Full Length Research Paper

Gender Barriers of Women Striving for a Corporate Officer Position: A Literature Review

Heidi Joy Gregory-Mina, DM, MBA, MS
CEO
The Center for Leadership Excellence
28 Jessica Circle
Pembroke, MA 02359
E-Mail: Heidi_mina@yahoo.com
508-246-3043

Adjunct Lecturer
Northeastern University
College of Business Administration
College of Professional Studies
h.gregorymina@neu.edu

Adjunct Lecturer
Kaplan University
School of Business and Management
HGregorymina@kaplan.edu

Literature examined from the past 30 years discovered that even though gender issues have received a great deal of attention, little research has been conducted on gender barriers and disparities in the corporate suite (Agars, 2004). Through examination of this literature, it became evident that women and men are not equally represented, and Agars (2004) wondered whether gender discrimination is a primary cause. Women have made tremendous breakthroughs within middle management but a lack of progress has been seen in obtaining corporate officer positions. The purpose of this paper is to provide an extensive literature review regarding the gender barriers that are applied to females who strive for a corporate officer position.

Historical Overview

Leadership has been a predominantly masculine role through the centuries that few females have obtained (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Beginning with early antiquity, few female leaders have stood out who performed a stereotypical masculine task. The females who did make historical advancements have helped to break down gender stereotyping and advance females within the workplace to gain equality (Porterfield & Kleiner, 2005).

The term 'leadership' was first used in the early 1800s to describe the political influence and power of the British Parliament. During the 18th and 19th century the first leadership style emerged, termed the Great Man theory, which believed certain distinguished men held the characteristics needed for leadership. The Great Man theory never considered women as leaders. During the 19th century, further research took place that determined certain individuals had characteristics that made them leaders, thus resulting in the development of trait theories. Trait theories listed traits in masculine terms that did not correlate with feminine characteristics. As a result, females who entered corporations fell into assistant roles (Jogulu & Wood, 2006).

In the mid-19th century, researchers began to argue that traits alone did not distinguish effective leadership techniques. Researchers argued that leadership could be taught and did not have to be an inborn characteristic. This led the way to three major behavior theories of leadership: democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles. In 1964, these leadership styles were extended to incorporate two other dimensions: employee- and product-oriented dimensions. As leadership research continued to evolve, it began to recognize the need for both individual traits and situational aspects, which led to situational leadership theories in the 1970s. Situational leadership stated that leaders would change their leadership style based on the needs of the situation. The emergence of situational leadership in the '70s gave birth to numerous other leadership styles, which focused on the specific individual traits of an individual's leadership style (Jogulu & Wood, 2006).

Biological Sex versus Gender

Early philosophers found females to be inferior to males, but by the 1960s, the feminist movement had begun to counter these findings. Sigmund Freud was the first philosopher to postulate a differentiation between sex and gender. Prior to this, gender was measured based on an individual's biological sex (Korac-Kakabadse, Korac-Kakabadse, & Myers, 1998; Watson & Newby, 2005). The term 'feminism' furthered the distinction between sex and gender where "sex is the biologically invariant factor and gender is comprised of various social, cultural, or historical variable components" (Korac-Kakabadse et al., 1998, p. 351).

Many researchers believe masculinity and femininity are the ends of a single bipolar dimension. This belief was challenged by Constantinpole in 1973, leading the way to a third dimension referred to as androgyny (Marsh & Myers, 1986). Androgyny theory stated that females and males could possess both masculine and feminine traits (Ballard-Reisch & Elton, 1992; McGregor & Tweed,

2001). This bi-dimensional conceptualization allowed individual personalities to be measured on a two-dimensional rather than a one-dimensional scale (Vecchio, 2002). Some researchers referred to this theory as the feminization of management, because organizations needed to include feminine characteristics, such as collaboration, in their leadership styles for success (Watson & Newby, 2005).

Individuals who are heavily sex-typed conform their behaviors to match stereotypically defined characteristics for that sex, and individuals who display both masculine and feminine traits are considered androgynous. Androgynous individuals are better able to adapt themselves to the current environment because they possess the necessary traits for any situation. Therefore, flexibility is a characteristic of androgynous individuals, which is also necessary for ego development. Proper ego development is necessary for moral, character, and cognitive development, as well as socialization (Schwarz & Robins, 1987).

Prejudice is measured by negative stereotypes and social distance. Stereotypes are defined as "a set of attributes ascribed to a group and imputed to its individual members simply because they belong to that group" (Heilman, 1983, p. 271). The relationship between men and women does not meet the scope of prejudice because images of women throughout Western culture have not always been negative. Sexism is an extension of prejudice, which defines the relationship between men and women more accurately because sexism accounts for ambivalence. Traditional theories have conceptualized sexism as being hostile towards women, but traditional ideas do not take into account positive attitudes and perceptions of women (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2001).

Traditional theories conceptualized that gender is a single dimension with masculinity and femininity at opposite ends (Vecchio, 2002).

Traditional theories do not take into account positive attitudes towards women because of the dominance of the male ego in Western culture. The male ego is dominant within Western culture due to factors relating to biological reproduction. On average, a male's physical body structure is larger than a female's, which has allowed males to dominate in roles that require physical strength. Females, meanwhile, have been stereotyped into the majority of domestic duties due to their reproductive abilities. A female carries a baby to term and provides nourishment to the baby, which has historically resulted in a division of labor. This division of labor left females taking on a majority of the domestic duties, while the males fell into the role of provider (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Traditional theories have, throughout history, sex-typed paid work as a male's domain except for a few roles that were deemed appropriate for females; namely, librarian, nurse, secretary, and elementary school teacher. These roles require characteristics that society has deemed as female characteristics: nurturing, social sensitivity, and service. Senior-level roles are held by few females because of the aggressive characteristics, which are predominately a male characteristic, needed to hold higher-level positions. A study conducted by Schein in 1973 found that the attributes of successful middle managers had a direct correlation to masculine characteristics. Kiesler conducted a study in 1975 that proposed an alternative view to the sex-typing of jobs. Kiesler proposed that jobs became sex-typed based on the individual who held the position prior, not

based on society's perception of the characteristics necessary for the job. Therefore, if a man held a position previously, then a man should fill the position because society sees the job as appropriate for that sex (Heilman, 1983).

Diversity in the Workplace
The concept of diversity in the workplace has created a large amount of activity in the research field. In 1964, the Civil Rights Act was passed, which "made it illegal for organizations to engage in employment practices that discriminated against employees on the basis of ethnicity, color, religion, sex, and national origin" (Kochan et al., 2003, p. 4). While this act assisted in developing policies and procedures for hiring managers in organizations as they moved forward it did not address decisions made prior to the Act. In 1965, an executive order was issued requiring "government contractors to take affirmative actions to overcome past patterns of exclusion or discrimination" (p. 4).

The late 1960s began the feminist movement, the main goal of which was to achieve equality for females by minimizing the differences between men and women. During this time the term androgyny, which is the combined presence of socially valued agentic and communal traits, was coined. During the feminist movement, sexual power became diffused and the focus was on socializing women to become equal with men. This re-socialization of women was conducted during workshops and seminars that were constructed to train women on becoming agentic, which continued the belief that women have deficits when it comes to leadership (Grant, 1988).

From the late '70s to early '80s, it became evident that these government mandates were not being enforced. While organizations did become increasingly diverse, the change was minimal and slow due to the entrenched corporate cultures. Corporations began offering in-house diversity training to help change their corporate cultures by showing the value of diversity. These training programs did not lead to long-term cultural changes within corporations. In the 1990s, business cases began to emerge that tied corporate diversity to better business results in hopes of fueling the diversity pipeline. These business cases highlighted the need for open channels of communication, conflict resolution, and cohesion, which was being hindered by the adverse effects of low workplace diversity (Kochan et al., 2003).

Gender Stereotyping
Over the years, there have been two main streams of research concerning gender and managerial stereotyping: Virginia Schein and Sandra Bem. Virginia Schein believed that gender stereotyping created a majority of managerial barriers for females. In 1970, a survey was done by Women in the Work Force that revealed only 5 percent of middle and senior management positions in corporations were held by females. Schein believed that sex role stereotyping was inhibiting females from achieving managerial roles through the creation of occupational sex typing (Schein, 1973). "Occupations can be described as sex-typed when a large majority of those in them are of one sex and when there is an associated normative expectation that this is how it should be" (Epstein, 1970, p. 152). Using the definition of occupational sex typing coupled with the statistical findings of the Women in the Work Force survey, Schein concluded that managerial roles are classified as masculine occupations (Schein, 1973).

Due to sex role stereotyping, some females do not even strive for management positions because it goes against their self-image and individuals typically only engage in positions that maximize their cognitive balance (Korman, 1970). Schein believed females who did aspire for a management role faced promotional barriers because the characteristics of a successful manager were more closely related to men. A study conducted by Bowman, Worthy, and Greyser (1965) found that men were more accepting of females in a managerial role if the females were older. Men were more accepting of older female managers than they were of younger female managers because older female managers were seen as having more experience and most likely to have adopted masculine characteristics over time.

Sandra Bem believed that masculine and feminine dimensions should be evaluated separately rather than as opposing dimensions. She hypothesized that typical sex-typing eliminated the possibility that individuals could have both feminine and masculine traits. In 1975, Sandra Bem used the BSRI to test the level of conformity of feminine individuals compared to masculine and androgynous individuals. Bem used prescreened cartoons that participants were asked to rate in order of perceived level of humor. There was only one subject per group, and the other group members were instructed on how to respond. Half the groups had the subject rate the cartoons first and the other half had the subject rate the cartoon last. The results of this study indicated that individuals with masculine or androgynous traits conformed less frequently than did individuals displaying feminine traits.

According to Bem and Lenney (1976), androgynous individuals were becoming the norm for society because these individuals have the flexibility to display masculine and feminine traits as needed. They hypothesized that androgynous individuals could display either masculine or feminine traits, but individuals categorized as displaying masculine or feminine traits did not cross over. The study pre-determined masculine, feminine, or neutral activities, and then subjects were asked to choose a pair of activities in which they wanted to partake, with 15 control pairs as the baseline. Each activity paid out a certain amount, with sex-appropriate activities paying less than less sex-appropriate activities. The results of the study showed that individuals with masculine traits picked the higher-paying activities regardless of the sex-appropriateness of the task, whereas individuals displaying feminine traits tended to choose only sex-appropriate tasks.

Current Theories

In the past, studies of sex differences have not taken into account the impact an organization's social culture has on the variables. By not accounting for this factor, there are inadequate explanations for individual behaviors in corporations. Ely and Padavic (2007) looked at studies done over the past twenty years to explore the need for further studies focusing on the impact of gender on corporations. Through their research, they found common trends in the studies. First, they found that a majority of studies used the terms 'gender' and 'sex' interchangeably. By not acknowledging differences between sex and gender outside of an individual's personal attributes, the researchers did not allow for the possibility that socialization would influence an individual's gender. Second, they found that researchers believed sex differences developed outside organizations during an individual's childhood socialization. Limiting the development of sex roles to an

individual's childhood eliminated the possibility that sex roles continue to develop and refine during one's life. Lastly, researchers assumed that differences existed between men and women due to variables other than sex and gender.

Gender has traditionally stemmed from biological sex. Biological sex is defined as an individual's biological characteristics, whereas gender is a collection of qualities, labeled male or female that is created culturally (Pounder & Coleman, 2002). "Gender is an institutionalized system of social practices for constituting males and females as different in socially significant ways and organizing inequality in terms of those differences" (Ridgeway, 2001, p. 637).

According to Carli (2001), an individual's gender impacts the power and influence he or she has over others. Women tend to hold lower status levels than men within organizations, thus placing women at a disadvantage. Due to this gendered hierarchy, individuals tend to be influenced by men more than women, and when women do yield power and influence, it is within the context of their defined societal role. Power shifts take place within group settings. When a group is predominantly comprised of women, women tend to participate to a larger degree, whereas if the group is predominantly comprised of men, women participate less. Individuals tend to resist women's influence because women are seen as having lower levels of competence than men. Men tend to resist a woman's power more often than do other women because men perceive influential women as threats to their power base.

Gender Stereotyping
Stereotypes are "beliefs about the characteristics, attributes, and behaviors of members of certain groups," which are used

to process information and justify certain social roles (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996; as cited in Powell, Butterfield, & Parent, 2002, p. 177). Stereotyping often works to women's disadvantage in the corporate world. Gender stereotyping is embedded into Western culture and has been a major impediment to women's progress into the corporate suite. When decisions need to be made regarding skills, leadership ability, and individual characteristics, stereotypical images fill in the blanks when making decisions (Gmur, 2006). According to Gmur (2006), women can lessen the influence of gender stereotyping by providing as much information and being as transparent as possible to eliminate information gaps in decision-making.

The expectations of how a group of individuals behave are referred to as descriptive norms, and how the group actually behaves is referred to as injunctive norms. Stereotypes correlate to a culture's descriptive norms and lack the prescriptive element of injunctive norms. Gender roles, meanwhile, combine the descriptive and injunctive norms of a culture. An individual's observable behavior matches the stereotype for his or her gender role. "Gender stereotypes thus follow from observations of people in sex-typical social roles…men's occupancy of breadwinner and higher status roles and women's occupancy of homemaker and lower status roles" (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 574). These gender stereotypes of men and women have remained stable within Western culture, even with the progress women have made in creating equality between the two sexes (Powell et al., 2002).

Expectation States Theory and Status Beliefs
Gender stereotypes are the *genetic coding* within Western culture that affects an

individual's perception of how females and males should behave in certain roles. Expectation states theory states that gender is deeply embedded into an organization's social hierarchy and an individual's leadership style because of the rules of the gender system. Gender stereotypes contain status beliefs, which are defined as "shared cultural schemas about the status position in society of groups such as those based on gender, ethnicity, education, or occupation" (Ridgeway, 2001, p. 637). According to the expectation states theory, when individuals in a corporation work together to carry out its vision, status beliefs shape the social hierarchies. The status beliefs that develop about the social groups within corporations are also grounded in inequalities. For example, when individuals exert power within social groups, powerful females find themselves facing disadvantages compared to powerful male colleagues because of gender status beliefs. According to Ridgeway (2001), advantaged groups are seen in society as having greater competence and social significance than disadvantaged groups.

"The core of expectations states theory is its account for the formation of behavioral hierarchies of influence and esteem among individuals and how this process is shaped by status beliefs" (Ridgeway, 2001, p. 642). These behavioral hierarchies are the basis for individuals accessing leadership roles, because leadership roles are based on both tasks and social ability. Western culture refers to this informally as *who's got it* and *who doesn't*. Task and social ability thus emerge as necessary components of leadership because of *self-other performance expectations*. Expectation states theory argues that when individuals enter the organizational setting for the first time they absorb the culture to determine what is socially acceptable in that

environment before constructing their role in the social hierarchy. The assumptions these individuals make about the culture are termed *self-other performance expectations* (Ridgeway, 2001; Weyer, 2007).

Role Congruity Theory
Role congruity theory takes into account an individual's gender role, its congruity with other roles, and prejudicial behavior associated with the role. Females holding or striving to obtain leadership roles face prejudice because their feminine gender role does not correlate with the stereotypical expectations of leaders. Feminine gender roles are seen as having communal qualities, whereas leadership roles are perceived as having agentic qualities (Sumer, 2006).

Role congruity theory is quite different from traditional theories because traditional theories are context-free. Traditional theories cannot explain why women have been evaluated positively in some roles but not others and postulate a general prejudice towards women. Role congruity theory also differs from Glick and Fiske (1996)'s ambivalent sexism theory, because ambivalent sexism theory sees both viewpoints as sexist. Ambivalent sexism theory is comprised of benevolent and hostile sexism. Benevolent sexism takes place when women are performing culturally appropriate gender roles, whereas hostile sexism occurs when women perform gender roles that go against culturally appropriate roles.

Heilman (1983)'s lack-of-fit model has greater congruency with Eagly and Karau (2002)'s role congruity theory. The lack-of-fit model states the success an individual will have in a position is determined by the "fit between the perception of an individual's attributes and the perception of the job's requirements" (p. 278). Applying

Heilman's lack-of-fit model to the perceived job requirements for a managerial role, women's attributes are a poor fit that will likely result in failure whereas a man's attributes are a good fit that will likely result in success. Eagly and Karau's role congruity theory "transforms [Heilman's] insights into a systemic theory by joining social-cognitive research on stereotyping and prejudice and industrial-organizational research on management and leadership" (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 579). By joining these theories, Eagly and Karau's role congruity theory is able to "account for a wide range of moderating conditions in terms of common underlying mechanisms" (p. 579).

Gender and Perceptions

Perceptions about men and women are embedded, from childhood, in creating a gendered lens within our society. A human develops three types of schemata: self-schema, cognitive generalizations, and gender schema (Olsson & Walker, 2003). An individual's gender schema defines how the individual perceives and processes information based along gender dimensions. In Western culture, females have more latitude than males when defining their gender schema. Females adopt feminine, masculine, or androgynous characteristics that do not have any restrictions on their gender role. Males only typically adopt masculine or androgynous characteristics and reject femininity. They typically reject feminine characteristics because, within Western culture, a male's gender role should not reflect these characteristics and could result in social rejection and ostracism (Grabill et al., 2005).

Within Western culture there is a general perception that men are leaders and women are followers that has not changed over the centuries (Jackson, 2001; Liu & Wilson,

2001; Robison-Awana et al., 2002). When women are perceived as good leaders, it becomes a disadvantage for them because of the injunctive norms that are associated with the feminine stereotype. To be defined as a good leader in Western culture, a leader needs to portray agentic attributes, which means when women are defined as good leaders they are displaying stereotypical masculine attributes. This could create a disadvantage for women when being evaluated by someone whose beliefs are embedded in traditional gender roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

According to Eagly and Karau (2002), women face discrimination based on perceptions of how women could lead or how they actually lead in comparison to men. A study conducted by Seem and Clark (2006) found that current gender role stereotypes have changed, but not to benefit women. Their study found that females are still expected to display traditional feminine characteristics in addition to masculine characteristics and behaviors such as competency. The perceptions for men have not changed.

Power, Influence, and Promotion

According to Cartwright (1959), power is defined as "the potential ability of one person to induce force on another person toward movement or change in a given direction, within a given behavior direction, at a given time" (p. 99). Women have not been victimized within corporations in relation to executive power (Olsson & Walker, 2003). Gender roles define the basis for power differentials, which is referred to as gender authority. An individual's perception of power is influenced by his/her social standing and systematic biases (Cundiff & Komarraju, 2008).

Men and women use power differently, when women exert power, it typically results in negative consequences. According to Johnson (1976), there are three dimensions of power: indirect vs. direct, personal vs. concrete, and helplessness vs. competence. Women use indirect power more than men, because women are seen as being less direct and sneakier than men. Men have concrete power in our culture because they control resources such as money, knowledge, and strength, whereas women have personal power because of their ability to build relationships. Women rely on helplessness because of their lack of concrete power.

There are two streams of research about how individuals exert influence over others: leadership theory and power research. Leadership style focuses on leaders' leadership style and how they use this style to influence others, whereas power research focuses on which power source a leader uses to influence others. Both methods are used to increase communication and meet organizational objectives. Stoeberl, Kwon, Han, and Bae (1998) conducted a study to determine if gender influenced the relationship between leadership and power. They used the Student Instructional Report developed by the Educational Testing Service, which was administered to four different universities totaling 486 participants. The study found that gender did have an impact on the power sources women and men used to influence others. Women use legitimate, expert, and referent power sources to influence others more than men, and men use reward and coercive power sources to influence others more than women.

Johnson (1976) conducted a study and found that when women tried to use masculine stereotyped power sources they received negative reactions but that it was socially accepted for men to use both feminine and masculine stereotyped power sources. Appendix A lists Johnson (1976)'s stereotyped power sources by biological sex. A study conducted by Raven and Kruglanski (1970) found a direct correlation between helplessness and self-esteem. Women who use helplessness as a power tend to have low self-esteem.

It is common today for individuals to wonder why some were promoted into the corporate suite while others were overlooked. Women are overlooked more frequently than men when organizations are filling senior management positions. When women inquire about this, the responses are typically vague and lack detail. If a woman adapts a masculine leadership style and is seen as displaying masculine characteristics, she will have a greater likelihood of success (Hopfl & Matilal, 2007). According to Beeson (2009), individuals must possess three characteristics for career advancement; strong performance, ethical behavior, and self-motivation. There are four characteristics meanwhile that would prevent an individual from advancement: poor interpersonal skills, lack of respect for others, putting self-interest above the organization, and having a narrow vision.

Gender and Leadership
The distinction between biological sex and gender has allowed females to exhibit masculine traits and males to exhibit feminine traits. In addition, by breaking down gender, distinctive characteristics have been attributed to each category: masculine, feminine, and androgynous (Pounder & Coleman, 2002). Appendix B presents a partial list of characteristics by gender. According to Pounder and Coleman (2002), the characteristics that have been attributed within our society as masculine have been

correlated to transactional leadership, whereas characteristics attributed as feminine have been correlated to transformational leadership. Socialization is the central idea behind Pounder and Coleman's theory that gender influences an individual's leadership style. Through the socialization process, "Women have developed values and characteristics that result in leadership behaviors that are different from the traditional competitive, controlling aggressive leadership behaviors of men" (Pounder & Coleman, 2002, p. 124).

Within Western culture, the terms 'leader' and 'leadership' refer to the individual and the collective. "A leader is an individual who influences others to make choices consistent with the leader's intention" (Volkmann, 2005, p. 290). The role of leader changes based on the needs of the organization and necessary skill sets to meet organizational objectives. "Leadership is the emergence of leader behaviors in a system over time" (p. 290). Over the past decade, there has been debate about leadership styles and gender. Prior to the '90s, researchers believed gender did not have an impact on an individual's leadership style. During the past two decades, this belief has been shifting with a greater focus on transformational leadership style. Transformational leadership was first coined in 1978 by Burns and was developed further by Bass in 1985. As females have increased their presence in the management arena over the past two decades, the differences between feminine and masculine leadership styles have become increasingly evident.

In 1990, Eagly and Johnson conducted a study of gender differences in leadership style and found that women adapted to a participative style while men adapted to a more autocratic style. Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995) furthered the 1990 study by using participants from corporations. This study found that women were more successful in roles that were deemed feminine and men were more successful in roles that were deemed masculine. In terms of leadership, the study found that men were accepted more frequently as leaders than women and that women generally led in a transformational style.

Both of these studies had some limitations such as sample size, narrow definition of variables, and so on. Kabacoff (1998) constructed a study that focused on narrowing down these limitations. He used 900 males and 900 females in his study, who were asked to complete 360-degree evaluations from 143 different companies. When the evaluations were analyzed, the researcher found results he did not expect in comparison to previous studies. Based on the previous studies, it would seem that males should have been rated higher on dominant and management focuses than females, but Kabacoff's study revealed the opposite to be true. Conversely, it would be expected that females would rate higher on cooperation and consensual issues than males; but again, Kabacoff found the opposite to be true. In terms of general effectiveness, women and men both rated the same except in regards to strategic vision. The study found that there is a general perception that females lack training in developing strategic plans, which creates an impediment for females to achieve senior-level positions.

In 2000 Kabacoff conducted another study, once again attempting to address limitations in previous studies by using the self and observer version of the Leadership Effectiveness Analysis (LEA). The self-analysis was given to 215 senior executives and the observer analysis was given to 622

peers and 784 direct reports. All participants reported male senior executives as restrained in their emotional expressions, whereas direct reports reported females as more emotional but having a greater capacity for keeping individuals motivated. Female senior executives also set more deadlines and benchmarks for their direct reports, resulting in higher expectations, whereas male senior executives were seen as following a more traditional approach and working towards minimizing risk. These leadership behaviors did not have an impact on the leader's effectiveness but observers did value involvement to a higher degree, which correlates closer to a female's leadership behavior.

Burke and Collins (2001) conducted a study to see how women and men identified their leadership styles. One thousand thirty-one CPAs were surveyed using the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire to measure the frequency between transformational and transactional leadership. The study found that both men and women in this industry tended to use transformational leadership more frequently than transactional leadership; but the women's frequency was higher than the men's frequency. Burke and Collins noted that industry played a large role in the study's findings because CPAs work in a team atmosphere, which demands higher levels of transformational traits.

Socialization

Some researchers believe that an individual's gender determines his or her leadership style, and the concept of socialization is central to this belief (Pounder & Coleman, 2002). Socialization is "the processes by which an individual selectively acquires the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to perform a social role effectively" (Trinidad & Normore, 2005, p. 577). Due to the socialization

process, women have developed leadership characteristics that are different than the traditional leadership characteristics of men (Pounder & Coleman, 2002). The socialization process has three stages: separation, transition, and incorporation. During the separation stage, individuals begin defining themselves rather than being defined by society. In the transition stage, individuals compare themselves against their job tasks and functions. Lastly, the incorporation stage is a time for individuals to reflect upon the differences between their former and present selves. For women, these socialization stages influence and shape their behavior within corporations (Trinidad & Normore, 2005).

Helgesin (1990) argues that a woman's domestic role involves juggling multiple tasks, which gives women an advantage over men in terms of being able to prioritize. Grant (1988) believes that, due to socialization and woman's role in nurturing, women are better at communicating than men. As 21st-century organizations continue to increase the amount of teamwork within the organization, leaders who have increased their communication capabilities will have more successful teams in terms of efficiency, commitment, trust, and productivity (Rigg & Sparrow, 1994). A study conducted by Yammarino, Dubinsky, Comer, and Jolson (1997) revealed that female leaders are able to develop interpersonal relationships more easily than male leaders. According to Rigg and Sparrow (1994), women communicate to develop relationships, whereas men communicate to dispense information. Women develop relationships through communication by using probing and open-ended questions, which are interpreted as indecisiveness and a lack of confidence.

Transformational-Charismatic Leadership

Research has shown that the most effective leadership style for the 21st century is transformational leadership, which has a higher rate of frequency with women than with men. The top-down approach within organizations is no longer effective. Knowledge workers want an environment that promotes self-development, innovative problem solving, teamwork, open channels of communication, and so on (*"The world needs,"* 2008).

Transformational Leadership empowers others to become freethinking, independent individuals capable of exercising leadership (Kinkead, n.d.). Judge (2004) believes transformational leadership adds to transactional leadership through the augmentation effect making better leaders. Without transactional leadership, transformational leadership would not be possible because transformational leadership is an extension of transactional leadership. Madzar (2001) believes transformational and transactional leadership are two distinct leadership theories, but that a single leader can possess traits from both theories.

Fiedler and House (1968) describe charismatic leadership as "articulating a vision and mission, and creating and maintaining a positive image in the mind of followers" (p. 78). According to Bedell, Hunter, Angie, and Vert (2006), a link exists between transformational and charismatic leadership because both leadership theories emerge from a single pathway. Aaltio-Marjosola and Takala (2000) believe followers who accept charismatic leadership are displaying signs of weakness and subordination. Followers accept charismatic leaders because they are in distress and believe the leader is extraordinarily qualified.

Transformational-Charismatic leaders develop relationships with their followers, which results in higher levels of productivity and efficiency and goes beyond meeting the needs of followers through the use of contingent rewards (Yammarino et al., 1997). A study conducted by Druskat (1994) found that female employees rated female leaders as having more transformational leadership characteristics than transactional characteristics. Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995) had similar findings as Druskat, but their study showed that both female and male employees felt that female leaders have more transformational than transactional leadership characteristics. Bass, Avolio, and Atwater (1996) conducted a study similar to Druskat et al. (1995), but determined the findings were not significant due to small effect sizes. All three studies did determine that leaders with transformational-charismatic characteristics have employees who performed superior work and had higher levels of organizational commitment.

Barriers Females Face

Females continue to report barriers preventing them from obtaining senior management positions and, females of color face double marginalization because of their gender and minority status. "Failure to acknowledge that there is discrimination in the workplace fails to address one of the core barriers: stereotyping and preconceptions" (Kilian, Hukai, & McCarty, 2005, p. 161). According to Barrett and Beeson (2002), there is a direct correlation between organizations that acknowledge diversity and offer diversity training and having a diversified leadership team. Organizations that do not acknowledge diversity are limiting female's career paths.

For females to be able to begin breaking down some of these organizational barriers, there needs to be commitment from senior management. It is not enough for corporations to meet the minimum legal requirements when building a diversity pipeline. Senior management needs to commit to moving females into senior management; the only way to do this is to change organizational culture through training. The *think male-think manager* phenomenon limits organizations and is a cultural norm that hinders females (Jackson, 2001; Schein, 2007).

Building a successful leadership pipeline is critical for succession planning in corporations. When top executives leave an organization, most organizations struggle to find the right talent to replace this individual. By maintaining a strong leadership pipeline within the organization there will be a large pool of talented candidates. This leadership pipeline needs to include a diverse pool of talented individuals to maximize the organization's potential (Charan, Drotter, & Noel, 2001).

Glass ceiling. The term 'glass ceiling' was first coined in 1986 by the *Wall Street Journal* and is defined as "a barrier of prejudice and discrimination that excludes women from higher level leadership positions" (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 573). Many researchers attribute this barrier to gender stereotyping rather than women having a lack of ability (Jackson, 2001; Maume, Jr., 2004). Education and social hierarchies are part of the reason the glass ceiling phenomenon exists (Guillaume & Pochic, 2009). Women are less likely than men to participate in networking events due to work-family conflicts ("*The world needs,"* 2008). According to Weyer (2007), three categories explain the glass ceiling:

biological, social, and structural/cultural issues.

Women find that it takes them longer than men to achieve corporate officer positions, if they achieve this level at all. Men typically follow a progressive vertical track to senior management, whereas women follow a slower route and at times make horizontal moves in hopes to get ahead. When geographical locations become a factor in organizational progression, women are less willing to move than men due to work-family conflicts. Western culture has established long hour norms for senior management, which is difficult for women because of their domestic role. Due to the social barriers that have developed in organizational culture, the glass-ceiling phenomenon has prevented women from obtaining corporate officer positions as frequently as men. For those females who do break through the glass ceiling to senior management, it typically happens later in their career than it does for their male counterparts (Guillaume & Pochic, 2009; Maume, Jr., 2004).

Goodman, Fields, and Blum (2003) looked at the *cracks in the glass ceiling* to understand in what type of organizations women have made it to the top and how they differ from other organizations. He hypothesized that organizations with more women in lower management would have more women in higher management; high turnover rates would be consistent with women in top management positions; the lower the management salaries, the more likely women would hold top management positions; and the younger the company, the more likely women would be in top management. Goodman et al. (2003)

found that women who did make it to the top did so in less-desirable companies. Women obtaining these positions in less-desirable companies faced gender stereotyping as a barrier since none of the women attained this level in a desirable company.

Most recently, women have been facing another version of the glass ceiling, referred to as the expatriate glass ceiling. With an increase in globalization and expansion of multinational firms, promotional opportunities into senior management not only reside within the U.S. but also abroad. Due to work-family obligations, women are often overlooked for foreign assignments. According to Insch, McIntyre, and Napier (2008), this should be a concern for corporations because their senior management lacks diversity, which inhibits strategic decision-making.

Glass cliff. In 2005 the media began making claims that organizations with female corporate officers and board members resulted in the organizations experiencing a decrease in their stock prices. As a result of the media's claims, Ryan and Haslam (2005) conducted a study of 100 organizations that had recently appointed a female to their board of directors. The study looked at the organizations' financial trends prior to and after the females' appointments. A majority of the organizations were struggling prior to the female being appointed and, in most cases, the stock prices rose slightly after the appointment. "In a time of a general downturn in the stock market, there was evidence of the glass cliff, such that [organizations] that made female board appointments had experienced consistently poor performance in the months

preceding the appointment" (Ryan, Haslam, & Postmes, 2007, p. 183).

Ryan et al. (2006) supplemented their prior research because their previous study used archival data. The 2006 study was an experimental study. Participants were provided with a job description and three likely candidates. One candidate was a female who was qualified for the job; the other two candidates were male. One of the male candidates was qualified and the other was not qualified for the job. This study found that females were more likely to be appointed into corporate officer positions or as board members when the organization was in a financial downturn.

Ryan et al. (2007) believed there are four underlying processes that create the glass cliff for females: sexism, lack of networks, perception, and inability to lead in a crisis. To determine the perception of others about the underlying processes of the glass cliff, Ryan, Haslam, and Postmes conducted a study using an article about the glass cliff phenomenon followed up with a survey that asked participants different questions about their perceptions of the glass cliff. When the results were analyzed, they found that females were more concerned about the glass cliff than males, and females more frequently related the glass cliff to sexism than males. The results also showed that both females and males felt females were at a disadvantage in terms of networking. Females believe they are appointed to these precarious positions because organizations see them as expendable.

Labyrinth. Women and men use different routes to climb the corporate ladder because of the barriers women face within corporations (Lyness & Thompson, 2000). A majority of the barriers that are used to describe a woman's path through the corporation are no longer relevant because

they describe impermeable paths. Nevertheless, women are beginning to break through these barriers into the corporate suite but in small numbers, which makes a metaphor, such as a labyrinth, more reasonable. A labyrinth represents the possible multiple routes that women follow in their career with viable routes to the corporate suite. The labyrinth still contains numerous barriers that females will face in corporations, but it accurately depicts that routes to the corporate suite do exist for females- they are just not direct (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly, 2008). This differs from male colleagues, who tend to obtain corporate office positions without hitting these barriers. Males climb the corporate ladder via a *glass escalator* (Ryan, Haslam, & Postmes, 2007).

Tokenism theory. Women who have broken through the glass ceiling are considered token women, because there are few who have achieved this status (Rosener, 1990). Tokenism theory was first coined by Kanter in 1977 and states that women will encounter at least six barriers to career advancement, which are listed in Appendix C, throughout their career. The label token has been associated with incompetence, and, since mostly women face this label, they are seen as incompetent (Kandola, 2004). According to Lyness and Thompson (2000), there are four facilitators women can use to be successful to alleviate the impact of barriers: have a good track record, develop good relationships, take a proactive approach to setting career goals, and obtain a mentor.

Female corporate officers will not feel the effect of tokenism theory in organizations that are predominantly feminine because social isolation will already have been overcome. In organizations where there are already women in senior management, these women will be perceived as a barrier to women below them because they will feel the organization's diversity quota has already been met. Women in these senior management positions still report a lack of power, and the predominant power still lies with men, even in situations when men might be the minority in senior management (Elvira & Cohen, 2001).

Simpson (2000) conducted a survey of 90 women to determine the differences between token and non-token women. Both token and non-token women reported the *men's club* as the single largest barrier they face. This is also referred to as corporate patriarchy and increases for women with minority status. Token women report having greater difficulty with their relationships with male colleagues than non-token women, which could be because there are fewer token women than non-token women, thereby causing organizational fit to be critical for their success. According to Yoder (2001), gender balancing is one solution for eradicating token status for women within corporations.

Elvira and Cohen (2001) found *tokenism* to be one of the reasons women have poor work experiences. People prefer to work with similar people, and when women are a minority in an organization, they have reported less positive experiences than men. Women in these types of organizations reported experiences such as social isolation, increased work demands, and so on. Organizational composition has been directly linked to employee turnover. The researchers did find that when men are the minority in an organization, they have not reported poor experiences like women have. It has been postulated that this is because men typically hold more powerful positions than women and belong to a larger majority of working individuals in society. Female

employees see the females directly above them as an impediment to success because there are fewer positions that need to be filled, and the organization may have already hit its quota of female employees. Females report that, when they are promoted, power and decision-making continue to reside with male employees.

Networking and mentoring.
Corporations have informal and formal networks. Research has shown that informal networks are typically divided by sex and ethnicity and that these networks have a significant impact on filling open vacancies. Formal networks in corporations are seen as a way to share knowledge and learn from others. Many of these formal networks are also segregated by sex and ethnicity limiting the impact (Kandola, 2004).

In the past, men had far more informal and formal networks than women, but that has slowly changed over the last decade. Women have been less successful in utilizing the full potential of these networks. They tend to rely on networks for social support while men use these networks to further their career growth. While women's participation in networking has increased, they are still not present in key networks. The barriers women face to joining key networks is power, less developed informal networks, and work-family conflicts. Many of these key networks meet after work-when women have family obligations that place them at a disadvantage (Tonge, 2008).

Individuals who have a mentor find they have greater career success than someone without a mentor. Mentoring moves through four stages: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition (Friday, Friday, & Green, 2004). Mentoring helps individuals learn values, abilities, and expected behaviors that they can implement

into their career paths (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Singh, Vinnicombe, & James, 2006). A study conducted by Palgi and Moore (2004) found that women who had male mentors had greater success gaining access to key networks and professional contacts than if they had a female mentor. Another study conducted by Okurame (2007) found that female mentors had higher psychosocial functions than male mentors, but there was no difference in terms of career development functions.

Few women have obtained senior management positions within corporations; this in turn, has resulted in limited same-sex mentors for younger women. The lack of female mentors has created a barrier for women striving to climb the corporate ladder, because younger women need to cross genders to find a mentor. Crossing genders can create issues for younger women because their approach to male senior colleagues can be misconstrued. When a man agrees to mentor a younger woman, he tends to spend less time and effort with that individual so their relationship is not seen as sexual in nature (Headlem-Wells, 2004).

Stress and Emotional Health
According to Nelson and Burke (2000), men reported women's lack of experience as the greatest barrier to achieving a corporate officer position. However, women perceived the corporate culture as the greatest barrier to achieving a corporate officer position. When women do obtain these positions, they tend not to last. Men believed they did not last due to work-life balance, whereas women believed they did not last due to a misalignment with personal values. Women who do obtain corporate officer positions report physical symptoms such as headaches, depression, sleep disturbances, and so on more often than

men. "Women's rate of depression is twice that found in men, and women are more likely to commit suicide than men" (p. 109). Due to women's minority status in corporations, women experience more stress than men. "The task stressors that pose particular risks for executive women are barriers to achievement, tokenism, overload, and downsizing" (p. 111).

Emotion management is comprised of two parts: emotional labor and emotion work. According to Erickson and Ritter (2001), emotional labor takes place in public for a wage and emotion work takes place in private. Within Western culture, our jobs are also emotionally gendered, placing an additional stressor on women. Women are best suited for positions that allow them to display positive emotions, while men are better suited for the opposite positions. An individual's hierarchical position within a corporation will determine the amount of control he or she has over his or her emotional labor. Hence, individuals in senior management will have more power and will be able to display negative emotions, whereas individuals in lower-level positions will have less power and need to display positive emotions towards individuals in higher positions. Since a majority of gendered roles for women are service positions, they will have less power and will receive a greater amount of negative emotions from their superiors. Due to this disadvantaged position for women, they report higher rates of burnout than men.

Over the centuries, the workplace has been dominated by men while the family role has been handled by women. However, this has been changing and women are attaining a larger role in the workplace. When work is defined as anything that is compensated, studies have found that women actually work five to seven hours a week more at

non-compensated tasks than men. While women have increased their presence in the work force, men have not kept pace with increasing their contribution to household work (Erickson & Ritter, 2001).

Women report feeling guilty when their work interferes with their family obligations, creating another barrier for women. A study conducted by Livingston and Judge (2008) revealed that women feel less guilty when family conflicts interfere with work, but more guilty when work conflicts interfere with family. Men feel guiltier when family conflicts interfere with work. Guilt has risen as an outcome from the work-family conflict, placing more pressure on women than on men.

Conclusion

Bias and discrimination are embedded in Western culture and are displayed in everyday interactions. The number of women in management positions within organizations has seen some sharp increases, but the number of women sitting on boards or in senior management positions has shown a much smaller increase over the years. Due to work-family conflicts, women are not able to join the same social networks as men since men typically get together after hours. Females have reported that they receive poor performance evaluations in comparison to their male colleagues within the context of their job roles resulting in a high percentage of turnover. As the landscape of corporate America continues to change and female-owned businesses increase, not having female board members could limit an organization's external resources.

References

Aaltio-Marjosola, I., & Takala, T. (2000). Charismatic Leadership, manipulation and the complexity of organizational life. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counselling Today*, 12(4), 146-158. doi:10.1108/13665620010332750

Agars, M. D. (2004). Reconsidering the impact of gender stereotypes on the advancement of women in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *28*(2), 103–111. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00127.x

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(1), 127-136. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.127

Ballard-Reisch, D., & Elton, M. (1992). Gender orientations and the bem sex role inventory: A psychological construct revisited. *Sex Roles, 27*(5/6), 291-306. doi:10.1007/BF00289930

Barrett, A. & Beeson, J. (2002). *Developing business leaders for 2010.* New York, NY: The Conference Board Research Report.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. E. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45*(1)*,* 5-34. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1996.tb00847.x

Bedell, K., Hunter, S., Angie, A., & Vert, A. (2006). A historiometric examination of Machiavellianism and a new taxonomy of leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(4), 50-73. doi:10.1177/107179190601200404

Beeson, J. (2009). Why you didn't get that promotion. *Harvard Business Review, 87*(6), 101-105.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162. doi:10.1037/h0036215

Bem, S. L. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*(4), 634-643. doi:10.1037/h0077098

Bem, S. L., & Lenney, E. (1976). Sex typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. *Journals of Personality and Social Psychology, 33*(1), 48-54. doi:10.1037/h0078640

Bowman, G. W., Worthy, N. B., & Greyser, S. A. (1965). Are women executives people? *Harvard Business Review, 43*, 14-16.

Burke, S. & Collins, K. M. (2001). Gender differences in leadership styles and management skills. *Women in Management Review, 16*(5), 244-256.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization or transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(4)*,* 468-478. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.80.4.468

Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 725-741. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00238

Cartwright, D. (1959). *Studies in social power.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Charan, R., Drotter, S., & Noel, J. (2001). *The leadership pipeline: How to build the leadership powered company*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cundiff, N. L., & Komarraju, M. (2008). Gender differences in ethnocultural empathy and attitudes toward men and women in authority. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 15*(1), 5-15. doi:10.1177/1548051808318000

Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the roman catholic church. *Leadership Quarterly, 5*(2), 99-119. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90023-X

Eagly, A. (2008). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(9), 63-72.

Eagly, A., & Johnson, B. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 233-256. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.108.2.233

Eagly, A., Karau, S., & Makhijani, M. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 117*(1), 125-145. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.117.1.125

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573-598. doi:10.1037//0033-295X.109.3.573

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(9), 63–71.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Elvira, M. M., & Cohen, L. E. (2001). Location matters: A cross-level analysis of the effects of organizational sex composition on turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(3), 591-605. doi:10.2307/3069373

Ely, R., & Padavic, I. (2007). A feminist analysis of organizational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1121-1143. doi:10.2307/20159359

Epstein, C. F. (1970). *Woman's place*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Erickson, R. J., & Ritter, C. (2001). Emotional labor, burnout, and inauthenticity: Does gender matter? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 64*(2), 146-163. doi:10.2307/3090130

Friday, E., Friday, S. S., & Green, A. L. (2004). A reconceptualization of mentoring and sponsoring. *Management Decision, 42*(5), 628-644. doi:10.1108/00251740410538488

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism theory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512.

Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109-118. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.56.2.109

Gmur, M. (2006). The gendered stereotypes of the 'good manager' sex role expectations towards male and female managers. *Management Review, 17*(2), 104-121.

Goodman, J. S., Fields, D. L., & Blum, T. C. (2003). Cracks in the glass ceiling: In what kinds of organizations do women make it to the top? *Group & Organization Management*, *28*(4), 475–501. doi:10.1177/1059601103251232

Grabill, K. M., Lasane, T. P., Povitsky, W. T., Saxe, P., Munro, G. D., Phelps. L. M., & Straub, J. (2005). Gender and study behavior: How social perception, social norm adherence, and structured academic behavior are predicted by gender. *North American Journal of Psychology, 7*(1), 7-24.

Grant, J. (1988). Women as managers: What they can offer to organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, *16(*3), 56-63. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(88)90036-8

Guillaume, C., & Pochic, S. (2009). What would you sacrifice? Access to top management and the work-life balance. *Gender, Work and Organization, 16*(1), 14-36. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00354.x

Headlem-Wells, J. (2004). E-mentoring for aspiring women managers. *Women in Management Review, 19*(4), 212-218. doi:10.1108/09649420410541281

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 5,* 269-298.

Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 657-674. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00234

Hopfl, H., & Matilal, S. (2007). The lady vanishes: Some thoughts on women and leadership. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(2), 198-208. doi:10.1108/09534810710724757

Insch, G. S., McIntyre, N., & Napier, N. K. (2008). The expatriate glass ceiling: The second layer of glass. *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*(1), 19-28. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9649-0

Jackson, J. C. (2001). Women middle managers' perception of the glass ceiling. *Women in Management Review, 16*(1), 30-41. doi:10.1108/09649420110380265

Johnson, P. (1976). Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. *Journal of Social Issues, 32*(3), 99-110. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1976.tb02599.x

Jogulu, U. D., & Wood, G. J. (2006). The role of leadership theory in raising the profile of women in management. *Equal Opportunities International, 25*(4), 236-250. doi:10.1108/02610150610706230

Judge, T., & Piccolo, R. (2004). Transformational and transactional Leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(5), 755-768. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Kabacoff, R. I. (1998). Gender differences in organizational leadership: A large sample study. *Management Research Group*, 1-22.

Kabacoff, R. I. (2000). Gender and leadership in the corporate boardroom. *Management Research Group*, 1-10.

Kandola, B. (2004). Skills development: The missing link in increasing diversity in leadership. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 36*(4), 143-147. doi:10.1108/00197850410542365

Kilian, C. M., Hukai, D., & McCarty, C. E. (2005). Building diversity in the pipeline to corporate leadership. *Journal of Management Development, 24*(2), 155-168. doi:10.1108/02621710510579518

Kinkead, J. (n.d.). Transformational leadership: A practice needed for first-year success. *Dalton State College*. 1-14.

Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D., & Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management, 42*(1), 3-21. doi:10.1002/hrm.10061

Korac-Kakabadse, A., Korac-Kakabadse, N., & Myers, A. (1998). Demographics and leadership philosophy: Exploring gender differences. *Journal of Management Development, 17*(5), 351-388. doi:10.1108/02621719810220225

Korman, A. K. (1970). Toward a hypothesis of work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *54*(1), 31-41. doi:10.1037/h0028656

Liu, J., & Wilson, D. (2001). The unchanging perception of women as managers. *Women in Management Review, 16*(4), 163-173. doi:10.1108/09649420110392145

Livingston, B. A. & Judge, T. A. (2008). Emotional responses to work-family conflict: An examination of gender role orientation among working men and women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 207-216. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.207

Lyness, K. S., & Thompson, D. E. (2000). Climbing the corporate ladder: Do female and male executives follow the same route? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(1), 86-101. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.85.1.86

Madzar, S. (2001). Subordinates' information inquiry: Exploring the effect of perceived leadership style and individual differences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74*, 221-232. doi:10.1348/096317901167325

Marsh, H. W., & Myers, M. (1986). Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny: A methodological and theoretical critique. *Sex Role, 14*(7/8), 397-430. doi:10.1007/BF00288424

Maume, Jr., D. J. (2004). Is the glass ceiling a unique form of inequality?: Evidence from a random-effects model of managerial attainment. *Work and Occupations, 31*(2), 250-274. doi:10.1177/0730888404263908

McGregor, J., & Tweed, D. (2001). Gender and managerial competence: Support for theories of androgyny? *Women in Management Review, 16*(6), 279-286. doi:10.1108/09649420110401540

N. A. (2008). The world needs women leaders: It is not the glass ceiling that prevents women from achieving senior leadership roles. *Strategic Direction*, *24*(3), 27-29.

Nelson, D. L., & Burke, R. J. (2000). Women executives: Health, stress, and success. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*(2), 107-119.

Okurame, D. E. (2007). Perceived mentoring functions: Does mentor's gender matter? *Women in Management Review, 22*(5), 418-427. doi:10.1108/09649420710761473

Olsson, S., & Walker, R. (2003). Through a gendered lens? Male and female executives' representations of one another. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24*(7/8), 387-396. doi:10.1108/01437730310498604

Palgi, J., & Moore, G. (2004). Social capital: Mentors and contacts. *Current Sociology, 52*(3), 459-480. doi:10.1177/0011392104043087

Porterfield, J., & Kleiner, B. H. (2005). A new era: Women and leadership. *Equal Opportunities International, 24*(5/6), 49-57. doi:10.1108/02610150510788150

Pounder, J. S., & Coleman, M. (2002). Women – better leaders then men? In general and educational management is still "all depends." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 23*(3), 122-133.

Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: Have the times changed? *Journal of Management, 28*(2), 177-193. doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(01)00136-2

Raven, B. H., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1970). *Conflict and power: The structure of conflict*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Gender, status and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 637-655. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00233

Rigg, C., & Sparrow, J. (1994). Gender, diversity and working styles. *Women in Management Review, 9*(1), 9-16. doi:10.1108/09649429410050971

Rizzo, A.-M., & Mendez, C. (1988). Making things happen in organizations: Does gender make a difference? *Public Personnel Management*, 17(1), 9-20.

Robison-Awana, P., Kehle, T. J., Bray, M. A., Jenson, W. R., Clark, E., & Lawless, K. A. (2002). Self-esteem, gender-role perception, gender-role orientation and attributional style as a function of academic competence: Smart girls are different, but a boy is a boy is a boy. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 17*(1), 47-64. doi:10.1177/082957350201700105

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 1,* 119-125.

Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Academy of Management, 16*(2), 81-90. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00433.x

Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S.A., & Postmes, T. (2005). What women can bring to the boardroom in the post-Enron era: The role of gender in transformational leadership. *Human Resource Management International Digest, 13*(2), 36-38.

Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., & Postmes, T. (2007). Reactions to the glass cliff: Gender differences in the explanations for the precsriousness of women's leadership positions. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 20*(2), 182-197.

Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., Hersby, M. & Bongiorno, R. (2006). *Think crisis-think female: Glass cliffs and contextual variation in the think manager-think male stereotype.*University of Exeter, Exeter, manuscript under review.

Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: Reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review, 22*(1), 6-18. doi:10.1108/09649420710726193

Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(2), 95-100.

Schwartz, F. N. (1989). Management women and the new facts of life. *Harvard Business Review*, 65–76.

Schwartz, K., & Robins, C. J. (1987). Psychological androgyny and ego development. *Sex Roles, 16*(1/2), 71-81.

Seem, S. R., & Clark M. D. (2006). Healthy women, healthy men, and healthy adults: An evaluation of gender role stereotypes in the twenty-first century. *Sex Roles, 55*(3/4*)*, 247-258. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9077-0

Simpson, R. (2000). Gender mix and organizational fit: How gender imbalance at different levels of the organization impacts on women managers. *Women in Management Review, 15*(1), 5-19.

Singh, V., & Vinnicombe, S. (2003). The 2002 female FTSE index and women directors. *Women in Management Review*, 18(7), 349-358. doi:10.1108/09649420310498975

Singh, V., Vinnicombe, S., & James, K. (2006). Constructing a professional identity: How young female managers use role models. *Women in Management Review, 21*(1), 67-81. doi:10.1108/09649420610643420

Stoeberl, P. A., Kwon, I. G., Han, D., & Bae, M. (1998). Leadership and power relationships based on culture and gender. *Women in Management Review, 13*(6), 208-216. doi:10.1108/09649429810232155

Sumer, H. C. (2006). Women in management: Still waiting to be full members of the club. *Sex Roles, 55*(1/2)*,* 63-72. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9059-2

Tonge, J. (2008). Barriers to networking for women in a UK professional service. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 23*(7), 484-505. doi:10.1108/17542410810908848

Trinidad, C., & Normore, A. H. (2005). Leadership and gender: A dangerous liaison? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(7), 574-590. doi:10.1108/01437730510624601

Vecchio, R. P., (2002). Leadership and gender advantage. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 643-671. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00156-X

Volckmann, R. (2005). Assessing executive leadership: An integral approach. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 18*(3), 289-302. doi:10.1108/09534810510599434

Watson, J. & Newby, R. (2005). Biological sex, stereotypical sex-roles, and SME owner characteristics. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research, 11*(2), 129-143. doi:10.1108/13552550510590545

Weyer, B. (2007). Twenty years later: Explaining the persistence of the glass ceiling for women leaders. *Women in Management Review, 22*(6), 482-496. doi:10.1108/09649420710778718

Yammarino, F. J., Dubinsky, A. J., Comer, L. B., & Jolson, M. A. (1997). Women and transformational and contingent reward leadership: A multiple-levels-of-analysis perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(1), 205-222. doi:10.2307/257027

Yoder, J. D. (2001). Making leadership work more effectively for women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 815-828. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00243

APPENDIX A: Stereotyped use of Power by Biological Sex (Johnson, 1976)

Female Power Sources	Male Power Sources
Coercions	Expert
Referent	Legitimate
Helplessness	Information
Indirect Forms of Power	Direct Rewards
	Coercion

APPENDIX B: Gender (Masculine, Feminine, or Androgynous) Characteristics

Masculine Characteristics	Feminine Characteristics	Androgynous Characteristics
Aggressive	Emotional	Adaptable
Independent	Sensitive	Conceited
Objective	Expressive	Conscientious
Logical	Cooperative	Conventional
Rational	Intuitive	Friendly
Analytical	Warm	Happy
Decisive	Tactful	Inefficient
Confident	Receptive to Ideas	Jealous
Assertive	Talkative	Likable
Ambitious	Gentle	Solemn
Opportunistic	Loyal	Unpredictable
Impersonal	Empathetic	Unsystematic
	Submissive	

Note: Data retrieved from Bem, 1974; Pounder & Coleman, 2002.

APPENDIX C: Token Status Barriers Faced by Women

Token Status Barriers
1. Women perceive that they are not a good fit with male dominated cultures.
2. Due to structural theory gender ratios are skewed within the upper rankings of corporations resulting in heightened cultural boundaries for women.
3. Women report receiving less mentoring than men.
4. Due to work-family conflicts women do not participate as often in social networking activities, which results in women relying more on formal organizational career processes than men.
5. Gender stereotyping has created barriers for women by attributing characteristics that are less desirable in male dominated cultures for critical assignments.
6. Women are less likely to receive overseas assignments due to stereotypical assumptions.

Note: Data retrieved from Kanter, 1977.