

Personality and Social Psychology

Gender-typing of leadership: Evaluations of real and ideal managers

ISABEL CUADRADO,¹ CRISTINA GARCÍA-AEL² and FERNANDO MOLERO²

¹University of Almería, Spain

²Spanish Open University (UNED), Spain

Cuadrado, I., García-Ael, C. & Molero, F. (2015). Gender-typing of leadership: Evaluations of real and ideal managers. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 56, 236–244.

This research focuses on female underrepresentation in managerial positions. Specifically, two studies examine gender-typing for managerial roles in Spain using ratings for real and ideal managers. In addition, we analyse the existence of same-gender bias on evaluations of the behavior of actual leaders. In the first study, 195 Spanish workers evaluate the extent to which gender-stereotypical traits are important for becoming a successful middle manager in three conditions (female managers, male managers, and managers in general). In the second study, we explore the degree to which the behavior of real Spanish managers is gender-typed and the existence of same-gender bias on leadership styles – transformational, transactional and avoidant/passive – and on leadership outcomes – effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction – from the perspective of subordinates ($N = 605$). Overall, the results demonstrate that masculine characteristics were rated as more important than feminine characteristics for managerial positions, and they were more often assigned to male managers than to female managers. Unexpectedly, this manager-male association is stronger among female participants than among male participants. Our findings also demonstrate that women subordinates evaluate their same-sex supervisors more favorably in transformational leadership, effectiveness, and extra effort. The negative consequences derived from gender-typing managerial positions are highlighted according to the role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. The positive effects of in-group female bias on behavior ratings are also noted. The mixed implications of these results for women's advancement to leadership positions are discussed.

Key words: Management, gender-typing, sex differences, leadership styles, same-gender bias.

Isabel Cuadrado, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Psychology, University of Almería, Spain, 04120. Tel: +34 950 214464; fax: +34 950 015420; e-mail: icuadrad@ual.es

INTRODUCTION

In Spain, one-third of middle management positions in small and medium-sized enterprises are occupied by women. However, women's representation in decision-making in the 35 largest companies (IBEX 35) dramatically decreases: Only 6.73% of the executive positions and 11.37% of the highest-ranking corporate board positions are held by women (Instituto de la Mujer, 2012). These data reveal that gender equality has not yet been reached in Spain, especially when compared to other European countries, such as France, Sweden, and Norway (European Commission, 2012), or the United States (Catalyst, 2012).

In recent years, research has provided numerous explanations for feminine underrepresentation in leadership positions (see, e.g., Ayman & Korabik, 2010). Gender-typing of managerial positions has been offered as one possible explanation for women's underrepresentation (e.g., Schein, 1973, 2001). Gender-typing refers to the association of a certain role with either gender (Kusterer, 2008). This paper attempts to expand on the literature regarding this topic.

GENDER-TYPING OF MANAGERIAL ROLES

One important line of research in the study of major barriers to women's entry into management has focused on gender stereotyping of managerial position (e.g., Duehr & Bono, 2006; Kusterer, 2008; Powell, Butterfield & Parent, 2002; Schein & Mueller, 1992; Schein, Mueller, Lituchy & Liu, 1996; Sczesny, 2003; Sczesny, Bosak, Neff & Schyns, 2004; Sümer, 2006). The general purpose of these studies has been to determine the

relationship between gender stereotyping and requisite management characteristics. Overall, the findings have shown the existence of the “think manager – think male” stereotype (Schein, 1973, 2001), which associates management roles with the masculine gender role.

A recent meta-analysis included studies based on three research paradigms (Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell & Ristikari, 2011) and summarized key points on gender stereotyping of managerial positions. First, leaders are perceived as similar to men but not very similar to women and as more agentic and masculine than communal and feminine. Second, the masculine construal of leadership is less pronounced for female than for male participants. Finally, cross-cultural comparisons in the meta-analysis were limited by the overrepresentation of the United States and, in general, were not examined.

A closer analysis revealed that several individual studies (Booyesen & Nkomo, 2010; Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Schein, 1989; Deal & Stevenson, 1998; Duehr & Bono, 2006; Kusterer, Lindholm & Montgomery, 2013; Schein, 2001; Sczesny, 2003) found diminished gender-typing of managerial roles among women. Cross-cultural studies (Schein & Mueller, 1992; Schein *et al.*, 1996; Sczesny *et al.*, 2004) have shown a similar pattern of gender-typing for the managerial position among male participants, but a different pattern among female participants. For example, US females did not gender-type the managerial position, but German and British females did, and British females did so to a lesser extent than German females (Schein & Mueller, 1992). Additionally, Schein *et al.* (1996) found a strong degree of managerial gender-typing among Chinese and Japanese women relative to former US female samples. Finally, Sczesny

et al. (2004) found that Australian women reported a higher task orientation (masculine) and valued this competence as being more important when compared to German and Indian women. These differences suggest that there is a need for further research on this topic in different countries.

The lack-of-fit model (Heilman, 2001) and the role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders (RCT; Eagly & Karau, 2002) explain how gender-typing leadership roles prevents women's access to managerial positions. RCT postulates that the perceived incongruity between the female stereotype and a leadership role is responsible for two types of prejudice towards female leaders and potential leaders. This prejudice results in poorer appraisal of women's leadership behavior in comparison to men's leadership behavior. The first type of prejudice, proceeding from the descriptive component of the gender stereotypes (i.e., beliefs about men's and women's characteristics) is due to the mismatch or incongruence between the predominantly feminine qualities associated with women and the predominantly masculine attributes that are supposedly necessary to be successful as a leader (see also Heilman, 2001). The second type of prejudice, derived from prescriptive gender stereotypes (i.e., beliefs about the desirable characteristics of the members of each sex) is due to that stereotypically male behavior is perceived as less desirable in women than in men. Consequently, while male leaders only need to demonstrate masculine behaviors, women leaders must exhibit both feminine and masculine traits in order to be perceived as effective (Caleo & Heilman, 2013; Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie & Reichard, 2008).

Despite the importance of descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotypes, most research on the "think-manager – think-male" stereotype has been exclusively focused on the descriptive component. To our knowledge, Sczesny (2003; Sczesny *et al.*, 2004) is the only author who has investigated both the descriptive and prescriptive content of leadership roles. Their results showed that gender stereotypes influenced descriptive aspects of the perception of leadership. Meanwhile, a more androgynous view regarding prescriptive aspects was observed. Because these studies were conducted on samples of students, it is relevant to examine the extent to which gender-stereotypical traits are important for becoming a successful middle manager among workers.

Most of the studies on gender stereotypes in leadership are conducted in settings (e.g., laboratories and classrooms) that are far removed from the actual context in which leadership takes place using imaginary people as targets (Kark, Waismel-Manor & Shamir, 2012). Along these lines, Landy (2008) notes that findings from such research cannot be generalized to the broader issues associated with employment discrimination, which calls into question the importance of stereotypes in workplace assessments (for comments contrary to this idea see Borgida, Deason, Kim & Fiske, 2008; Heilman & Eagly, 2008; Leslie, King, Bradley & Hebl, 2008). To our knowledge, the only study that *directly* examines whether stereotypes and workplace evaluations are associated was conducted by Kusterer *et al.* (2013) in Sweden. The results confirmed a link between stereotypes and evaluations of existing managers. That is, they empirically supported that stereotypes influence workplace assessments. Therefore, it is also important to analyse the degree to which male

and female subordinates gender-type their actual leaders in an organizational context.

Because the number of women in leadership roles has grown during the past three decades, the possibility that they may perform these roles differently than men has attracted increasing attention (Ayman, Korabik & Morris, 2009; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003). Consequently, another important approach to the study of female underrepresentation in managerial positions has been to investigate whether male and female leaders adopt different leadership styles.

SEX DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP STYLES

As noted by Eagly *et al.* (2003), the possibility that women and men differ in their leadership style is important because leaders' behavior is a major determinant of their effectiveness and chances for advancement.

Transformational and transactional leadership are two well-studied leadership styles. Briefly, transformational leaders innovate and produce changes in subordinates' attitudes, values, and beliefs through their personal influence. Such leaders establish themselves as role models by gaining the trust and confidence of followers. Transactional leadership involves managing, in the sense of clarifying subordinate responsibilities, rewarding subordinates for meeting objectives, and correcting subordinates when they fail to meet objectives (Bass, 1985). Avolio and Bass (2004) state that transformational leadership is comprised of five dimensions: idealized influence (attributes), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Transactional leadership includes two dimensions: contingent reward and active management by exception. Passive/avoidant leadership, which is adopted by leaders who avoid specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, or providing goals and standards to be achieved by followers (Avolio & Bass, 2004), encompasses passive management by exception and laissez-faire. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1997) was the first instrument designed (and the most widely used) for measuring these three leadership styles. The MLQ also measures three outcomes of leadership: effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort (defined as getting others to do more than they expected they could do; Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Although empirically separable, transformational and transactional leadership, especially contingent reward, are displayed by leaders who achieve high levels of performance (i.e., effectiveness and extra effort) and satisfaction (Dumdum, Lowe & Avolio, 2002; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Passive/avoidant leadership is negatively related to leaders' effectiveness and extra effort achieved in their subordinates, as well as subordinates' satisfaction with their leaders (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe *et al.*, 1996).

Eagly *et al.*'s (2003) meta-analysis showed that female leaders displayed more transformational (results also obtained in the meta-analysis conducted by van Engen & Willemsen, 2004) and contingent reward behaviors, and fewer avoidant/passive behaviors compared to men. These findings have been suggested as representing a female leadership advantage due to their association with leadership success (e.g., Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

However, Ayman *et al.* (2009) showed that male subordinates evaluated a female leader who rated herself as transformational more negatively than did female subordinates. Therefore, the evaluator's sex is an essential factor to consider in research on leadership style ratings.

A meta-analysis on gender and the evaluation of leaders (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992) demonstrated that male evaluators rated female leaders less favorably than equivalent male leaders, whereas females did not exhibit gender bias in their evaluations. Likewise, Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani's (1995) meta-analysis about gender and the effectiveness of leaders found that men considered same-gender leaders to be more effective, but women did not prefer one sex to the other in their evaluations of effectiveness. Contrary to these results, Powell, Butterfield, and Bartol (2008) experimentally showed that women exhibited favoritism in their evaluations of female-transformational leaders, while male evaluators did not evaluate male and female leaders differently. Kusterer *et al.*'s (2013) study also found that women appeared biased in favor of their own gender. Jackson, Engstrom, and Emmers-Sommer (2007) found same-gender bias in both men and women who had to determine the leader of a group. According to Jackson *et al.* (2007), men continue to see leadership as part of the male group identity, and women now also associate their own gender with leadership. These inconsistent results reveal that more research is needed to examine same-gender bias.

In this vein, Fajak and Haslam (1998) introduced the concept of "gender solidarity" in the workplace, which refers to identification and unity among members of the same sex. These authors noted that solidarity may occur as a function of gender (i.e., an inclination to favor persons of same sex), status (i.e., people in low-status positions will band together), or as a reflection of common processes upon which the above variables and others impact.

In order to expand our knowledge on the reviewed issues, we conducted two studies aimed at examining the existence of gender-typing of managerial roles in Spain using workers' ratings of real and ideal managers. In addition, we aimed to examine same-gender bias on the evaluations of the behavior of actual leaders.

STUDY 1

The present study investigated the extent to which gender-stereotypical traits were perceived as important for becoming a successful middle manager in three conditions (female managers, male managers, or managers in general). This study focuses on the prescriptive dimension of gender-typing of managerial roles. Limited attention has been given to the prescriptive component of gender stereotypes, except for studies that used student samples (Sczesny, 2003; Sczesny *et al.*, 2004). The present research employed a working sample in order to address this issue. On the basis of the aforementioned literature, we formulate the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Participants will value masculine characteristics as more important than feminine characteristics for becoming a successful middle manager (regardless of condition).

Hypothesis 2. The masculine gender-typing of successful managers will be stronger for male participants than female participants in all conditions.

Hypothesis 3. Participants will value feminine traits as more important for becoming a successful female middle manager than for becoming a successful male or general middle manager.

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of 195 Spanish workers (115 men and 80 women) ranging from 18 to 65 years old ($M = 39.48$, $SD = 10.59$). Fifty-seven percent (57.7%) of participants had higher education levels, and the remainder were distributed into primary, secondary, and vocational education levels. They were drawn from both public ($n = 111$) and private companies ($n = 84$). On the whole, they worked in different sectors of economic activity: industry (21.03%), education (15.9%), tourism (13.85), health (13.33%), construction (11.79%), commerce (10.77%), transport (9.23%), and agriculture (4.1%). Participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions (successful male middle manager, successful female middle manager, and successful gender-neutral middle manager). Participation in this study was voluntary.

Instrument and procedure

The authors and research assistants, who were colleagues and psychology students in the final year of their university studies, were trained to administer questionnaires. Participants were recruited from public places (e.g., bookstores, bus stops, train stations, parks). Active workers were asked to read and complete a 5-minute questionnaire. They did not receive any compensation for their participation. We obtained a response rate of 93%.

Participants were asked to evaluate the extent to which 12 masculine and feminine traits were important for becoming a successful leader. Items were selected from the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and from the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974), which have previously been used to measure stereotypical gender perceptions in leadership roles in Spain (e.g., Cuadrado, García-Ael & Molero, 2007). Some traits were eliminated because they could be viewed as irrelevant or misleading in the context of leadership (e.g., child-loving, tender, athletic) and/or they had a negative connotation (e.g., aggressive, dominant, compliant), which might skew the image of a good leader (Sczesny, 2003).

A principal factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 12 items. This analysis verified that masculine ($\alpha = 0.77$; variance explained 26.63%; factor loadings ranged from 0.59 to 0.75) and feminine ($\alpha = 0.72$; variance explained 23.08%; factor loadings ranged from 0.48 to 0.82) traits belonged to different dimensions. Factor 1 included six masculine traits (stands up very well under pressure, self-confident, competitive, makes decisions easily, willing to take risks, has negotiation skills). Factor 2 contained six items referring to feminine characteristics (able to devote self completely to others, warm in relations with others, emotional, sensitive to needs of others, understanding of others, helpful to others).

The study consisted of three conditions (successful male middle manager, successful female middle manager, and successful gender-neutral middle managers). An equal number of the three different forms of the questionnaire were mixed so that participants were randomly assigned to one condition. An almost equal number of men and women evaluated successful male middle managers ($n = 66$; $n_{Male} = 37$; $n_{Female} = 29$), successful female middle managers ($n = 65$; $n_{Male} = 32$; $n_{Female} = 33$),

and successful gender-neutral middle managers ($n = 64$; $n_{Male} = 36$; $n_{Female} = 28$).

Finally, participants were asked to complete socio-demographic questions (e.g., sex, age, level of education, and whether the organization belonged to the public or private sector).

RESULTS

The means and standard deviations of masculine and feminine traits by participant sex and manager sex are presented in Table 1. In general, as the paired t -test confirms, participants valued masculine traits as more important than feminine characteristics for becoming a successful middle manager, $t(194) = 13.64$, $p < 0.001$.

A 2 (Sex of participant: male vs. female) \times 3 (Target: successful middle male manager, successful middle female manager, and successful middle manager in general) univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for each dependent variable (masculine and feminine traits). The assumption of homogeneity of variance was assessed as adequate by Levene's test ($p > 0.05$).

Results showed a main effect for participant's sex on masculine traits, $F(1,194) = 3.75$, $p = 0.05$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$. Female participants considered masculine characteristics more important for becoming a successful middle manager than did male participants (see Table 1).

Results also showed a main effect for target on feminine traits, $F(2, 194) = 5.47$, $p = 0.005$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.055$. Scheffe *post hoc* comparisons were used to identify which samples were significantly different. The results showed that participants perceived feminine traits as more important for becoming a successful female middle manager than a successful male middle manager ($p = 0.032$). In addition, participants considered these traits as more important for becoming a successful gender-neutral middle manager than a successful male middle manager ($p = 0.007$). Therefore, both

male and female participants rated feminine traits as more important for becoming a successful middle manager (female and in general) than a successful male middle manager (see Table 1).

No additional significant effects were found.

Discussion

The aim of Study 1 was to investigate the extent to which perceived gender-stereotypical traits were important for becoming a successful middle manager across three conditions (female managers, male managers, or managers in general) in a working sample.

Our findings show that masculine traits are valued as more important than feminine characteristics for becoming a successful middle manager regardless of condition. This result supports Hypothesis 1 and confirms that the masculine construal of leadership observed in most countries (Koenig *et al.*, 2011; Schein, 2001) also occurs in Spain.

In contradiction to Hypothesis 2, we also found that male-typing of successful managers is stronger for female participants compared to male participants across all conditions. This finding is contrary to research that has found a diminished gender-typing of managerial roles among women (Booyesen & Nkomo, 2010; Brenner *et al.*, 1989; Deal & Stevenson, 1998; Duehr & Bono, 2006; Kusterer *et al.*, 2013; Schein, 2001; Sczesny, 2003), and it suggests that the gender advancements achieved in some countries have not yet been reached in Spain.

Finally, supporting Hypothesis 3, our results show that women and men workers value feminine traits as more important for becoming a successful middle manager (female and in general) than for becoming a successful male middle manager. These results suggest that male leaders need to only demonstrate masculine characteristics, while women leaders must also exhibit feminine traits in order to be perceived as effective (Caleo & Heilman, 2013; Johnson *et al.*, 2008).

Overall, these findings reveal that stereotyping continues to contribute to the difficulties that women encounter in attaining managerial roles in Spain.

The current study is focused on ideal managers, that is, we used imaginary people as targets. This limitation is present in most of the studies on gender stereotypes in leadership (Kark *et al.*, 2012). In addition, because Kusterer *et al.* (2013) have shown that stereotypes also influence workplace evaluations for actual leaders, the current research aims complement Study 1 and analyse the degree to which Spanish males and females gender-type their close leaders.

STUDY 2

This study attempts to accomplish two main goals. First, we seek to explore the degree to which the actual behavior of managers is gender-typed from the subordinates' perspective. In addition, we extend our analysis to investigate same-gender bias on evaluations of actual leaders' leadership styles. Maher (1997) also considered jointly held stereotypes and leadership styles. However, Maher did not investigate gender-typed traits, but instead examined leadership style stereotypes. Moreover, this author did not conduct research on ideal leaders to establish

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of masculine and feminine traits by participant sex and manager sex (Study 1)

Manager's sex	Participant's sex					
	Male		Female		Total	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Masculine traits						
Male manager	4.19	0.52	4.14	0.61	4.17	0.54
Female manager	3.95	0.66	4.38	0.42	4.17	0.59
Manager in general	4.15	0.63	4.26	0.49	4.19	0.57
Total	4.11 _a	0.60	4.28 _b	0.50	4.18^a	0.56
Feminine traits						
Male manager	3.22	0.64	3.19	0.70	3.21 _a	0.65
Female manager	3.39	0.62	3.61	0.62	3.50 _b	0.62
Manager in general	3.50	0.56	3.64	0.65	3.56 _b	0.60
Total	3.35	0.62	3.52	0.67	3.42^b	0.64

Notes: Scores range from 1, *not at all important*, to 5, *very important*. In masculine traits, means within a same row with different subscripts differed at $p < 0.05$. In feminine traits, means within a column that do not share the same subscripts differed at $p < 0.05$. Differences between masculine and feminine traits (in bold) have different supercripts ($p < 0.001$).

conclusions about ideal and real managers, and did not include leadership outcomes. Due to inconsistencies in previous research about the direction of gender bias, we focus on same-gender bias in leadership styles and leadership outcomes.

With these aspects in mind, the second goal of Study 2 is to investigate same-gender bias on transformational, transactional, and avoidant leadership style evaluations and leadership outcomes (effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort) of actual managers from the subordinates' perspective. According to the literature, we expect that:

Hypothesis 4. Subordinates – males to a greater extent than females – will describe their actual managers as possessing more masculine characteristics than feminine ones – male managers to a greater extent than female managers.

Hypothesis 5. Male participants will rate same-sex managers more favorably in leadership styles and outcome variables. Women will not favor one sex over the other in their evaluations.

METHOD

Participants

The study was comprised of 605 Spanish workers (252 males and 353 females), ranging from 18 to 65 years old ($M = 36.08$, $SD = 11.05$). Forty-two per cent (42.81%) of participants had higher education, and the remaining participants were distributed into primary, secondary, and vocational education levels. Sixty-four per cent (64.5%) of participants were employed in private companies. The remaining participants worked in public companies. Participants worked in different activity sectors, including public administration (24.46%), education (18.18%), health (13.88%), industry (11.08%), tourism (10.91%), commerce (7.61%), communication (6.61%), finances (3.8%), and transport (3.47%). Half of the participants (52%) indicated that their supervisor/leader was a male, whereas the other half (48%) reported having a female as their immediate superior.

Instruments and procedure

Research assistants contacted human resource managers at private and public Spanish companies that were easy to access and asked for their permission to conduct a survey with their employees. These managers were informed about the purpose of research, the procedure to use and the time required to perform the questionnaire. Questionnaires were distributed to the employees by the authors or research assistants. Research assistants were provided with a set of standard instructions to ensure that the conditions under which all workers filled out the questionnaires were the same. Workers were informed that the questionnaire was part of a research project on leadership. It was explained that there were no right or wrong answers. In order to assure the anonymity of their answers, human resource managers or other management staff of the company did not allocate the questionnaires among the employees. We obtained a response rate of 56%.

The questionnaire included the following variables:

Gender-typed traits. Each participant was asked to describe his/her immediate supervisor using the six masculine ($\alpha = 0.89$) and six feminine ($\alpha = 0.86$) characteristics from Study 1.

Leadership styles. Participants were also asked to judge the extent to which their immediate supervisor engaged in specific behaviors that were

measured by the MLQ. The latest version of the MLQ (5X-Short; Avolio & Bass, 2004) was used to assess supervisors' leadership behaviors. This instrument is a 45-item questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale scored from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*frequently, if not always*). This study used the version validated in Spain by Molero, Recio, and Cuadrado (2010).

The three factor structure of this questionnaire was assessed using the following scales (Avolio & Bass, 2004): transformational (20 items, $\alpha = 0.93$), transactional (eight items, $\alpha = 0.77$), and passive/avoidant leadership styles (eight items, $\alpha = 0.84$). The correlation between transformational and transactional leadership was $r(605) = 0.82$. Passive leadership styles were negatively correlated with transformational, $r(605) = -0.53$, and transactional leadership, $r(605) = -0.44$ ($p < 0.001$, in all the cases). These relations are similar those obtained in most studies using the MLQ (see Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Leadership outcomes. Participants were also asked to rate the extra effort they were willing to put into their work (three items; $\alpha = 0.84$), the perceived effectiveness of leaders' behavior (four items; $\alpha = 0.81$), and their satisfaction with their respective managers (two items; $\alpha = 0.77$). These three scales are part of the standardized MLQ 5X and are considered leadership outcomes (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Finally, participants completed socio-demographic questions (e.g., sex, age, level of education, whether the enterprise belonged to the public or private sector, and the sex of his/her immediate supervisor).

RESULTS

Sex differences in masculine and feminine traits

Means and standard deviations for the masculine and feminine traits by participant sex and manager sex are presented in Table 2. As the paired *t*-test confirms, managers were perceived as more masculine than feminine, $t(601) = 12.65$, $p < 0.001$.

The next step was to analyse how managers of different sexes were evaluated on masculine and feminine traits by males and females in subordinate positions. A 2×2 (Participant's sex \times Manager's sex) ANOVA was conducted for each dimension (feminine and masculine traits). The assumption of homogeneity of variance was assessed as sufficient using Levene's test ($p > .05$).

Table 2. Means and standard deviations of masculine and feminine traits by participant sex and manager sex (Study 2)

	Participant's sex					
	Male		Female		Total	
Manager's sex	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Masculine traits						
Male manager	3.49	0.96	3.59	0.98	3.54 _a	0.97
Female manager	3.21 _a	0.91	3.49 _b	0.94	3.41 _b	0.94
Total	3.39 _a	0.95	3.53 _b	0.96	3.48^a	0.96
Feminine traits						
Male manager	3.13	0.91	3.20	0.96	3.16	0.94
Female manager	2.96	0.93	3.21	0.95	3.14	0.95
Total	3.07 _a	0.92	3.21 _b	0.96	3.15^b	0.94

Notes: Scores range from 1, *not at all*, to 5, *frequently, if not always*. In masculine traits, means within a same root or line with different subscripts differed at $p < 0.05$. The same is true for feminine traits at $p < 0.05$. Differences between masculine and feminine traits (in bold) are signed with different superscripts ($p < 0.001$).

The ANOVA for the masculine factor resulted in a significant main effect for the manager's sex, $F(1, 598) = 5.05$, $p = 0.025$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$, and a significant main effect for the participant's sex, $F(1, 598) = 5.39$, $p = 0.021$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$. Male and female subordinates ascribed more masculine traits to male managers compared to female managers. For participants' sex, female subordinates attributed more masculine traits to their managers than male subordinates (see Table 2). The results of the ANOVA on feminine traits yielded a main effect for participant's sex, $F(1, 598) = 3.99$, $p = 0.046$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$. Compared to male subordinates, female subordinates reported that male and female managers possessed more feminine characteristics (see Table 2).

No other significant effects were found.

Sex differences in leadership styles and leadership outcomes

A 2 (Participant sex: male and female) \times 2 (Manager sex: male and female) ANOVA was conducted for each leadership style and leadership outcome variable. Levene's test was used to assess the assumption of homogeneity of variance for each analysis ($p > 0.05$).

Results yielded a significant Participant sex \times Manager sex interaction for four factors: Transformational leadership, $F(1, 600) = 3.89$, $p = 0.049$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$; avoidant leadership, $F(1, 600) = 4.18$, $p = 0.041$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$; effectiveness, $F(1, 600) = 4.92$, $p = 0.027$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$; and extra effort, $F(1, 600) = 4.59$, $p = 0.033$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$. No other significant effects were found.

As shown in Table 3, the test for simple effects (using the Bonferroni adjustment) found a same-gender bias among female subordinates for three factors. Female participants attributed more transformational behaviors ($p = 0.016$), more extra effort ($p = 0.007$), and more effectiveness to female managers than to male managers ($p = 0.014$).

Discussion

The general aim of this study was twofold. First, we sought to investigate the degree to which the actual behavior of managers is gender-typed from the subordinates' point of view. Moreover, we

were interested in studying same-gender bias on the leadership styles and the outcomes of leadership ratings for these managers.

For gender-typing in managerial positions, our findings show that managers are perceived as possessing more masculine than feminine characteristics, and this perception is stronger among the female than among the male participants. Likewise, masculine traits are more often assigned to male managers than to female managers. These findings partially support Hypothesis 4. Contrary to what we expected, women's perceptions of their managers were more male typed than those of men and were in consonance with the results obtained in Study 1. That is, the results confirm that the male-stereotypical view of leadership exists in Spain, especially among women. Therefore, these findings are in line with the male typing of managerial positions (e.g., Koenig *et al.*, 2011; Schein, 2001), but they do not align with the diminished gender-typing of managerial roles among women that has been found in several studies (Booyesen & Nkomo, 2010; Brenner *et al.*, 1989; Deal & Stevenson, 1998; Duehr & Bono, 2006; Kusterer *et al.*, 2013; Schein, 2001; Sczesny, 2003). In light of the above findings, equality in managerial positions should be further promoted in Spain.

Nevertheless, compared to males, female subordinates viewed managers – both men and women – as possessing more feminine characteristics. One might speculate that women are more aware of the current conception of leadership, which has incorporated more feminine qualities in recent years (Koenig *et al.*, 2011) and pays more attention to feminine traits.

Our findings also show that women subordinates tend to evaluate their same-gender supervisors more favorably (more transformational, more extra effort, and more effectiveness), in contrast to what we predicted in Hypothesis 5. This result is contrary to meta-analytic research (Eagly *et al.*, 1992, 1995), which highlights in-group male favoritism and that female evaluators do not exhibit gender bias. In contrast with these results and in consonance with Power *et al.* (2008) and Kusterer *et al.* (2013), the present study showed that in-group bias occurs exclusively among women. This finding could suggest that, for women, a female leader begins to be perceived as an in-group member (Jackson *et al.*, 2007), but men no longer see leadership as part of the male group identity.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations by participant sex and manager sex on the MLQ factors (Study 2)

	Manager's sex							
	Male managers				Female managers			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
Participant's sex	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Transformational leadership	3.01	0.79	2.99	0.78	2.83 _a	0.78	3.08 _b	0.82
Transactional leadership	3.03	0.78	2.96	0.70	2.93	0.81	3.05	0.76
Avoidance leadership	2.54	0.88	2.66	0.90	2.73	0.90	2.54	0.90
Outcome variables								
Extra effort	2.71	1.06	2.69	1.10	2.48 _a	1.06	2.86 _b	1.18
Effectiveness	3.21	0.94	3.15	1.06	2.94 _a	0.91	3.25 _b	0.99
Satisfaction	3.08	1.10	3.00	1.17	2.90	1.14	3.04	1.14

Notes: Scores range from 1, not at all, to 5, frequently, if not always. Means within a factor with different subscripts differed at $p < 0.05$.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present research focused on gender-typing of managerial positions in two studies. In Study 1, participants evaluated ideal leaders and these results were complemented by Study 2, in which participants rated their actual managers.

For ideal managers, the working sample estimated stereotypically masculine characteristics as more important than feminine characteristics for successful middle managerial positions. These findings confirm the existence of a “think manager – think male” stereotype (Schein, 1973) among Spanish workers, and they are consistent with recent meta-analytic research (Koenig *et al.*, 2011). However, in contrast to the meta-analytic research and other studies (e.g., Schein, 2001; Sczesny, 2003), the present research also shows that female workers value masculine characteristics as more important for becoming a successful middle manager than male workers. Therefore, the androgynous view of prescriptive aspects observed by Sczesny (2003) in Germany do not occur in Spain. These contradictory findings may be due to differences between German and Spain on gender equality, or to the different samples used in both studies (students vs. workers). More research is needed in order to explore prescriptive components of gender stereotypes in managerial positions.

It should be noted that the cultural masculinity of leader stereotypes has been addressed across different paradigms that use different methods – see Koenig *et al.*'s (2011) meta-analysis. However, Koenig *et al.*'s meta-analysis established a strong and robust tendency for leadership to be viewed as culturally masculine across paradigms.

Our second study, conducted with actual managers, demonstrates a similar pattern of findings. Thus, stereotypically masculine characteristics are more often assigned to actual male managers than to actual female managers, and females evaluate their real managers as more masculine than do males. Again, our findings confirm the presence of think manager – think male, and women hold this stereotype more strongly than men. Cross-cultural studies (Schein & Mueller, 1992; Schein *et al.*, 1996; Sczesny *et al.*, 2004) have shown that women gender-type leadership positions to a different extent depending on the country. In this vein, our results suggest that a gender-stereotypical view of leadership in masculine terms exists in Spain, particularly among women.

In light of the above findings, we can state that participants' gender stereotypes about successful management (Study 1) fit in well with gender-typed evaluations of actual managers (Study 2). This correspondence might indicate the influence of gender stereotypes on workplace evaluations, as some authors have advocated (Borgida *et al.*, 2008; Heilman & Eagly, 2008; Kusterer *et al.*, 2013; Leslie *et al.*, 2008).

According to RCT, stereotypically male traits are perceived as less desirable in women than in men. Thus, the male-typing observed in our studies may imply that females become victims of the prejudice identified by RCT. This prejudice might explain the low percentage of Spanish women in management positions.

RCT also posits that female managers presumably break prescriptive norms of their gender role if they do not exhibit feminine characteristics. As such, our first study shows that feminine characteristics are considered (by men and women) as more

important for becoming a successful female or general manager than for becoming a successful male manager. This result suggests that while male leaders need to only demonstrate masculine characteristics, women are allowed to be masculine as long as they exhibit feminine traits in order to be perceived as effective (Caleo & Heilman, 2013; Johnson *et al.*, 2008).

In short, taking RCT into account, our findings stress barriers to the advancement of Spanish women in management because they highlight the incongruity between the female stereotype and leadership roles. Given that some of our findings coincide with the research conducted in other countries while others do not, more cross-cultural studies are needed to examine the effect of culture on gender-typing, in line with what has been expressed by several authors (e.g., Koenig *et al.*, 2011; Schein, 2001; Sczesny *et al.*, 2004). Another interesting avenue for research would be to determine the extent to which the manager-male association is present among adolescents. It is critical to explore this issue in Spain to develop programs and interventions that can reduce the persistence of gender stereotypes in management.

The behavior and outcome ratings on actual managers provide encouraging findings that confirm the existence of in-group female favoritism, supporting the results of Power *et al.* (2008) and Kusterer *et al.* (2013) but contrasting to meta-analytic findings (Eagly *et al.*, 1992, 1995). In Fajak and Haslam's (1998) terms, there is a “gender solidarity” effect among the women in our study. Three explanations exist for this effect. First, this effect may be a product of gender, that is, women's sense of belonging to a group dominated rather than dominating leads them to define themselves and to be defined in relation to the opposite sex and to favor persons of their own gender. Second, the greater “gender solidarity” may be due to status, or the fact that women normally hold positions with a lower status in organizations. Finally, this finding may be a reflection of common processes upon which the above variables and others exert their effect. Future studies should examine factors that contribute to “gender solidarity.” In any case, these findings may represent an improvement for women in their route towards leadership.

As with other research, this work is not exempt of limitations. First, several of the differences found in our studies were small. However, as Eagly and Carli (2003) argued, effects that can seem small in terms of statistical metrics can have a practical importance in natural settings. Moreover, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) have specified that researchers face many barriers to achieving well-controlled studies of leadership, mainly in organizational settings; thus, uncontrolled variability would decrease the magnitude of systematic effects, including those representing sex differences. Another limitation is the convenience sampling procedure used in our studies, which precludes the generalization of our results. Consequently, we had an unequal distribution of participants as a function of the activity they perform (e.g., education, health). Future studies on the issues investigated here must include different organization types using representative samples to study the influence of organizational context on their results. Finally, because effectiveness and satisfaction were analysed using subjective ratings (see, e.g., Yukl, 2010), more research with objective measures of these variables is needed.

In spite of these limitations, this paper contributes to the literature on gender and leadership and allows for a detailed picture of how ideal and real managers – both men and women – are rated by male and female workers. This research has allowed for conclusions about gender-typing managerial positions based on the evaluations of ideal and actual managers – two important issues that are not usually jointly addressed. In addition, due to the overrepresentation of studies with US samples, our studies have been conducted in a country where the status of women in the labour force is lower. Moreover, unlike most studies on this topic that were conducted with undergraduate (see Koenig *et al.*, 2011) or management students (see Schein, 2001), our samples consisted of workers.

Taking these issues into consideration allows us to draw mixed implications about female advancement to leadership positions. On one hand, men and especially women continue supporting the think manager – think male stereotype in Spain. In this way, women's access to managerial positions in this country remains limited unless legal and structural measures in organizations are put in place. Steps must be taken so that similar proportions of men and women have decision-making power in organizations and feminine characteristics in leadership are valued. In turn, the rise of women into leadership roles will favor their presence in organizations given the female bias in actual behaviors found in this research. Thus, it is desirable that women, not just men, make up selection committees. We hope these changes occur rapidly in order to decrease gender inequality in management positions.

REFERENCES

- Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire* (3rd edn). Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Ayman, R. & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist*, *65*, 157–170.
- Ayman, R., Korabik, K. & Morris, S. (2009). Is transformational leadership always perceived as effective? Male subordinates' devaluation of female transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *39*, 852–879.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Revised manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 155–162.
- Booyesen, L. A. E. & Nkomo, S. M. (2010). Gender role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Gender in Management*, *25*, 285–300.
- Borgida, E., Deason, G., Kim, A. & Fiske, S. T. (2008). Stereotyping research and employment discrimination: Time to see the forest for the trees. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *1*, 405–408.
- Brenner, O. C., Tomkiewicz, J. & Schein, V. E. (1989). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, *32*, 662–669.
- Caleo, S. & Heilman, M. E. (2013). Gender stereotypes and their implications for women's career progress. In S. Vinnicombe, R. J. Burke, S. Blake-Beard & L. L. More (Eds.), *Handbook of research on promoting women's careers* (pp. 143–161). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Catalyst (2012). *Women in US Management*. Retrieved 2 June 2014 from <http://www.catalyst.org/publication/206/women-in-us-management>.
- Cuadrado, I., García-Ael, C. & Molero, F. (2007). Género y dirección: Un análisis del estereotipo "think manager-think male" [Gender and management: An analysis of the "think manager-think male" stereotype]. In C. L. Guillén & R. Guil (Eds.), *Psicología social: Un encuentro de perspectivas* (pp. 1410–1413). Cádiz: Asociación de Profesionales de la Psicología.
- Deal, J. J. & Stevenson, M. A. (1998). Perceptions of female and male managers in the 1990s: Plus ça change ... *Sex Roles*, *38*, 287–300.
- Duehr, E. E. & Bono, J. E. (2006). Men, women, and managers: Are stereotypes finally changing? *Personnel Psychology*, *59*, 815–846.
- Dumdum, R. U., Lowe, K. B. & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (pp. 35–66). New York: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*, 1–12.
- Eagly, A. H. & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 807–834.
- Eagly, A. H. & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 781–797.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. & van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 569–591.
- Eagly, A. H. & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573–598.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J. & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 125–145.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G. & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 3–22.
- European Commission (2012). *Women in economic decision-making in the EU: Progress report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fajak, A. & Haslam, S. A. (1998). Gender solidarity in hierarchical organizations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 73–94.
- 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.
- Heilman, M. E. & Eagly, A. H. (2008). Gender stereotypes are alive, well, and busy producing workplace discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *1*, 393–398.
- Instituto de la Mujer (2012). *Mujeres en cifras* [Women in numbers]. Retrieved 27 February 2014 from <http://www.e-igualdad.net/informes/mujeres-cifras>.
- Jackson, D., Engstrom, E. & Emmers-Sommer, T. (2007). Think leader, think male and female: Sex vs. seating arrangement as leadership cues. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 713–723.
- Johnson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., Zewdie, S. & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *106*, 39–60.
- 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.
- Kark, R., Waismel-Manor, R. & Shamir, B. (2012). Does valuing androgyny and femininity lead to a female advantage? The relationship between gender-role, transformational leadership and identification. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 620–640.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A. & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*, 616–642.

- Kusterer, H. L. (2008). Exploring the gender typing of management characteristics in an egalitarian context. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49, 549–557.
- Kusterer, H. L., Lindholm, T. & Montgomery, H. (2013). Gender typing in stereotypes and evaluations of actual managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28, 561–579.
- Landy, F. J. (2008). Stereotypes, bias, and personnel decisions: Strange and stranger. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 379–392.
- Leslie, L. M., King, E. B., Bradley, J. C. & Hebl, M. R. (2008). Triangulation across methodologies: All signs point to persistent stereotyping and discrimination in organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 399–404.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385–425.
- Maher, K. J. (1997). Gender-related stereotypes of transformational and transactional leadership. *Sex Roles*, 37, 209–225.
- Molero, F., Recio, P. & Cuadrado, I. (2010). Liderazgo transformacional y liderazgo transaccional: Un análisis de la estructura factorial del Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) en una muestra española [Transformational and transactional leadership: An analysis of the factor structure of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in a Spanish sample]. *Psicothema*, 22, 495–501.
- Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A. & Bartol, K. M. (2008). Leader evaluations: A new female advantage? *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 23, 156–174.
- Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A. & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: Have the times changed? *Journal of Management*, 28, 177–193.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 95–100.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 675–688.
- Schein, V. & Mueller, R. (1992). Sex role stereotyping and requisite management characteristics: A cross cultural look. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 439–447.
- Schein, V. E., Mueller, R., Lituchy, T. & Liu, J. (1996). Think manager – think male: A global phenomenon? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 33–41.
- Sczesny, S. (2003). A closer look beneath the surface: Various facets of the think manager – think male stereotype. *Sex Roles*, 49, 353–363.
- Sczesny, S., Bosak, J., Neff, D. & Schyns, B. (2004). Gender stereotypes and the attribution of leadership traits: A cross-cultural comparison. *Sex Roles*, 51, 631–645.
- Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Sümer, H. (2006). Women in management: Still waiting to be full members of the club. *Sex Roles*, 55, 63–72.
- van Engen, M. L. & Willemssen, T. M. (2004). Sex and leadership styles: A meta-analysis of research published in the 1990s. *Psychological Reports*, 94, 3–18.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th edn). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Received 6 June 2014, accepted 25 October 2014