
ABSTRACT. Research on leadership has either ignored women or focused on sex differences. This paper illustrates how both of these strategies have been detrimental to women. An alternative conception based on sex-role orientation is presented and the research relating androgyny to leadership style and managerial effectiveness is reviewed. It is proposed that adopting an androgynous management style may help women to overcome the negative effects of sex-stereotyping in the workplace.

Only recently has there been any study of women in positions of leadership (Nieva and Gutek, 1982). Most established theories of leadership (Fiedler, 1967; Graen, 1976; House and Mitchell, 1974; Stogdill, 1974; Vroom and Yetton, 1973) have been formulated on samples of male subjects and have excluded women from consideration. Although this exclusion has not always been intentional, it has contributed to the perception of women leaders as "invisible" (Porter *et al.*, 1978). Hopefully, as more and more women advance into high level managerial positions, this omission will be redressed.

The preponderance of the research which does pertain to women and leadership has focused on differences in leadership style (Nieva and Gutek, 1982). Furthermore, the reliance on a trait paradigm in this work (Riger and Galligan, 1980) has led to the attribution of such differences to internal, stable factors such as biological sex and this in turn has provided a rationale for viewing women as inappropriate for positions of leadership.

Recently, several authors who have reviewed the literature on leadership style have noted inconsistencies in the findings, particularly in regard to the

performance of females in same versus mixed sex groups and in laboratory settings versus actual positions of leadership (Dobbins and Platz, 1986; Hollander, 1979; Riger and Galligan, 1980). The first part of this paper will consist of a critique of the sex differences literature. The second part will be devoted to the presentation of an alternative theory of leadership style based on sex-role orientation. This conception not only helps to resolve the problems brought about by the previous perspective, but also offers a more positive view of the contribution which women make to leadership.

Sex differences in leadership

Bales' theory of leadership

Bales' theory of leadership style (1951, 1953) was originally developed in the laboratory using groups of male undergraduates. Bales found that in such groups two types of leadership specialists emerged: (1) a task-oriented expert who was concerned with instrumental functions related to achievement of group goals and (2) a social-emotional expert whose concern was the morale and cohesiveness of the group. Bales (1955, 1958) found that these leadership roles were generally independent and that they were usually fulfilled by different people. However, later research has demonstrated that a single person can and frequently does perform both functions (Lewis, 1972; Turk, 1961).

Bales (1951, 1953) conceived of these two leadership roles as complementary and saw both as necessary for the smooth functioning of the group. He concluded, however, that the social-emotional leader was the "real" leader of the group because interpersonal skills would generalize from situation to

Karen Korabik is currently an Associate Professor in the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph.

situation, whereas, instrumental skills were often task specific. Later research on leadership has largely ignored this conclusion and the implications which can be derived from it.

Studies of heterogeneous sex groups

Sex differences in leadership were first studied in mixed sex groups. In a wide variety of settings ranging from marriage to the courtroom, males were found to display more task-orientation than females and females were found to be more social-emotional than males (Heiss, 1962; Kenkel, 1957; Lockheed and Hall, 1976; Rosmann, 1977; Strodtbeck *et al.*, 1957; Strodtbeck and Mann, 1956). In addition, men and women are evaluated more favorably when they conform to these stereotyped roles than when they deviate from them (Bartol and Butterfield, 1976; Petty and Miles, 1976). In marital decision making wives have more influence when they use social-emotional arguments than when they use task-oriented arguments and husbands have more influence when they use task-oriented arguments than when they use social-emotional ones (Kenkel, 1957; Rosmann, 1977). Thus, it is likely that such sex-differentiated roles persist because they result in social rewards for the persons who embrace them (Riger and Galligan, 1980).

Studies of homogeneous sex groups

The literature on groups composed of members of the same biological sex, however, contains results which are quite inconsistent with those from mixed sex groups. Several laboratory studies have shown that there is no difference in the number of task-oriented acts produced by males and females in same sex groups (Eskilson and Wiley, 1976; Lockheed and Hall, 1976; Megargee, 1969). One explanation for the dissimilarity in the findings between the homogeneous and heterogeneous gender composition settings is that women may be socialized to suppress their capacity for instrumental behaviour when they are in the company of men.

A study by Megargee (1969) is particularly illustrative of this phenomena. He found that in groups composed of a high dominance female paired with a

low dominance female, the high dominance female would adopt the leadership role. However, when a high dominance female was paired with a low dominance male, in 91% of the groups the female would *actively* assign the leadership role to the male. Other research has shown that allowing women to first perform a task in a group composed of other women will increase their task-oriented output in mixed sex groups (Lockheed and Hall, 1976). These studies reveal that although women may have the capacity for instrumental behaviour, they often do not evidence it in heterogeneous sex situations either because of lack of experience or because they see it as inappropriate due to the sex-role constraints of the situation.

Persons in positions of leadership

Studies of men and women in actual leadership roles illustrate that persons who occupy parallel positions and perform similar functions do not differ in personality, leadership style, motivation or effectiveness (Birdsall, 1980; Chapman and Luthans, 1975; Day and Stogdill, 1972; Dobbins and Platz, 1986; Donnell and Hall, 1980; Miner, 1974; Muldrow and Bayton, 1979; Nieva and Gutek, 1982; Roussell, 1974). For instance, sex differences disappear when factors such as experience, education and age of superiors and subordinates (Osborn and Vicars, 1976) or the type of occupation and level in the organization (Bartol, 1976; Brief and Oliver, 1976; Renwick and Tosi, 1978) are controlled.

Furthermore, it is likely that in order to be successful in a managerial capacity, women must pattern their behaviour after that of their male colleagues (Riger and Galligan, 1980). Therefore, women in leadership positions are undoubtedly a selected group who do not conform to the typical feminine stereotype. Several studies have demonstrated that women managers are higher in masculinity than women in the general population (Banfield, 1976; Baril *et al.*, 1987; Fagenson and Horowitz, 1985; Korabik and Ayman, 1987; Muldrow and Bayton, 1979).

In addition, it is probable that gender is more salient in the laboratory than in real life situations where there is long-term contact and repeated opportunity to observe behaviour (Dobbins and

Platz, 1986; Field and Caldwell, 1979). Research has demonstrated that sex differences in the task-oriented and social-emotional styles of dating couples decrease as their level of intimacy increases (Heiss, 1962). One effect of increased familiarity is to lessen the likelihood that behaviour will be appraised in terms of stereotypes.

Perceptions of leadership ability

Although male and female leaders do not differ in actual effectiveness, the degree to which their subordinates perceive them to be effective does vary as a function of the sex of both the supervisor and the subordinates (Bartol and Butterfield, 1976; Haccoun *et al.*, 1978; Petty and Lee, 1975; Rosen and Jerdee, 1973). Subordinates are more satisfied when their male supervisors use an initiating structure (task-oriented) style and their female supervisors use a consideration (social-emotional) style (Petty and Miles, 1976). The atmosphere in groups with same sex leaders is also better than that in groups with opposite sex leaders despite a lack of difference in productivity between the two types of groups (Boullard and Cook, 1975).

There is evidence that both males and females expect that leadership positions will be held by men (Lockheed, 1977; Porter *et al.*, 1978). One reason for this is that perception of leadership is highly related to quantity of verbal output (Regula and Julian, 1970; Sorrentino and Boutiller, 1975). In mixed sex groups, men talk more than women and are, therefore, more likely to be perceived as the group leaders (Lockheed and Hall, 1976). Furthermore, males tend to speak more to the group as a whole, whereas females are more likely to speak to individual group members (Aries, 1977). Speaking to the group as a whole is an indication of power and influence (Bales, 1970). Women also tend to vary their speaking time from one session to the next so that leadership assessed by quantity of verbal output is not stable in female groups (Aries, 1977). However, women have been found to speak more in the presence of other women than with men (Aries, 1977) and there are no differences in the verbal rates of males and females in homogeneous gender groups (Borgatta and Stimson, 1963).

The tendency to view males as the leaders of

groups has resulted in an association between task-orientation and leadership proficiency. Studies have shown that males are attributed more task-oriented leadership ability than females are (Fallon and Hollander, 1976). Task-orientation is related to the likelihood of being chosen as a leader (Eskilson and Wiley, 1976) and to increased influence, but not increased group satisfaction (Hollander and Yoder, *in press*). Although subordinate satisfaction has long been noted to be related to consideration rather than to initiating structure (Haccoun *et al.*, 1978; Rosen and Jerdee, 1973), expressive qualities have been given low weight in the determination of leadership (Slater, 1955). Thus, despite Bales' (1951) contention that the social-emotional leader is the "real" group leader, the bias toward choosing leaders solely on the basis of their task-oriented expertise remains.

Stereotypes of women leaders

This focus on instrumentality has been particularly detrimental to women managers because they have been stereotyped as lacking in task-oriented skills. Both men and women ascribe to a stereotype of the ideal manager which is composed of qualities more common to men in our society than to women (Massengill and DiMarco, 1979; McGregor, 1967; Powell and Butterfield, 1979, 1984; Schein, 1973, 1975). Since women are seen as not possessing the attributes necessary for effective leadership, they are often perceived by both sexes as being unsuitable for leadership positions (Bowman *et al.*, 1965; Haavio-Mannila, 1972). Because of this, they are less likely than men either to be chosen as leaders or to seek leadership roles (Eskilson and Wiley, 1976) and their success in these roles is not valued either by themselves or by others (Bass *et al.*, 1971; Rosen *et al.*, 1975). Unfortunately, unfavorable stereotypes are applied to women in management even though they may not be valid. In reality, the scores of women leaders are frequently closer to the stereotype of the ideal than those of their male colleagues are (Butterfield and Powell, 1987; Strache, 1976).

Problems with the sex differences perspective

The reliance on biological sex as an explanatory

variable in the leadership literature has had several undesirable effects. It has produced findings which often appear to be inconsistent. Furthermore, it has resulted in an inaccurate stereotype of women managers and has provided a rationale which has allowed women to be excluded from positions of leadership solely on the basis of their sex.

The basic problem with the sex differences perspective is that it is founded upon an inappropriate theoretical framework — one which makes the mistaken assumption of biopsychological equivalence (i.e., that biological sex is equivalent to psychological sex-role). The premise underlying the sex differences literature is that socialization practices have encouraged the development of personality traits and behaviour patterns in women which are antithetic to the managerial role (Riger and Galligan, 1980). However, researchers have failed to separate biological sex from sex-role socialization in their research designs. Because in our culture a large proportion of the population is socialized to display role behaviors which are appropriate to biological sex, these two variables will covary to a certain extent. However, Bem (1974) has presented evidence that sex-role orientation does not conform to the principle of biopsychological equivalence; not all males are masculine nor are all females feminine. Likewise, the leadership literature offers many exceptions to the task role being filled exclusively by males or to the social-emotional role being the primary province of females. It is likely, therefore, that leadership style is actually a function of sex-role orientation rather than of biological sex.

Sex-role orientation and leadership style

Bem's theory of androgyny

Bem (1974) has proposed a theory of sex-role orientation in which masculinity and femininity are viewed as two uncorrelated bipolar dimensions. Masculine characteristics are those related to instrumentality and agency, whereas feminine traits are those in the interpersonal and expressive domains. According to this conception, traditionally sex-typed persons are socialized to have more characteristics from one dimension than the other (masculine males possess more masculine than feminine attributes; feminine females have more feminine than mascu-

line attributes). Androgynous individuals, on the other hand, are characterized by both masculine and feminine traits. Androgynous men are, therefore, just as masculine as masculine men, but they are also much higher in femininity. Likewise, androgynous women are just as feminine as feminine women, but they also have as many masculine personality characteristics as masculine men do.

Parallels between androgyny and leadership theories

There are several parallels between Bales' theory of leadership (1951, 1953) and Bem's androgyny theory (1974). Both are dialectical models which are based on the same two underlying dimensions — instrumentality and expressiveness. Although Sampson (1977) was the first to note the similarities between these two theories, his main concern was in pointing out their differences. Bem (1974) sees the integration of instrumentality and expressiveness as taking place within the individual personality, with the proportional representation of traits on each dimension representing the degree to which a person is sex-typed. Bales (1951), on the other hand, is interested in the representation of instrumental and expressive attributes within the small group and with the subsequent effects on group functioning.

An alternative to either of these approaches is to locate the synthesis in the interaction of the person and his or her milieu. A small group is composed of individual personalities and whether or not certain characteristics will be expressed in a group is a function of whether or not they exist in the individual members. Persons who have been socialized to possess instrumental or expressive qualities will be likely to adopt either instrumental or expressive roles in group settings. Thus, if one takes an interactionist perspective, one would expect the concept of androgyny and leadership style to be conceptually related.

Studies of sex-role orientation and leadership style

Although the idea of androgynous leadership has been discussed frequently in the management literature and has seemingly gained widespread acceptance (Bolton and Humphreys, 1977; Sargent, 1981), there has been a lack of attention to research on the

topic. The studies which have been carried out, however, provide strong support for the notion that leadership style is a function of sex-role orientation rather than biological sex.

In preliminary work with undergraduate psychology students, correlations between the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) and the Ohio State Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ; Stogdill and Coons, 1957) were examined (Korabik, 1982a). For the purpose of this study the LBDQ was modified to make each statement into a self-referent so that it became a self-report of one's own leadership behaviour rather than a judgment about someone else's (e.g., "He makes his attitudes clear to the staff" was changed to "I make my attitudes clear to the staff"). This also had the effect of removing the sex bias from the wording of the original items which were all expressed in terms of the generic he.

Masculinity was found to be significantly correlated with the reported use of an initiating structure style of leadership and femininity to be significantly related to reported use of consideration. Furthermore, androgyny was significantly related to both initiating structure and to consideration. In addition, multiple regression analyses demonstrated that sex-role orientation was a better predictor of leadership style than was biological sex.

In further laboratory studies (Korabik, 1981, 1982b) the behaviour of subjects in small groups was examined using Bales' (1951) Interaction Process Analysis. The results of these studies demonstrated that masculine individuals of both sexes preferred the task-oriented leadership role to the social-emotional role. Similarly, feminine individuals of both sexes preferred the social-emotional role to the task-oriented role. In addition, androgynous individuals were found to be capable of adopting either the task-oriented or the social-emotional leadership role and would choose to perform whatever role was not already represented in the group (i.e., they would display social-emotional leadership with masculine partners and task-oriented leadership with feminine partners regardless of their partners' gender).

In order to demonstrate that similar findings could be obtained outside the laboratory with persons in actual leadership positions, Korabik and Ayman (1987) studied 121 male and 126 female middle to upper level managers who were matched for job position and tenure. They found that masculinity was significantly related to a style of leader-

ship high in initiating structure and that femininity was significantly related to a style of leadership characterized by consideration. In addition, they found that androgynous managers were significantly more likely to report using a consideration style of leadership than masculine or feminine managers were. Biological sex was not significantly related to either initiating structure or to consideration.

The results of these studies clearly support the contention that biological sex is not an important factor in determining leadership style. The demonstration that socialization rather than biology is responsible for leadership style means that females should not be excluded from positions which require instrumental ability merely on the basis of their biological sex. Furthermore, the findings from these studies confirm that not all women are socialized to be deficient in instrumental ability nor are all men socialized to possess such ability. The realization that men and women can be equally proficient in task-oriented roles should result in more leadership positions being opened up to women.

Sex-role orientation and conflict resolution style

The Korabik and Ayman (1987) study sought to extend the proposed conceptual model to encompass conflict resolution style. Blake and Mouton (1978) have proposed a two dimensional theory of conflict resolution where one dimension indexes "concern for people" and the other indexes "concern for production". A similar conception has been suggested by Thomas (1976). He postulates five conflict management styles — avoidance, competition, compromise, accommodation and collaboration which fall along the two dimensions of assertiveness or concern for oneself and cooperation or concern for the other party. Thus, conflict resolution style is another variable relevant to managerial leadership which is also based on the dimensions of instrumentality and expressiveness.

The results of the Korabik and Ayman (1987) study were supportive of the extended model. As predicted, masculinity was found to be significantly related to the use of competitive style of conflict management, whereas femininity was significantly correlated with an accommodative conflict resolution style. It was expected that androgyny would be associated with a collaborative conflict management

style (which requires an integration of concern for self with concern for others), but collaboration was found to be significantly related only to masculinity and not to femininity. However the effects of femininity may have been attenuated due to a problem with restriction of range.

In general, the results of these studies attest to the utility of a synthesis of the theoretical perspectives on androgyny, leadership and conflict resolution styles. Such an integration of theories would provide a more balanced conception of leadership as a dialectical synthesis of task-oriented and social-emotional functions. The instrumental and expressive roles once again would be viewed as complementary and equal in importance. This would benefit both men and women because the important skills that each individual contributes to leadership would be recognized.

Studies of sex-role orientation and leadership effectiveness

Androgyny, leadership and conflict resolution theories all predict that the most effective manager will be someone who is high in both instrumentality and expressiveness. Bem (1974) contends that androgynous people will be more effective than sex-typed individuals due to their broader repertoire of behaviors and greater flexibility. In the area of leadership, both task-orientation and social-emotionality are seen as necessary for good group functioning (Bales, 1951) and both initiating structure and consideration have been determined to be essential to leadership effectiveness (Flieshman, 1973; Stogdill, 1974). Similarly, according to theories of conflict management (Blake and Mouton, 1978) the best (i.e., win-win) outcomes result when approaches which are high in both concern for self and concern for the other party are used.

The results of research relating androgyny to leadership effectiveness, however, are ambiguous and contradictory. One study found no relationship between sex-role orientation and effectiveness. Masculine, feminine and androgynous persons did not differ in the accuracy with which they made personnel decisions (Mudrow and Bayton, 1979). Another study (Baril *et al.*, 1987) found evidence that androgyny was negatively related to effectiveness. Androgynous managers were rated by their super-

visors to be less effective than masculine or feminine managers were. Two studies, on the other hand, have provided limited support for the notion that androgyny is positively related to managerial effectiveness. Motowidlo (1982) found that androgynous managers were rated by their supervisors as being more likely than sex-typed managers to display acceptance of non-traditional job change, support for those in non-traditional jobs and active listening. Korabik and Ayman (1987) found androgyny to be negatively associated with job stress and positively related to self-reported leadership effectiveness.

The discrepancies in the findings from these studies are not very surprising given that they: (1) used various measures of sex-role orientation and different methods to assign subjects to sex-role categories, (2) examined different dependent variables, and (3) drew their subjects from widely different populations. While these studies do not offer unequivocal support for the overall superiority of an androgynous management style, neither do they demonstrate that a task-oriented style is invariably preferable. Social-emotional styles often have been shown to lead to better outcomes than task-oriented styles (Bond and Vinacki, 1961; Eskilson and Wiley, 1976; Filley, 1977; Forisha and Goldman, 1981; Maier and Sashkin, 1971). It is likely that the best style is a function of the situation. Instrumental styles will produce better outcomes in some situations and expressive styles in others.

The contribution of femininity to managerial effectiveness

"Masculine" styles, which emphasize competition, have been found to be self-defeating in problem solving situations which require group cooperation (Filley, 1977; Maier and Sashkin, 1971), whereas a feminine concern with the equity of an outcome rather than individual gain has been found to be advantageous in many situations (Bond and Vinacki, 1961; Robie, 1973), including negotiation (Forisha and Goldman, 1981).

In addition, masculinity is detrimental and femininity is beneficial for job satisfaction. Highly masculine managers are less satisfied with their work and co-workers than are managers low in masculinity (Korabik and Ayman, 1987) and subordinate satisfaction is related to femininity and consideration

(Baril, *et al.*, 1987, Haccoun *et al.*, 1978; Rosen and Jerdee, 1973). Type A managers, who are highly masculine (DeGregario and Carver, 1980), report low job satisfaction and although they are well represented in middle management, they often are not promoted into more senior positions. One of the reasons which has been postulated for this (Howard *et al.*, 1978) is that they are overly competitive and task-oriented.

An emphasis on task-orientation to the exclusion of social-emotionality may result in negative consequences for both individuals and the corporations which employ them. McCall and Lombardo (1983) have cited the masculine characteristics of insensitivity to others, a cold, arrogant style and being overly ambitious as the chief reasons for the derailment of fast-track executives. Korabik and Ayman (1987) found that managers low in masculinity reported receiving more promotions and organizational rewards than those high in masculinity. In addition, several authors have pointed to a lack of interpersonal skills as a primary problem for managerial productivity (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Luthans, 1986; Neider *et al.*, 1980; Peters and Austin, 1986). The feminine attributes of collaboration, open communication, sensitivity to feelings and development of support and trust are the basis for human resources management (Eddy, 1980, as cited in Sargent, 1981), and hence contribute significantly to managerial effectiveness (Luthans, 1986).

These examples illustrate the often overlooked functions that expressivity plays in corporations and show that feminine traits are essential to the effectiveness of both men and women managers. Unfortunately, research in the area of leadership often has been contaminated by a masculinity bias in which the task leadership function is viewed as more important than the social-emotional function (Slater, 1955). The importance of consideration must be understood before we can turn away from the masculine ideal which now prevails in management.

Implications for women in management

The masculine/task-oriented stereotype of the ideal manager persists (Massengill and DiMarco, 1979; McGregor, 1967; Powell and Butterfield, 1979, 1984; Schein, 1973, 1975) whether or not it is valid.

Because of this women managers are a selected group who are high in masculinity (Banfield, 1976; Baril *et al.*, 1987; Fagenson and Horowitz, 1985; Korabik and Ayman, 1987; Muldrow and Bayton, 1979). Requiring women managers to conform to this masculine ideal, however, may put them in a double bind. Research has shown that males and females who conform to sex stereotyped roles are evaluated more positively by their subordinates than those who deviate from such roles (Bartol and Butterfield, 1976; Petty and Miles, 1976). Thus, women managers who are masculine sex-typed may have trouble relating to their subordinates. On the other hand, although women managers who conform to the feminine stereotype may be evaluated favorably by their subordinates, they may have difficulties in adaptation because they are seen by their superiors to lack the appropriate characteristics for task-oriented leadership. Androgyny may offer women managers a particularly attractive solution to this dilemma. Women who are androgynous have both traditionally feminine qualities and also masculine task-oriented ones. Thus, they should be perceived by others as both likeable and competent. While some recent research is suggestive that this may be the case (Arkkelin, 1987), it is far from conclusive.

Before we can understand the topic of women and leadership, theories about leadership need to be validated on women. Obviously, before this can be done, much more research needs to be carried out using women in actual positions of leadership as subjects and employing control groups of comparable men. Furthermore, a sex-role rather than a sex differences paradigm should be employed in such research. In addition, the nature of the job subjects are engaged in needs to be taken into account before one can draw any conclusions relating leadership style to managerial effectiveness.

References

- Aries, E.: 1977, 'Interaction Patterns and Themes of Male, Female and Mixed Groups', in A. G. Sargent (Ed.) *Beyond Sex Roles* (West, Boston, Ma) (Spring).
- Arkkelin, D.: 1987, 'Influence of Gender Schema on Perceptions of the "Good Manager"', paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY, August.

- Bales, R. F.: 1951, *Interaction Process Analysis* (Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, MA).
- Bales, R. F.: 1953, 'The Equilibrium Problem in Small Groups', in T. Parsons, R. F. Bales and E. Shils, *Working Papers in a Theory of Action* (The Free Press, New York).
- Bales, R. F.: 1955, 'How People Interact at Conferences', *Scientific American* **192**, pp. 31–5.
- Bales, R. F.: 1958, 'Task Roles and Social Roles in Problem-Solving Groups', in E. E. Macoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (Eds.) *Readings in Social Psychology* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York).
- Bales, R. F.: 1970, *Personality and Interpersonal Behaviour* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York).
- Banfield, E. E.: 1976, 'Women in Middle Management Positions: Characteristics, Training, Leadership Style, Limitations, Rewards, Problems', *Dissertation Abstracts International* **4-B**, pp. 1952–3.
- Baril, G. L., Elbert, N., and Mahar-Potter, S.: 1987, 'Sex-Role Orientation and the Success of First Line Supervisors', paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, N.Y., August.
- Bartol, K. M.: 1976, 'The Relationship of Sex and Professional Training Area to Job Satisfaction', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **61**, pp. 446–54.
- Bartol, K. M. and Butterfield, D. A.: 1976, 'Sex Effects in Evaluating Leaders', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **61**, pp. 446–54.
- Bass, B. M., Krusall, J. and Alexander, R. H.: 1971, 'Male Manager's Attitudes toward Working Women', *American Behavioral Scientist* **15**, pp. 221–36.
- Bem, S. L.: 1974, 'The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny', *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* **42**, pp. 155–62.
- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B.: 1985, *Leaders* (Harper and Row, New York).
- Birdsall, P. A.: 1980, 'A Comparative Analysis of Male and Female Managerial Communication Style in Two Organizations', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* **16**, pp. 183–97.
- Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S.: 1978, *The New Managerial Grid* (Gulf Publishing Co., Houston, TX).
- Bolton, E. B. and Humphreys, L. W.: 1977, 'A Training Model for Women – An Androgynous Approach', *Personnel Journal*, pp. 230–4.
- Bond, J. R. and Vinacki, W. E.: 1961, 'Coalitions in Mixed Sex Triads', *Sociometry* **24**, pp. 61–5.
- Borgatta, E. F. and Stimson, J.: 1963, 'Sex Differences in Interaction Characteristics', *Journal of Social Psychology* **80**, pp. 89–100.
- Boullard, P. D. and Cook, P. E.: 1975, 'Sex and Work Style of Leaders and Followers: Determinants of Productivity', *Psychological Reports* **36**, pp. 545–6.
- Bowman, G. W., Worthy, N. B. and Greysen, S. A.: 1965, 'Are Women Executives People?', *Harvard Business Review* **43**, pp. 14–28 and 164–78.
- Brief, A. P. and Oliver, R. L.: 1976, 'Male-Female Differences in Work Attitudes Among Retail Sales Managers', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **61**, pp. 526–8.
- Butterfield, D. A. and Powell, G. N.: 1987, 'Androgyny, Good Managers, and U.S. Presidential Candidates', a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, N.Y., August.
- Chapman, J. B. and Luthans, F.: 1975, 'The Female Leadership Dilemma', *Public Personnel Management* **4**, pp. 173–9.
- Day, D. R. and Stogdill, R. M.: 1972, 'Leader Behaviour of Male and Female Supervisors: A Comparative Study', *Personnel Psychology* **25**, pp. 353–60.
- DeGregario, E. and Carver, C. S.: 1980, 'Type A Behaviour Pattern, Sex Role Orientation and Psychological Adjustment', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **39**, pp. 286–93.
- Dobbins, G. H. and Platz, S. J.: 1986, 'Sex Differences in Leadership: How Real Are They?', *Academy of Management Review* **11**, pp. 118–27.
- Donnell, S. M. and Hall, J.: 1980, 'Men and Women as Managers: A Significant Case of No Significant Difference', *Organizational Dynamics* (Spring), pp. 60–77.
- Eskilson, A. and Wiley, M. G.: 1976, 'Sex Composition and Leadership in Small Groups', *Sociometry* **39**, pp. 183–94.
- Fagenson, E. A. and Horowitz, S. V.: 1985, 'La Difference' in Organizations: A Test of Three Perspectives', a paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Fallon, B. J. and Hollander, E. P.: 1976, 'Sex-Role Stereotyping in Leadership: A Study of Undergraduate Discussion Groups', a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association.
- Fiedler, F.: 1967, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness* (McGraw-Hill, New York).
- Field, H. S. and Caldwell, B. E.: 1979, 'Sex of Supervisor, Sex of Subordinate and Subordinate Job Satisfaction', *Psychology of Women Quarterly* **3**, pp. 391–9.
- Filley, A. C.: 1977, 'Conflict Resolution: The Ethic of the Good Loser', in R. C. Houseman *et al.* (Eds.) *Readings in Interpersonal and Organizational Communication* (3rd Ed.) (Holbrook, Boston).
- Fleishman, E. A.: 1973, 'Twenty Years of Consideration and Structure', in E. A. Fleishman and J. G. Hunt (Eds.) *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership* (pp. 1–38) (Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, Ill).
- Forisha, B. L. and Goldman, B. H.: 1981, *Outsiders on the Inside: Women and Organizations* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.).
- Graen, G.: 1976, 'Role-Making Processes Within Complex

- Organizations', in M. D. Dunette (Ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Rand McNally, Chicago).
- Haavio-Mannila, E.: 1972, 'Sex-Role Attitudes in Finland, 1960-1970', *Journal of Social Issues* **28**, pp. 93-110.
- Haccoun, D. M., Haccoun, R. R. and Sallay, G.: 1978, 'Sex Differences in the Appropriateness of Supervisory Styles: A Non-Management Review', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **63**, pp. 124-7.
- Heiss, J. S.: 1962, 'Degree of Intimacy and Male-Female Interaction', *Sociometry* **25**, pp. 197-208.
- Hollander, E. P.: 1979, 'Composition Counts: The Behaviour of Men and Women in Groups', a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia, PA, April.
- Hollander, E. P. and Yoder, J.: in press, 'Some Issues Comparing Men and Women as Leaders', *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.
- House, R. J. and Mitchell, T. R.: 1974, 'Path-Goal Theory of Leadership', *Journal of Contemporary Business* (Autumn), pp. 81-97.
- Howard, J., Cunningham, D. and Rechnitzer, P.: 1978, *Rusting Out, Burning Out, Bowing Out: Stress and Survival on the Job* (Financial Post/Gage, Toronto).
- Kenkel, W. F.: 1957, 'Differentiation in Family Decision Making', *Sociology and Social Research* **42**, pp. 18-25.
- Korabik, K.: 1981, 'Androgyny and Leadership: An Integration', a paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Women and Psychology, Boston, MA.
- Korabik, K.: 1982a, 'Sex-Role Orientation and Leadership Style', *International Journal of Women's Studies* **5**, pp. 328-36.
- Korabik, K.: 1982b, 'Sex-Role Orientation and Leadership: Further Explorations', a paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., August.
- Korabik, K. and Ayman, R.: 1987, 'Androgyny and Leadership: A Conceptual Synthesis', paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, N.Y.
- Lewis, G. H.: 1972, 'Role Differentiation', *American Sociological Review* **37**, pp. 424-34.
- Lockheed, M. E.: 1977, 'Cognitive Style Effects on Sex Status in Student Work Groups', *Journal of Educational Psychology* **69**, pp. 158-65.
- Lockheed, M. E. and Hall, K. P.: 1976, 'Conceptualizing Sex as a Status Characteristic: Applications to Leadership Training Strategies', *Journal of Social Issues* **32**, pp. 11-124.
- Luthans, F.: 1986, 'Fifty Years Later: What Do We Really Know About Managers and Managing?', presidential speech at the Academy of Management Meeting, Chicago, IL.
- Maier, R. and Sashkin, M.: 1973, 'Specific Leader Behaviors That Promote Problem Solving', in R. C. Houseman *et al.* (Eds.) *Readings in Interpersonal Organization and Communication* (2nd Ed.) (Holt, Boston).
- Massengill, D. and DiMarco, N.: 1979, 'Sex-Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics: A Current Replication', *Sex Roles* **5**, pp. 561-70.
- McCall, M. W. and Lombardo, M. M.: 1983, 'What Makes a Top Executive?', *Psychology Today* (February), pp. 26-31.
- McGregor, D.: 1967, *The Professional Manager* (McGraw-Hill, New York).
- Megargee, E. L.: 1969, 'The Influence of Sex Roles on the Manifestation of Leadership', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **53**, pp. 377-82.
- Miner, J. B.: 1974, 'Motivation to Manage Among Women: Studies of Business Managers and Educational Administrators', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* **5**, pp. 197-208.
- Motowidlo, S. J.: 1982, 'Sex Role Orientation and Behaviour in a Work Setting', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **42**, pp. 935-45.
- Muldrow, T. W. and Bayton, J. A.: 1979, 'Men and Women Executives and Processes Related to Decision Accuracy', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **64**, pp. 99-106.
- Neider, L. L., Carpenter, W. A. and Hollander, E. P.: 1980, 'Assessing Good and Bad Leaders Using Critical Incidents and Rating Scales in Three Organizations', paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Hartford, CN.
- Nieva, V. F. and Gutek, B. A.: 1982, *Women and Work: A Psychological Perspective* (Praeger, New York).
- Osborn, R. N. and Vicars, M. W.: 1976, 'Sex Stereotypes: An Artifact in Leader Behaviour and Subordinate Satisfaction Analysis?', *Academy of Management Journal* **19**, pp. 439-49.
- Peters, T. and Austin, N.: 1986, *A Passion for Excellence*.
- Petty, R. N. and Lee, G. K.: 1975, 'Moderating Effects of Sex of Supervisor and Subordinate on Relationships between Supervisory Behaviour and Subordinate Satisfaction', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **60**, pp. 624-8.
- Petty, M. M. and Miles, R. H.: 1976, 'Leader Sex Role Stereotyping in a Female Dominated Work Culture', *Personnel Psychology* **29**, pp. 393-404.
- Porter, N. P., Geis, F. L. and Walstedt, J. J.: 1978, 'Are Women Invisible as Leaders?', a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, August.
- Powell, G. N. and Butterfield, D. A.: 1979, 'The "Good Manager": Masculine or Androgynous?', *Academy of Management Journal* **22**, pp. 395-403.
- Powell, G. N. and Butterfield, D. A.: 1984, 'If "Good Managers" are Masculine, What are "Bad Managers"?', *Sex Roles* **10**, pp. 477-84.
- Regula, R. C. and Julian, J. W.: 1970, 'The Impact on

- Quantity and Frequency of Task Contributions on Perceived Ability', *Journal of Social Psychology* **89**, pp. 115–22.
- Renwick, P. A. and Tosi, H.: 1978, 'The Effects of Sex, Marital Status and Educational Background on Selection Decisions', *Academy of Management Journal* **21**, pp. 93–103.
- Riger, S. and Galligan, P.: 1980, 'Women in Management: An Exploration of Competing Paradigms', *American Psychologist* **35**, pp. 902–10.
- Robie, E. A.: 1973, 'Challenge to Management', in E. Ginzberg and A. Yohalem (Eds.) *Corporate Lib: Women's Challenge to Management* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD).
- Rosen, B. and Jerdee, T. H.: 1973, 'The Influence of Sex-Role Stereotypes on Evaluations of Male and Female Supervisory Behaviour', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **57**, pp. 44–8.
- Rosen, B., Jerdee, T. H. and Prestwich, T. L.: 1975, 'Dual Career Marital Adjustment: Potential Effects of Discriminatory Managerial Attitudes', *Journal of Marriage and the Family* **37**, pp. 565–72.
- Rosmann, M. R.: 1977, 'Differential Effects of Task Structure and Expectancy Set on Family Leadership', *Dissertation Abstracts International* **10-B**, p. 5373.
- Roussell, C.: 1974, 'Relationship of Sex of Department Head to Department Climate', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **19**, pp. 211–20.
- Sampson, E. E.: 1977, 'Psychology and the American Ideal', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **35**, pp. 767–82.
- Sargent, A.: 1981, *The Androgynous Manager* (AMACOM, New York).
- Schein, V.: 1973, 'The Relationship between Sex-Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **57**, p. 95.
- Schein, V.: 1975, 'Relationship between Sex-Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics among Female Managers', *Journal of Applied Psychology* **60**, pp. 240–344.
- Slater, P. E.: 1955, 'Role Differentiation in Small Groups', *American Sociological Review* **20**, pp. 300–10.
- Sorrentino, R. M. and Boutiller, R. G.: 1975, 'The Effect of Quantity and Quality of Verbal Interactions on Ratings of Leadership Ability', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* **11**, pp. 403–11.
- Stogdill, R. M.: 1974, *Handbook of Leadership* (Free Press, New York).
- Stogdill, R. M. and Coons, A. E.: 1957, *Leader Behaviour: Its Description and Measurement* (Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio).
- Strache, K.: 1976, 'Personality Characteristics of Men and Women Administrators', a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., August.
- Strodtbeck, F. L., James, R. M. and Hankins, C.: 1957, 'Social Status in Jury Deliberations', *American Sociological Review* **22**, pp. 713–9.
- Strodtbeck, F. L. and Mann, R. D.: 1956, 'Sex Role Differentiation in Jury Deliberations', *Sociometry* **19**, pp. 3–11.
- Thomas, K. W.: 1976, 'Conflict and Conflict Management', in M. D. Dunnett (Ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Rand McNally, Chicago).
- Turk, H.: 1961, 'Instrumental and Expressive Ratings Reconsidered', *Sociometry* **24**, pp. 76–81.
- Vroom, V. and Yetton, P. W.: 1973, *Leadership and Decision-Making* (University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh).

Department of Psychology,
University of Guelph,
Guelph, Ontario,
N1G 2W1 Canada.