Gender Differences and Transformational Leadership Behavior: Do Both German Men and Women Lead in the Same Way?

Thomas W. Kent, Carrie A. Blair, Howard F. Rudd
College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, USA

Ulrich Schuele
Mainz University of Applied Sciences, Mainz, Germany

This article examines the differences between men and women leaders with respect to their transformational leadership behaviors. Subordinates of the leaders rated the frequency of use of transformational leadership behaviors from five different categories. The five behavior categories and the instrument used (The Leader Behavior Inventory or LBI) to rate those behaviors were developed in several previous studies. Generally, it was found that men and women leaders behave as leaders in the same way. It was also found that men and women do not differ in their general perceptions of others as leaders. Possible explanations for these findings are discussed.

While there is data to indicate that women leaders employ different leadership styles than men (see Grant, 1988; Kabacoff, 2001; Karau & Eagly, 1999; Kim & Shim, 2003; Rosener, 1990), few articles have looked at the specific behaviors employed by women vs. men. Further, recent studies (Chemers et al., 2000; Morgan, 2004; Anderson et al., 2006) suggest that there is little difference in the results men and women achieve as leaders. These findings indicate that leadership style has little to do with the results that leaders achieve. That is, if the leadership styles of women are different from the leadership styles of men, yet the results they achieve are similar, then leadership style must have little to do with results. Given the above, we chose a German sample to study the differences between men and women on five factors or sets of behaviors related to transformational leadership. This article will explore differences in the way

males and females demonstrate transformational leadership based on research conducted within a German population.

Much of the research on gender similarities and differences in leadership roles was initially driven by the paucity of females holding significant roles within corporations, politics, and government. While women have made great strides achieving positional success within business organizations (Fortune, 2007) and government, they are still underrepresented at the higher levels of these organizations.

The phenomenon, known as the "glass ceiling," has been described as a barrier of prejudice and discrimination that excludes women from higher level leadership positions (Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987). The idea is that systemic impact is created via formal systems (such as performance evaluations, promotions, training, etc.) and informal systems (such as who talks with whom, who gets to attend which events, etc.) such that it impedes the advancement of women to higher levels. That this organizational result exists has been widely verified (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Fletcher, 2004; Heilman, et al., 2004; Lyons & McArthur, 2007). These studies showed that there may actually be different styles of leadership employed by men and women, which could account for the disparity in promotion to higher level leadership positions. At the same time, it should be noted that there is also ample evidence to suggest that men and women do not use different leadership styles (Grant, 1988; Mandell & Pherwani, 2003).

While the evidence on leadership style differences between men and women is conflicting, the evidence on the results they attain is not. Perhaps, therefore, looking at leadership from a style perspective is not helpful. In contrast, this study attempts to look at leadership in terms of the behaviors employed by men and by women.

The GLOBE study (Den Hartog, et al., 1999) found that there are a number of universal attributes that contribute to the practice of transformational leadership that apply across cultures. They include motive arouser, foresight, encouraging, communicative, trustworthy, dynamic, positive, confidence builder, and motivational. The study also found that there were a number of culture specific attributes. Those include enthusiastic, risk taking, ambitious, self-effacing, unique, self-sacrificial, sincere, sensitive, compassionate, and willful. These are attributes that contribute to leadership performance in some cultures but not in others. Den Hartog and colleagues point out that while both the universal and the culture specific attributes are known, the specific behaviors that are associated with an attribute that are employed by leaders in different cultures may not be the same. For example, an encouraging leader in one culture may use different encouraging behaviors than an encouraging leader in a different culture.

Koopman et al. (1999) and Brodbeck et al. (2000) found there are cultural differences that can be distinguished across European countries that account for leadership prototypes. These differences in the concepts or prototypes that "followers" hold about effective and ineffective leadership behaviors predict readiness or lack of readiness to follow a given leader. That is, if a leader behaves in a way that fits the follower's prototype, that follower will be more likely to follow the leader. This could be a partial explanation for the "glass ceiling" and how it operates. Let us assume that women, even though they are as effective as men in terms of the results they achieve, employ behaviors that do not fit with the leadership prototype that is held by followers and by the female leaders' managers. This disconnect would, according to the theory, lead to lower performance evaluations in spite of the actual results achieved by the women.

This idea, known as Leadership Categorization Theory (Johnson et al., 2008) suggests that individuals (followers) hold personal projections or prototypes of how their leader(s) should

behave. Offerman et al. (1994) showed that followers hold different prototypes for male leaders and for female leaders. The fact that subordinates rate female leaders as more transformational may be explained by Leadership Categorization Theory. If this is true, it may be necessary to get to the level of specific behaviors that define the leadership "styles" in question, and avoid the more generic "leadership styles" or "leadership types"—that is, what behaviors define transformational leadership.

Furthermore, as a part of their GLOBE study, Den Hartog et al. (1999) emphasized that a common preference for the attributes that make up transformational leadership "… does not preclude differences in the observed ratings of actual leader behavior." In other words, while we might label a given group of leaders "good communicators," the specific behaviors they employ might quite well be different.

Kent et al. (2001) and Kent (2004) attempted to define the behaviors that make up transformational leadership. These studies led to five sets of behaviors that are components of the Leadership Behavior Inventory or LBI, which describes transformational leadership. They are Visualizing Performance; Empowering the "We"; Communicating for Meaning; Managing One's Self; and Care and Recognition. Some of these sets of behaviors may well correlate with the attributes found in the GLOBE study. For example, Visualizing Performance from the LBI may be related to *foresight* and *motivational* attributes; Empowering the "We" may be related to *encouraging* and *positive* or to *confidence builder*; Communicating for Meaning from the LBI may be related to *communicative* and/or to *motive arouser*; Managing One's Self may be related to *trustworthy*, *dynamic*, and *positive*; and Care and Recognition from the LBI may be related to *encouraging* and *confidence builder*. Clearly, further study would be needed to suggest that the specific behaviors that make up each behavioral factor are related to the universal attributes of transformational leadership found in the GLOBE study. However, there seems to be at least conceptual support for the universality of the five factors of the LBI.

The items in the questionnaire used for these studies—the Leadership Behavior Inventory (LBI)—were developed by taking descriptions of transformational leaders' behaviors from noted authors in the field. These behavioral descriptions were written as questionnaire items for subordinates in the U.S. to describe their leaders. The results were factor analyzed to derive the five sets of behaviors mentioned above. The Appendix includes a brief description of each factor and the actual LBI items. The studies have been replicated in Spanish speaking countries— Costa Rica, Mexico, and Spain (Quesada et al., 2008)—and in Germany (Rudd, Kent, Blair, & Schuele, 2009). These intercultural studies have verified that transformational leaders in those cultures engage in the same five kinds of behaviors as American leaders.

The question in this paper is whether the same is true for both male leaders and female leaders. There is some evidence suggesting that, in Germany, there are similarities in male and female leadership styles. For example, Mohr and Wolfram (2008) found that male and female leaders in Germany showed the same degree of verbal consideration as rated by their followers. And Gardiner and Tiggemann (1999) found that women, in a male dominated industry, alter their leadership behaviors to conform more to their male counterparts' leadership styles.

This paper will initiate the investigation of whether these five behavior sets are employed differently, or to a different extent, among female leaders compared to male leaders in Germany. Because there is evidence that males and females display similar patterns of leadership behaviors (Grant, 1988), we hypothesize that males and females will display similar patterns in this study using a German sample:

RH1:   There will be no differences in the transformational leadership behaviors of German men and women.

This research also explores the interaction between rater gender and rated gender. That is, do men tend to rate men more highly than they rate women; and/or do women tend to rate women more highly than they rate males? This question was exploratory in nature, so a research question was formed:

RQ2:   Do "rater" gender and "rated" gender affect ratings of transformational leadership behavior as defined by the Leadership Behavior Inventory?

Methodology

Transformational leadership behaviors were assessed using the Leadership Behavior Inventory (LBI), which was developed by Kent et al. (2001) and Kent (2004). The LBI assesses leadership behaviors in five categories: Visualizing Greatness; Empowering the "We"; Communicating for Meaning; Managing One's Self; and Care and Recognition. (See Appendix I for a description of the factors and a listing of questionnaire items).

The questionnaire is administered to subordinates who are asked to describe their leaders. The questionnaire is made up of behaviorally specific statements, and respondents indicate how often their leader engages in each behavior on an 8-point scale where one (1) is "rarely" and eight (8) is "very often."

All of the participants were German working adult students at the University of Mainz. These individuals were employees of mainly German companies in the Frankfurt metropolitan area who were studying management and business administration at the Mainz University of Applied Sciences. The study program is a five-year program with the degree of "Diplom," which is a degree with a level somewhere between the U.S. undergraduate and master's levels.

Since the respondents were all German, the LBI was prepared using the method of "retranslation." The questionnaire was translated into German by a German graduate student, then back to English by two German colleagues; the three collaborated until all were satisfied that the English and German versions were roughly equivalent in meaning. The translation posed a couple of unique problems. For example, words such as "mission" and "vision" in the German language carry a slightly different meaning from the English in the American culture. Vision in German carries more of a religious connotation than in English. Additionally, the very word leader is difficult to use since leader in German is literally translated as "Furher." Due to its history, this word is still difficult to use in Germany; another way to refer to leader had to be found. The authors used another expression "Fuhrungskraft" which is relatively close to "leader" but is only used in the business world. This was deemed appropriate since all the individuals completing the LBI in this study were from the business world.

The study included 337 student participants. They were given written instructions that were approved and signed by institutional representatives while also providing a process for and assurances of anonymity and confidentiality. The paper and pencil questionnaires were filled out by circling the number on the scale that most accurately reflected how often the respondent's leader demonstrated that behavior described in each of the 27 items.

Since the questionnaires were completed in a classroom setting, 100% of the questionnaires were returned. In some cases participants left items blank or used illegible

handwriting. Three methods were used to deal with missing data in the study: list-wise deletion, pair-wise deletion, and expectation maximization imputation. In instances in which only one response was missing from the LBI items, expectation maximization imputation was employed as a method that produces a relatively accurate estimation of the value of the data in comparison to other estimation techniques (Switzer & Roth, 2002). In the current study, estimation maximization imputation was conducted using SPSS 15.0. In two cases, more than one response was missing for the LBI items. The cases were deleted listwise from the dataset, thus the data from was not included in any of the study analyses. Finally, in other instances, data were missing for demographic items. Such data was addressed with pairwise deletion. That is, the cases were deleted from any analyses involving the specific demographic items, but the case was included in all other analyses (Switzer & Roth, 2002).

For Hypothesis 1, male and female leaders were sorted based on the response to the following question: "What is the sex of your Supervisor?" A factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the effects of leader gender, rater gender, and leader gender by rater gender on ratings of leader behavior. More specifically, Hypothesis 1 was examined based on the main effects of leader gender on ratings of leader behavior. Research Question 1 was answered by examining the main effects of rater gender, as well as the interaction effects of leader gender by rater gender in the factorial ANOVA.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for the study variables are presented in Table 1. Means associated with leader gender, rater gender, and the leader gender by rater gender interaction are presented in Table 2.

Table 1
Means, standard deviations, and correlations for the study variables

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Rater gender		1.0						
Leader gender		.09	1.0					
Visualizing Greatness		.10	.07	.92				
Empowering the "We"		.10	.09	.63*	.93			
Communicating for Meaning		.16*	.11*	.62*	.81*	.90		
Managing Oneself		.07	.09	.65*	.57*	.62*	.87	
Care and Recognition		.02	-.03	.55*	.73*	.68*	.49*	.84
	M	1.46	1.80	4.75	4.93	4.83	5.52	4.12
	sd	.50	.40	1.60	1.55	1.53	1.44	1.73
	N	326	324	335	335	335	335	335
	N_{female}	172	66					
	N_{male}	144	258					

Note. Female = 1, Male = 2. Coefficient Alphas are presented on the diagonal. For the columns representing rater gender and leader gender, total number of males and females is also provided.
* $p < .05$.

We hypothesized that there would be no difference between men and women on the five leader behavior categories. Our hypothesis was supported in each of the five categories. That is, there was no main effect of leader gender for Visualizing Greatness [F (1, 315) = 0.78, p = n.s.], Empowering the "We" [F (1, 315) = 1.31, p = n.s.], Communicating for Meaning [F (1, 315) = 2.79, p = n.s.], Managing One's Self [F (1, 315) = 2.23, p = n.s.], and Care and Recognition [F (1, 315) = .48, p = n.s.]. However, it should be noted that the difference between male leaders and female leaders in the category Communicating for Meaning approached statistical significance. Indeed, the correlation between gender and ratings of Communicating for Meaning was significant (r = .11, $p < .05$). In summary, support was found for Hypothesis 1, although some evidence suggests that men may display more Communicating for Meaning behaviors than women.

Research Question 1 addressed how the gender of the rater may interact with the gender of the target to influence ratings of leader behaviors. The interaction effects of a factorial ANOVA were examined in order to address Research Question 1. As indicated by the means displayed in Table 2, there was not a significant difference between male ratings and female ratings of leader behaviors in four of the five leader behavior categories, nor was there a significant interaction between leader gender and rater gender in each of the five categories.

Table 2
Means and sample size information

		Female Leader	Male Leader	Total
Visualizing Greatness	Female Rater	4.49	4.69	4.62
	Male Rater	4.77	4.97	4.93
	Total	4.54	4.95	
Empowering the "We"	Female Rater	4.47	4.90	4.81
	Male Rater	5.14	5.11	5.12
	Total	4.83	5.10	
Communicating for Meaning	Female Rater	4.15	4.73	4.63
	Male Rater	5.09	5.10	5.10
	Total	4.67	4.90	
Controlling Oneself	Female Rater	5.16	5.48	5.42
	Male Rater	5.38	5.65	5.63
	Total	5.26	5.58	
Care and Recognition	Female Rater	4.09	4.13	4.16
	Male Rater	4.65	4.16	4.23
	Total	4.26	4.13	

Note. Numbers in bold represent mean totals for each category of gender of leaders and raters. *N* (female raters rating female leaders) = 40; *N* (female raters rating male leaders) = 132; *N* (male raters rating female leaders) = 23; *N* (male raters rating male leaders) = 121.

More specifically, neither leader gender, rater gender, or the leader gender by rater gender interaction had an effect for Visualizing Greatness, Empowering the "We", Managing One's Self, or Care and Recognition. However, the overall ANOVA was significant for the ratings of the leader behavior Communicating for Meaning, F (3, 315) = 4.39, $p < .01$. Upon

further examination, it was clear that the main effect of rater gender was significant [F (1, 315) = 8.71, $p < .01$]. In this category, women ($M = 4.63$, $sd =1.60$) rated leaders significantly lower than did men ($M = 5.10$, $sd = 1.42$). Nevertheless, neither the main effect for leader gender [F (1, 315) = 2.79, $p < .01$] nor the interaction effect [F (1, 315) = 1.68, $p = $ n.s.] were significant.

Discussion

This study did not look at transformational leadership effectiveness. The authors were more concerned with whether male and female leaders lead differently using different kinds of behaviors that are associated with transformational leadership. The results showed that men and women lead using the same behaviors. In each of the 5 categories of behaviors, there were no differences between men and women's transformational leadership behaviors. However, the difference between ratings of male leaders and female leaders approached significance in the category Communicating for Meaning.

It is generally accepted that men and women communicate differently and about different things (Christopher, 2008; Crawford, 1995). While this article does not deal with leadership effectiveness nor communication effectiveness, the findings do suggest that men may attempt to communicate the meaning and value of important matters within the organization slightly more frequently than women—though the differences between men and women on this leadership behavior only approach significance.   However, for the most part, the results of this study support the findings by Mohr and Wolfram (2008), who found that males and females showed the same degree of "verbal consideration." These factors – Verbal Consideration and Communicating for Meaning – may or may not be related. More research is needed to understand this issue.

Communicating for Meaning as a part of the LBI includes the following items: *explains why she/he is doing what she/he is doing; knows his/her audience when speaking to them; talks about the principles or values behind decisions that are made; communicates in ways that inspire and motivate others; takes the time needed to explain fully what he/she is thinking; and sets the example by behaving in ways that are consistent with his/her stated values.*

The items clearly do not reference all forms of communications; for example, there is no mention of communicating facts or information, and there is no mention of communicating related to issuing orders or solving problems. Rather, the items focus more on explaining the why and value of a particular course of action. They refer to acting consistently with one's statements and to taking the time necessary to explain things. This particular kind of communication is a key component of transformational leadership. It is about the deeper aspects of communications beyond facts and general information; and it is beyond the "bottom line" communications at which men are supposed to be more effective than women (Christopher, 2008).

According to the data, male leaders perform these behaviors no more frequently than female leaders. This is somewhat contradictory to much of the literature on men and women as communicators. However, as mentioned above, this study looks specifically at transformational leadership communication. There may be a difference between men and women in that limited frame in which men focus more on the underlying meaning and value of things in their communications when acting as leaders. Clearly, more research is needed.

It may also be true that this is simply a German phenomenon, though there is nothing in the literature to suggest that culture might account for this difference. This should be investigated further.

However, if future studies find differences in communicating for meaning, then these findings have relevance for both the training and selection of female leaders. The data indicate that women could improve their ability to act out their espoused values and to clearly discuss the reasons and worth of the actions being undertaken. This occasionally means taking more time to help people to understand why the organization is on a particular path. The results do suggest that specific leader development programs, or components thereof, should be designed for women. As reported by Morgan (2004), this occurred at the U.S. National Institute of Corrections with great success.

There is a nagging problem inherent in this study. The research on Leadership Categorization Theory and agentic vs. communal leadership behaviors indicates that women are rated more poorly than men when they do not perform in accordance with the communal prototype. That phenomenon may have been at work in followers' descriptions of female leaders' communication patterns in this study. However, this study did not ask followers to evaluate or rate behavior; it asked them to describe how frequently women performed the behaviors. It would seem that the method used in this study would have sidestepped the negative categorization problem, but that cannot be clearly stated. It is difficult to imagine that the "categorization" phenomenon would have been at work for one of the five factors and not for the other four. One could only conclude that it was at work consistently across all five factors. If that were true, then it would have to be concluded that the results for the four factors in which men and women were rated equally are unbelievable. That is, the results would have been different for men and women in either direction depending on the prototypes that raters held about their male and female leaders. Since this phenomenon was not assessed, we can draw no such conclusions.

Regarding the research questions—do men and women view the behavior of leaders differently on the five categories of leadership behaviors; and do male vs. female raters rate male and female leaders differently—there were some interesting findings that may help to account for the findings related to Hypothesis 1.

For the five dimensions of Visualizing Greatness, Empowering the "We," Communicating for Meaning, Managing One's Self, and Care and Recognition, there were no differences regarding Hypothesis 1 or the research question. Generally speaking, men and women are reported to perform these five behaviors to the same extent, regardless of whether the rating is being done by male or female raters.

However, male raters tended to rate all leaders, male or female, as employing more Communicating for Meaning behaviors than female raters. Additionally, women tended to rate men higher on Communicating for Meaning behaviors than they rate female leaders.

Can it be that men simply value this behavior more than women do and, therefore, are more sensitive to its use among leaders? The fact that male raters tend to rate all leaders higher on this dimension suggests that perhaps they are simply more aware of it than women when it occurs among their leaders.

On the other hand, women rated leaders of their own gender lower on this dimension only. That is, women rated male and female leaders the same on four of the five dimensions. But on this one dimension, Communicating for Meaning, they rated men higher than women, indicating that they perceive that men employ these behaviors more than women do. This cannot be accounted for simply by saying women are more critical of other women leaders. If that were true, then women leaders would have been rated lower on all five dimensions.

Previous research has portrayed women as better communicators than men. But the Communicating for Meaning dimension of the LBI is a special case of communications. It does

not include the communications of facts, data, interpersonal perceptions, etc.; it includes that special case of communicating meaning from one person to another. This is the focus of communications that are important to leadership alone. This form of communications differentiates leading from other organizational processes such as managing, planning, etc.

These results indicate that men and women engage in this leadership behavior to the same extent; and that in this special arena of communications, women are more critical of women than they are of men. Clearly more research is needed to investigate this phenomenon.

Implications of the Study

The results of this study have interesting implications for future research and future thinking about leadership. For example, the GLOBE study did not investigate the differences in leadership values and attributes based on gender. One might hypothesize that there might be a difference between genders on these attributes. Numerous studies mentioned previously indicate that women leaders employ different leadership styles than men. Based on these studies we might conclude that the attributes studied in the GLOBE study would be employed or valued differently by male and female leaders. At this point, we should point out that the many studies on leadership style, some of which were mentioned earlier, have little bearing on the conclusions here since several other studies, also mentioned earlier, have found that there is little difference in the results produced by male and female leaders. One would assume that if leadership style were an important issue, it would have some bearing on leadership results. Having said that, it may be that one's style is affected by one's values and attributes as assessed within the GLOBE study. If so, then we may find that the results of the GLOBE are different for males and for females.

In this study, the important issue is leadership behaviors. The Gardiner and Tiggemann (1999) study found that women in a male dominated industry alter their leadership behaviors to conform more to their male counterparts' leadership behaviors.

It can be assumed that many of Germany's organizations are male dominated since women make up only 25% of German managers and only 5% of Germany's top managers. In this study, women were slightly underrepresented, having made up only 20.9% of the sample while men made up 79.1% of the sample. From this, however, we might conclude that the women in the study were, for the most part, members of male dominated organizations (Fortune, 2007). Based on the Gardiner and Tiggemann (1999) results, we can easily account for the findings of this study. This study found no differences between men and women's leadership behaviors. If our assumption that the sample came from male dominated German organizations is correct, we would be safe in concluding that the female leaders in those organizations altered their behaviors to correspond with the behaviors of the male leaders in those same organizations. Therefore, the findings that both male and female leaders employed the same behaviors are explained. But what if some other variable accounts for the similarity between men and women leaders; what if the women did not alter their behaviors, but are in fact the same as men with regard to their leadership behaviors?

More research is recommended to see whether 1) women specifically alter their leadership behaviors and if they would be different kinds of leaders if this pressure to conform did not exist; and whether 2) the GLOBE results would be different if we were focusing on male leaders only and/or on female leaders only.

On a different note, this study did not assess the impact of various demographic factors other than gender such as age, education, tenure with the organization, tenure as a leader, level in

the organization, job roles and levels of the leaders, etc. These possible moderators should be investigated in future research.

Summary

This study looked at the differences between German men and women as transformational leaders. For the most part, no differences were found in the behaviors of male and female leaders. Additionally, one research question was explored. The authors looked at the impact of the gender of the raters on the ratings of leaders. It was found that women raters were more critical of both men and women leaders on the single factor of Communicating for Meaning. Also, women raters were more critical of female leaders than they were of male leaders. Possible causes and implications of these findings were discussed.

About the Authors:

Dr. Tom Kent is an Associate Professor at the College of Charleston where he teaches in the areas of Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior, Leadership, and Change. He previously served as Chair of the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship at the College. He has received numerous awards for his teaching including the Innovation in Teaching Award from the Institute of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Dr. Kent's research is in the area of Transformational Leadership.

Carrie Blair Messal, Ph.D**.,** is an Assistant Professor of Management at the College of Charleston. She has published articles in *Journal of Applied Psychology, Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *International Journal of Leadership Studies,* and *Human Performance*. In 2006, she was one of the authors on a paper that was named as a John C. Flanagan Award Finalist at the 21st Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists. Dr. Messal is currently the Director of the Schottland Scholars Program.

Dr. Howard F. Rudd, Jr., is Founding Dean/Dean Emeritus, Bank of America Teaching Professor and Professor of Management at the College of Charleston. He was previously the Small Business Institute Director and Chairman of the Department of Management at California State College, Bakersfield and a Captain in the USAF. Dr. Rudd is author of numerous articles, cases, monographs, and research studies.

References

Anderson, N., Lievens, F., Van Dam, K., & Born, M. (2006). A construct-driven investigation of gender differences in a leadership-role assessment center. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 555-566.

Baum, K. (1999). *The Mental Edge*. New York: Berkley Publishing.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Brodbeck, F. C., Frese, M., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., Bakacsi, G., & Bendova, H. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 1-29.

Chemers, M. M., Watson, C. B., & May, S. T. (2000). Dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness: A comparison of self-esteem, optimism, and efficacy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 267-277.

Clarke, B., & Crossland, R. (2002). *The Leader's Voice*. New York: SelectBooks, Inc.

Conger, J. A. (1989). *The Charasmatic Leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 219-257.

Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *Leadership Quarterly, 5*, 99-119.

Christopher, B. (2008). Why Are Women So Strange and Men So Weird? *Business Credit*, *110*, 4-8.

Crawford, M. (1995). *Talking Difference: On Gender and Language*. London: Sage Publications.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 23-256.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 3-22.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109,* 573-598.

Fletcher, J. (2004). The paradox of postheroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 247-261.

Fortune. (2007). *155* (8), Nov. 15.

Gardiner, M., & Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender differences in leadership style, job stress and mental health in male- and female-dominated industries. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, *72*, 301-315.

Grant, J. (1988). Women as managers: What can they offer organizations? *Organizational Dynamics,* Winter. 56-63.

Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 416-427.

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.

Kabacoff, R. J. (2001). *Gender differences in organizational leadership. Do men and women lead differently?* Briefings Publishing Group.

Karau, S. J., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Invited reaction: Gender, social roles, and the emergence of leaders. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *10*, 321-327.

Kent, T. W. (2005). Leading and managing : It takes two to tango. *Management Decision, 43*, 1010-1017.

Kent, T. W. (2004). The five ingredients of leadership. Proceedings of the 4th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Business.

Kent, T. W., Crotts, J. C., & Aziz, A. (2001). Four factors of transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22,* 221-229.

Kim, H., & Shim, S. (2003). Gender-based approach to the understanding of leadership roles among retail managers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 14,* 321-342.

Koopman, P. L., Den Hartog, D. N., & Konrad, E. (1999). National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8,* 503-520.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A Force for Change*. New York: The Free Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Mandell, B., & Pherwani, S. (2003). Relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style: A gender comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*, 387-404.

Mohr, G., & Wolfram, H. (2008). Leadership and effectiveness in the context of gender: The role of leaders' verbal behaviour. British *Journal of Management, 19*, 4-16.

Morgan, M. J. (2004). Women in a man's world: Gender differences in leadership at the military academy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *34*(12), 2482-2502.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Offermann, J. K., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: content, structure, and generalizability. *The Leadership Quarterly, 5*, 43-58.

Nadim, A., & Singh, P. (2005). Leadership styles and gender: A re-examination and extension. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management, 5,* 333-340.

Powell, G. N. (1990). One more time: Do female and male managers differ*? Academy of Management Executive, 4,* 68-74.

Quesada, G., Gonzalez, M., & Kent, T. W. (2008). A road for achieving an international measure and understanding on leaders' behaviors. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 29*, 678-692

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

Rudd, H., Kent, T., Blair, C. A., & Schuele, U. (in press). Leadership across cultures: Examining the equivalence of the Leader Behavior Inventory in two different cultures. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*.

Switzer, F. S., & Roth, P. L. (2002). Coping with missing data. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Winston, B. E., & Patterson, K. (2006). An integrative definition of leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 1*, 6-66.

Appendix: Content Description of the Leadership Behavior Inventory (LBI)

The LBI is comprised of five factors. Below is a brief description of each factor and a listing of the items that make up that factor. Each factor is listed separately.

Factor 1: Visualizing Performance

People, generally, will do what they can see in their mind's eye. A mental vision provides both direction and motivation. Athletes visualize their performance prior to actually performing as a way to create a model for their behavior and to pre-groove their actions. Baum (1999) describes the physiological and psychological dynamics of this cognitive affect on behavior.

Leaders somehow know that visualization is key to performance. They seem to do it naturally. A leader strives to "implant" a single vision in each person's mind to create a "common vision." This factor appears similar to Conger's (1989) *Sensing Opportunity and Formulating a Vision,* and Kotter's (1990) *Establishing Direction*. Further, Kouzes and Posner (1995) assert:

> Not only do constituents demand that leaders be credible, they also demand that
> leaders be forward looking; that they have a sense of direction, a vision for the
> future. Credibility is the foundation of leadership, but the capacity to paint an
> uplifting and ennobling picture of the future differentiates leaders from other
> credible sources (p. 31).

Apparently, according to the items identified by the factor analysis, leaders demonstrate to others that they are visionary in a number of ways. They discuss their vision at every opportunity. They demonstrate an eagerness to make something happen. They show that their vision is clear and they are enthusiastic about it. They are willing to challenge the system as well. This latter point might indicate that "leaders" who are not mavericks, so to speak, are not seen as "visionaries."

Has visions and dreams of what can be.

Has a desire to make something happen.

Has a clear image of the future.

Expresses enthusiasm for his/her vision.

Experiments, innovates, and takes risks to find new or better ways.

Is willing to challenge the system.

Factor 2: Empowering the "We"

It appears that leaders, these days, use the team or some unit that is greater than the individual as the anchoring point of his/her efforts. Certainly, everything comes down to individual effort and intelligence; but leaders use the team to anchor that effort, to stimulate creative use of intellect, to spur on effort, to support individual performance. Leaders work to create a sense of unity and togetherness among individuals by developing group, team, or unit identity. The leader strives to engender commitment and motivation at the "we" level. They stress mutual commitment to, or stake in, each other and to the larger whole's goals. Leaders emphasize the "we's" common purpose and mission; they focus on the common enemy or the goal that is critical to all. Leaders get people involved, communicate with words like "we," and "our," foster and sponsor collaboration among followers, encourage caring about each other, celebrate the team's accomplishments, and pay attention to the team's spirit, and allow people to act and do what must be done.

Lets people (empowers them to) do what they believe is right.

Gets people involved in decisions that affect them.

Creates in others a sense of ownership in the organization.

Uses the word "we" constantly instead of "I".

Enlists the support and assistance of others who have a stake in the vision.

Involves others who must live with the results

Appeals to others' values, interests, hopes, and dreams.

Strengthens people by giving power away, developing their competence, and assigning critical tasks to them.

Factor 3: Managing One's "Self"

It is important for a leader to be trusted. For that to happen the leader must be somewhat predictable in certain areas of thought and behavior that are important to followers. The leader's behavior must be somewhat consistent and not erratic or irrational. Additionally, the leader must be able to sustain his or her focus and effort, and his/her behavior must reflect the values the leader espouses. At an inner, psychological level the leader must be capable of managing his or her thinking and behaving -- they must be able to manage their "self." Leaders who can do this create a sense of purposefulness. They are viewed as being able to maintain a consistent focus and energy level. Their behavior is seen as consistent with their values and reflective of their intent or purpose.

Has a sense of self-determination and self-confidence.

Keeps his/her own level of energy up high.

Believes anything can be done; has a "can do" attitude.

Is a model of persistence and perseverance.

Maintains focus and constancy of purpose.

Factor 4: Communicating for Meaning

Bennis and Nanus (1985) describe a situation that demonstrates that leaders do not have to be "good communicators." What they have to be is communicators of meaning. They have to find ways to get more than their message across; they have to get their meaning across. A leader's message must be about much more than data, and/or information. Data, and information is the message of managers. Meaning is the message of leaders. The message of leaders is about "why," and it is about implications, and it is about values. Clarke and Crossland (2002) argue that leaders communicate with facts, emotions, and symbols.

Leaders understand that if you want people to commit to a difficult, new course of action, then they must understand and buy into *why* the action is *valuable*. Both their minds and their hearts must be involved. So leaders engage people's minds and hearts. This is most difficult to do, the leader knows, if we only speak in the direction of people about facts, data and information. Passing on information does not necessarily require an engaged mind; and clearly, it does not automatically engage the heart. Clarke and Crossland (2002) state that a leader who minimizes the emotional and symbolic content of their message degrade the quality of their message and subsequent decision making.

Explains <u>why</u> she/he is doing what she/he is doing.

Knows his/her audience when speaking to them.

Talks about the principles or values behind decisions that are made.

Communicates in ways that inspire and motivate others.

Takes the time needed to explain fully what he/she is thinking.

Sets the example by behaving in ways that are consistent with his/her stated values.

Factor 5: Care & Recognition

This factor seems pretty fundamental. Yet, only in one other body of work in the serious leadership literature has it been identified as a key component of leadership behavior. Kouzes & Posner (1995) call it *Encouraging the Heart*. The items in this factor -- Care and Recognition -- and in *Encouraging the Heart* are very similar. Kouzes & Posner (1993) describe the factor in the following words: "Leaders must give encouragement and recognition if people are to persist, especially when the climb is steep and arduous. To continue to pursue the vision, people need to feel that they are part of a team." (p. 22) Kouzes & Posner believe that leaders *Encourage the Heart* by recognizing contributions and by celebrating accomplishments.

Publicizes peoples' successes to all employees.

Celebrates team accomplishments regularly.

Genuinely cares about others.

Celebrates victories.