaries in leadership research. In addition, leadership is not a gender-neutral phenomenon. When women leaders adopt stereotypically masculine leadership behaviors, are in male-dominated settings, or are evaluated by men, they are particularly susceptible to being rated negatively. This illustrates some of the additional barriers that women encounter as they attempt to negotiate their way through the labyrinth. Androgynous leaders, however, are more likely to adopt leadership behaviors that combine a task and person orientation and are transformational in nature; this is related to enhanced leadership effectiveness.

Contingency Approaches

Contingency models were introduced during the 1960s and 1970s. They include trait approaches (the contingency model of leadership effectiveness and cognitive resource theory) and behavioral approaches (path-goal theory, situational leadership, and normative decision making; Ayman, 2004b). Here we discuss only how gender and culture relate to Fiedler's (1978) contingency model of leadership effectiveness and Vroom and Jago's (1988) normative decision-making model.

The contingency model of leadership effectiveness. Ayman (2002) summarized and updated the research on Fiedler's (1978) contingency model of leadership effectiveness. This model predicts that the leader's work orientation, as defined by the Least Preferred Coworker Scale (LPC; Ayman & Romano, 1998), will interface with the leader's control over the situation to affect group effectiveness. In this model situational variables include the quality of the leader-member relationship, the structure of the task, and the position power of the leader. Although there have been many challenges to it, the model has been demonstrated to have validity in predicting performance (Peters, Hartke, & Pohlmann, 1985;

Schriesheim, Tepper, & Tetrault, 1994; Strube & Garcia, 1981). In addition, there is a validated training program based on the model (Burke & Day, 1986).

Research shows some support for the model cross-culturally (see Ayman, 2002). The model not only incorporates culture in its conceptualization of the situation (Triandis, 1993), but it also has been validated in several countries. When the leader and followers are from different cultures, the leader's assessment of the quality of the leader-member relationship is likely to be low to moderate. In particular, leaders interacting with a diverse work team will be more susceptible to having a volatile team relationship because there may be cultural misunderstandings. This is because multicultural teams, more so than culturally homogeneous teams, have the potential for team members to hold very different cultural assumptions about social interactions and mental models of a team. In the studies in which American leaders worked with non-Americans, the leader-member aspect of the situation was greatly affected (Chemers, 1969; Fiedler, 1966). Overall, the model has been shown to be supported in some countries but not in others. More research is needed to understand why this is so.

Less is known about the impact of the gender composition of the work team. Men and women leaders do not differ on LPC scores. Nonetheless, it is possible that, depending on the sociodemographic gender composition of the group and the type of task, women and men with the same LPC scores may lead groups differently. For example, Offermann's (1984) study demonstrated that men leading all-women groups had high LPC scores (i.e., were more relationship oriented), whereas women leading all-men groups had low LPC scores (i.e., were more task oriented). Offermann assumed that because she gave the measure of LPC after the group exercise, the sociodemographic gender composition of the group affected the men and women leaders' LPC scores. However, two studies on leader emergence in teams of mixed sociodemographic gender, in which the task was consensus building, found that low LPC (task-oriented) individuals were more likely than high LPC (relationship-oriented) individuals to emerge as leaders (Groag-Blavise, Scheuer, Ayman, & Roch, 2007; Kuo & Ayman, 2008). When the sociodemographic gender of the leader was also examined, women seemed to have more chance than men of being chosen as a leader (Kuo & Ayman, 2008). Thus, although there is some indication that sociodemographic gender can affect the relationship between LPC score, situation, and outcome, more investigations are needed.

The normative model of leadership decision making. The normative approach to leadership decision making presents five decision-making processes that are based on the leader's choice of actions, from highly autocratic to highly participative (Vroom & Jago, 1988). This approach predicts that, on the basis of prescribed decision rules, each of these styles can lead to effective outcomes. Depending on the type of outcome desired and the nature of the situation, different behaviors are prescribed. For example, if the focus outcome is group cohesion, a participative style is recommended. But, if there is

conflict in the group, a consultative style may be better. On the other hand, if quality of decision is needed, then which style is chosen is highly dependent on the knowledge of the leader and the followers. In this model the role of the situation is the focal point (Vroom & Jago, 2007), and it is assumed that the leader is responding to the situational determinants.

Research using this model has indicated that sociodemographic gender makes a difference in terms of leadership style and effectiveness. In general, women were more likely to use a participative leadership style than were men (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), and women's preferences were more in line with the prescriptions of the normative decision-making model (Jago & Vroom, 1982). However, although men leaders were able to use autocratic decision strategies with some success, women leaders who used autocratic styles were rated more harshly than men leaders who did so.

Cross-cultural studies examining this leadership approach are few. Ayman (2004b) pointed out that the political situation could be a determinant of managers' acceptance of the model. In post-Communist Poland, managers became more accepting of using a participative instead of an autocratic style (e.g., Jago, Maczynski, & Reber, 1996). Likewise, the preferred decision-making style was found to be different in three different German-speaking European countries (Szabo, Reber, Weibler, Brodbeck, & Wunderer, 2001).

Summary. The contingency approaches to leadership have considered various situational factors, such as task expertise, subordinate support, and group cohesion, as well as the leader's position power. However, these approaches have not extensively addressed the role of gender, nor, to the best of our knowledge, have the measures used in these models been tested for measurement equivalence across gender or culture. Therefore, we would suggest caution in recommending the use of certain leadership decision-making strategies for individuals from diverse groups. Regarding Fiedler's (1978) model, it is possible that leaders functioning in multicultural and mixed sociodemographic gender groups may be faced with low quality leader-member relationships. However, the model provides a prescription for the leader to manage this.

Summary

As can be seen from this review, gender and culture are important to the leadership experience. Studies on gender, culture, and leadership provide support for the influence of intrapsychic processes, social structural processes, and interpersonal processes. Thus, both gender and culture matter because they can affect a leader's style, behavior, emergence, and effectiveness in many complex ways. For example, gender and culture matter because leaders' gender-role identities and cultural values can affect the choices they make about the manner in which they will lead. Moreover, the low social status that is attributed to leaders who are women and people of color can result in the devaluation of their accomplishments by others. In addition, when there is a lack of congruence between people's

implicit stereotypes of leadership and the traditional roles associated with women and people of color, leaders from these social groups experience a higher level of scrutiny and have more trouble legitimizing their authority (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

The purpose of our review is to illustrate that both gender and culture do make a difference when it comes to leadership. Leadership is not universal; rather, it can vary as a direct function of either gender or culture. Furthermore, both gender and culture can moderate the relationship between leadership behaviors and outcomes. For example, a poor leader-member relationship appears to be more detrimental for men leaders with women subordinates than for women leaders with men subordinates. However, a transformational leadership style appears to be less effective for women leaders with men subordinates than for men leaders with women subordinates. Thus, leadership theories are not generalizable over all individuals, regardless of their gender or culture.

Future Research Directions

As we look to the future we see that work still needs to be done to better understand the role of cultural norms and values in the leadership process, as well as to understand the dynamics attributable to sociodemographic gender, gender-role orientation, and their intersection. Furthermore, research is needed that explores how the relation between leadership and outcomes is affected by dyad or group diversity. For example, more investigations need to be carried out that examine the interactions of leaders and subordinates who represent different nationalities or ethnicities with differing cultural values and assumptions. In particular, researchers need to be mindful of the status and privilege that are accorded to North American and Western European leaders working with culturally diverse workgroups. Likewise, more research that examines the impact of both overt and covert sexist and ethnocentric attitudes on the leadership process is important.

It is critical in a diverse society to be cognizant of the impact of people's appearance and values in social interactions, as suggested in Chemers's (1997) integrative model. Therefore, gender and culture should become variables that are incorporated into theory building in leadership. As well, our models and measures should be validated across social groups. In addition, we recommend that more research teams be composed of people from diverse backgrounds with diverse perspectives who work together as equals.

Conclusion

Over time, the image of leadership has been evolving. As early as the 1950s, Bales (1951) maintained that the socio-emotional leader was the true group leader because people skills were not context dependent in the same way that task skills were. Nonetheless, a masculine leadership prototype has prevailed (Heilman, 2001; Schein, 2002). Lately, however, there has been more recognition of the importance of people skills for leaders. Scholars have associated the in-

creased prominence of the transformational leadership and leader-member exchange paradigms in the last three decades with the “feminization” of leadership (e.g., Eagly & Carli, 2003; Rudman & Glick, 2001). This perspective has led to a more androgynous conception of leadership. A move toward inclusion of more women and ethnocultural minorities in the workplace could be one factor that has precipitated this change. Globalization also has had an impact, particularly due to the influence of Asian management styles, which have been noted to be more relationship focused (Triandis, 1993).

It may be that this more androgynous conception of leadership, which gives equal emphasis to task and people skills, will open up more opportunities for women and ethnocultural minorities to be considered as leaders and will assist them in negotiating their way through the barriers within the labyrinth (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Other factors that can facilitate this process include eradicating the masculine stereotypical image of a leader, eliminating the ethnocentrism that creates ingroup-outgroup biases, and equalizing access to power and privilege. Moreover, increasing the cultural awareness of leaders about different norms of conduct should enhance the level of trust in their relationships with their subordinates.

An examination of the effects of gender and culture has the potential to change our definition of what constitutes leadership and what is considered to be effective leadership. This more inclusive conceptualization can expand the vision of leadership to represent all human beings.

REFERENCES

- Abbe, A., Gulick, L. M. V., & Herman, J. L. (2008). *Cross-cultural competence in army leaders: A conceptual and empirical foundation* (Study Report 2008–01). Arlington, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 261–295. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4
- Aryee, S., & Chen, Z. X. (2006). Leader-member exchange in Chinese context: Antecedents, mediating role of psychological empowerment and outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, *59*, 793–801. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.03.003
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 25–33. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25
- Ayman, R. (1993). Leadership perception: The role of gender and culture. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 137–166). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Ayman, R. (2002). Contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. L. Neider & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership* (pp. 197–228). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Ayman, R. (2004a). Culture and leadership. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 507–519). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Ayman, R. (2004b). Situational and contingency approaches to leadership. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 148–170). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ayman, R., & Bassari, A. (2009). *The implicit leadership theory of Iranians*. Paper presented at the Global to Worldly Leadership Symposium—The Leadership Trust, Weston-under-Penyard, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, England.
- Ayman, R., & Chemers, M. M. (1983). Relationship of supervisory behavior ratings to work group effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction among Iranian managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 338–341. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.68.2.338
- 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. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00463.x
- Ayman, R., Rinchiuso, M., & Korabik, K. (2004, August). *Organizational commitment and job satisfaction in relation to LMX and dyad gender composition*. Paper presented at the International Congress of Psychology, Beijing, China.
- Ayman, R., & Romano, R. (1998). Measures and assessments for the contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In F. Dansereau & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Leadership: The multiple-level approaches, classical and new wave* (pp. 97–113). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Ayman-Nolley, S., & Ayman, R. (2005). Children’s implicit theory of leadership. In B. Schyns & J. R. Meindl (Eds.), *Implicit leadership theories: Essays and explorations* (pp. 189–233). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Bales, R. F. (1951). *Interaction process analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bass, B. M. (1991). *Bass & Stogdill’s handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*, 130–139. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993a). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993b). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49–80). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Becker, J., Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2002). Discrepancies in self/subordinates’ perceptions of leadership behaviors: Leader’s gender, organizational context, and leader’s self-monitoring. *Group and Organization Management*, *27*, 226–244. doi:10.1177/10501102027002004
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 155–162. doi:10.1037/h0036215
- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Berger, J., Wagner, D. G., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1985). Introduction: Expectation states theory: Review and assessment. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch Jr. (Eds.), *Status, rewards, and influence: How expectations organize behavior* (pp. 1–72). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). An ecocultural approach to the study of cross-cultural industrial/organizational psychology. In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 130–147). San Francisco, CA: New Lexington Press.
- Burke, M. J., & Day, R. R. (1986). A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 232–245. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.2.232
- Chemers, M. M. (1969). Cross-cultural training as a means for improving situational favorableness. *Human Relations*, *22*, 531–546. doi:10.1177/001872676902200604
- Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Chen, N. Y., & Tjosvold, D. (2007). Guanxi and leader member relationships between American managers and Chinese employees: Open-minded dialogue as mediator. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *24*, 171–189. doi:10.1007/s10490-006-9029-9
- Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *7*, 89–117. doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2004.00137.x
- Chin, J. L., Lott, B., Rice, J. K., & Sanchez-Hucles, J. (2007). *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Chin, J. L., & Sanchez-Hucles, J. (2007). Diversity and leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 608–609. doi:10.1037/0003-066X62.6.608
- Connerley, M. L., & Pedersen, P. B. (2005). *Leadership in a diverse and multicultural environment: Developing awareness, knowledge, and skills*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 322–331. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.322
- Day, D. V., Schleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-mentoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 390–401. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.390
- Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological Review*, *94*, 369–389. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.369
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *70*, 19–34.
- Duckitt, J., Callaghan, J., & Wagner, C. (2005). Group identification and outgroup attitudes in four South African ethnic groups: A multidimensional approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 633–646. doi:10.1177/0146167204271576
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). Reporting sex differences. *American Psychologist*, *42*, 756–757. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.42.7.755
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 807–834. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.004
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- 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*, 569–591. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 233–256. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.233
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 685–710. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.5.685
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573–598. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 125–145. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.1.125
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 3–22. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.3
- Ellis, R. J., & Cronshaw, S. F. (1992). Self-monitoring and leader emergence: A test of moderator effects. *Small Group Research*, *23*, 113–129. doi:10.1177/1046496492231007
- Erdogan, B., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2005). Work value congruence and intrinsic career success: The compensatory roles of leader-member exchange and perceived organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*, 305–332. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02493.x
- Ferree, M. M. (1995). Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research. In G. Bowen & J. Pittman (Eds.), *The work and family interface: Toward a contextual effects perspective* (pp. 122–137). Minneapolis, MN: National Council on Family Relations.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1966). The effect of leadership and cultural heterogeneity on group performance: A test of the contingency model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *2*, 237–264.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1978). The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 11, pp. 59–96). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 530–555. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.530
- Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., & Ehrhart, K. H. (2002). Methodological issues in cross-cultural organizational research. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 216–246). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gershenoff, A. B., & Foti, R. J. (2003). Leader emergence and gender roles in all-female groups: A contextual examination. *Small Group Research*, *34*, 170–196. doi:10.1177/1046496402250429
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, *5*, 121–134.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 827–844. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827
- Goktepe, J. R., & Schneier, C. R. (1989). Role of sex, gender roles, and attraction in predicting emergent leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 165–167. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.165
- Graen, G. B. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross-cultural lesson in leadership from Project GLOBE: A response viewed from the third culture bonding (TCB) model of cross-cultural leadership. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *20*, 95–101.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 219–247. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5
- Green, S. G., Anderson, S. E., & Shiver, S. L. (1996). Demographic and organizational influences on leader-member exchange and related work attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *66*, 203–214. doi:10.1006/obhd.1996.0049
- Groag-Blavvise, O., Scheuer, M., Ayman, R., & Roch, S. (2007, April). *Leadership emergence in face-to-face and virtual groups: Contingency model application*. Poster presented at the meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New York, NY.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 657–674. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00234
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Personality and culture revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *38*, 52–88. doi:10.1177/1069397103259443
- Hollander, E. P., & Offermann, L. R. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 179–189. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.179
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Wright, N. S., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 535–625). San Francisco, CA: New Lexington Press.
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 269–277. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.269
- Jago, A. G., Maczynski, J., & Reber, G. (1996). Evolving leadership styles?: A comparison of Polish managers before and after market economy reforms. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, *27*, 107–115.
- Jago, A. G., & Vroom, V. H. (1982). Sex differences in the incidence and evaluation of participative leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*, 776–783. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.67.6.776
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhart, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 765–780. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 755–768. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 36–51. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.36
- Kent, R. L., & Moss, S. E. (1994). Effects of sex and gender role on leader emergence. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 1335–1346. doi:10.2307/256675

- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). The study of culture. In D. Lerner & H. D. Lasswell (Eds.), *The policy sciences* (pp. 86–101). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Korabik, K. (1981, March). *Androgyny and leadership: An integration*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Women and Psychology, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED208-274)
- Korabik, K. (1982a). Sex-role orientation and leadership style. *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 5, 328–336.
- Korabik, K. (1982b, August). *Sex-role orientation and leadership: Further explorations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED223-963)
- Korabik, K. (1990). Androgyny and leadership style. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 9–18.
- Korabik, K. (1996). Gender, leadership style, and managerial effectiveness. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Association of Management*, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Korabik, K. (1997). Applied gender issues. In S. W. Sadava & D. R. McCreary (Eds.), *Applied social psychology* (pp. 292–309). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Korabik, K. (1999). Sex and gender in the new millennium. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 3–16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Korabik, K., & Ayman, R. (1987, August). *Androgyny and leadership style: A conceptual synthesis*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED291-032)
- Korabik, K., & Ayman, R. (1989). Androgyny and managerial effectiveness. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada Annual Conference: Women in Management*, 10, 1–9.
- Korabik, K., & Ayman, R. (2007). Gender and leadership in the corporate world: A multiperspective model. In J. L. Chin, B. Lott, J. K. Rice, & J. Sanchez-Hucles (Eds.), *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices* (pp. 106–124). Malden, MA: Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9780470692332.ch5
- Korabik, K., Ayman, R., & Purc-Stephenson, R. (2001, June). *Gender-role orientation and transformational leadership*. Paper presented at the Conference on Gender, Work, and Organizations, Keele University, Keele, England.
- Kuo, S. V., & Ayman, R. (2008). *The effects of rater and ratee characteristics on leadership emergence*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Leffler, H., Ayman, R., & Ayman-Nolley, S. (2006, July). *Do children possess the same stereotypes as adults? An exploration of children's implicit leadership theories*. Poster presented at the 26th International Congress of Applied Psychology, Athens, Greece.
- Ling, W., Chia, R. C., & Fang, L. (2000). Chinese implicit leadership theory. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 729–739. doi:10.1080/00224540009600513
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 311–338. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00081-9
- Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402–410. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.402
- 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, 385–425. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2
- Marsella, A. J., Dubanoski, J., Hamada, W. C., & Morse, H. (2000). The measurement of personality across cultures: Historical, conceptual, and methodological issues and considerations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 41–62. doi:10.1177/00027640021956080
- McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Anderson, R. D. (2005). Subordinate–manager gender combination and perceived leadership style influence on emotions, self-esteem and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 115–125. doi:10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00112-7
- McIntosh, P. (2003). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In S. Plous (Ed.), *Understanding prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 191–196). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Misumi, J. (1985). *The behavior science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Morrison, A. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist*, 45, 200–208. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.200
- Moss, S. E., & Kent, R. L. (1996). Gender and gender-role categorization of emergent leaders: A critical review and comprehensive analysis. *Sex Roles*, 35, 79–96. doi:10.1007/BF01548176
- Offermann, L. R. (1984). Short-term supervisory experience and LPC score: Effects of leader's sex and group sex composition. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 123, 115–121.
- Peters, L. H., Hartke, D. D., & Pohlmann, J. T. (1985). Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership: An application of the meta-analysis procedures of Schmidt and Hunter. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 274–285. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.274
- Raju, N. S., Laffitte, L. J., & Byrne, B. M. (2002). Measurement equivalence: A comparison of methods based on confirmatory factor analysis and item response theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 517–529. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.517
- Ridgeway, C. L. (Ed.). (1992). *Gender, interaction, and inequality*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 743–762. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00239
- Scandura, T., & Dorfman, P. (2004). Leadership research in an international and cross-cultural context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 277–307. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.004
- Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. (1996). Developing diverse leaders: A leader-member exchange approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 243–263. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90043-0
- Schein, V. E. (2002). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 675–688. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00235
- Schriesheim, C. A., Tepper, B. J., & Tetrault, L. A. (1994). Least preferred co-worker score, situational control, and leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contingency model performance predictions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 561–573. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.561
- Schyns, B., Paul, T., Mohr, G., & Blank, H. (2005). Comparing antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange in a German working context to findings in the U.S. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14, 1–22. doi:10.1080/13594320444000191
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1984). A model of effective leadership styles in India. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 14, 86–98.
- Smith, P. B., Misumi, J., Tayeb, M., Peterson, M., & Bond, M. (1989). On the generality of leadership style measures across cultures. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 62, 97–109.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and the conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29–39. doi:10.1037/h0076857
- Sternberg, R. J. (2007). Foreword to the special issue on leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, 1. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.34
- Strube, M. J., & Garcia, J. E. (1981). A meta-analytical investigation of Fiedler's contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90, 307–321. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.90.2.307
- Szabo, E., Reber, G., Weibler, J., Brodbeck, F. C., & Wunderer, R. (2001). Values and behavior orientation in leadership studies: Reflections based on findings in three German-speaking countries. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 219–244. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00070-4
- Thomas, D. C., & Ravlin, E. C. (1995). Responses of employees to cultural adaptation by a foreign manager. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50, 133–146. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.133
- Triandis, H. C. (1993). The contingency model in cross-cultural perspectives. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 167–188). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). A theoretical framework for the study of diversity. In M. M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, & M. A. Costanzo (Eds.), *Diversity in*

- organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace* (pp. 11–36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist, 51*, 407–415. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.51.4.407
- Triandis, H. C., & Brislin, R. W. (1984). Cross-cultural psychology. *American Psychologist, 39*, 1006–1016. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.39.9.1006
- Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. *American Psychologist, 34*, 1085–1094. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.34.11.1085
- van Emmerik, IJ. H., Euwema, M. C., & Wendt, H. (2008). Leadership behaviors around the world: The relative importance of gender versus cultural background. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 8*, 297–315. doi:10.1177/1470595808096671
- Vecchio, R. P., & Brazil, D. M. (2007). Leadership and sex-similarity: A comparison in a military setting. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 303–335. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00075.x
- Vecchio, R. P., & Bullis, R. C. (2001). Moderators of the influence of supervisor–subordinate similarity on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 884–896. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.884
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*, 17–24. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17
- Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*, 6–16. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6
- Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101–124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zugec, L., & Korabik, K. (2003, June). *Multiple intelligences, leadership, and androgyny*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.