GENDER AND LEADERSHIP: A SECOND ORDER META-ANALYTIC REVIEW

by

Kristen Lee Santos

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Business Administration

Charlotte

2023

Approved by:

_____

Dr. George Banks

_____

Dr. Jill Yavorsky

_____

Dr. Natasha Randle

_____

Dr. Reginald Silver

_____

©2023

Kristen Lee Santos

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

KRISTEN LEE SANTOS. Gender and Leadership. A Second-Order Meta-Analytics Review. (Under the direction of DR.GEORGE BANKS)

Given the importance of understanding how gender bias impacts the advancement of women into upper leadership, this second-order meta-analysis attempts to explore and summarize previous developments in the gender and leadership literature in order to present the current state of the literature and identify a roadmap for future research.

This dissertation delivers three primary theoretical contributions. First, I conducted a systematic review of the leadership and gender literature to create a primer, with relevant definitions and theoretical frameworks, for gender and leadership theory. This review highlighted that little theoretical integration exists to synthesize the literature on gender and leadership.

Second, I present a second-order meta-analysis and subsequent relative weights analysis to demonstrate the relationship between personality, gender and follower evaluation of leadership constructs such as leader emergence and other leader behaviors (ex: transformational leadership, ethical leadership, etc.). The final meta-analytic correlation matrix included 89 meta-analytic estimates (total k=1,404; total n=366,329). Results indicate that variation in the evaluation of leaders can be explained by gender, however, the subsequent relative weights analysis indicates that for no construct is gender the dominant predictor.

Finally, this dissertation presents a research agenda based on the current findings that will advance the field, including research questions ranging from resolving methodological issues

related to the measurement of evaluations of behaviors rather than actual behaviors, to further understanding further moderators of the relationship between gender and leader evaluations.

DEDICATION

To my dad, who never stopped asking when I was going go back to school to get my doctorate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Reginald Silver, Dr. Jill Yavorsky, and Dr. Natasha Randle for their guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank the chair of my committee, Dr. George Banks, for his encouragement, counsel and enthusiasm throughout my dissertation process.

I would like to thank my family for all of the patience and grace while going through the doctoral process and my friends, who never doubted from day one that I would make it through this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

There has been “explosive” growth in the leadership field in the last decade, driven by both industry, scholarly and societal interest (Hunt, 2005; Hunter, Bedell-Avers, & Mumford, 2007). United States companies alone spend an estimated $14 billion annually on leadership development (Gurdijian, 2014), but just fifteen percent of leaders who receive training are able to establish permanent behavior change (Todd, 2018). The costs of this failure to implement can be significant, with the effects of poor leadership being associated with decreased performance, productivity, and output (Kılıç & Günsel, 2019). Failure to develop effective leadership within organizations can be caused by not fully leveraging women leaders. Leadership inequalities for women persist in spite of increased workforce participation in recent decades (Bilimoria & Liang, 2013). Women comprise 51.8% of all workers employed in management and professional occupations, yet only 27.6% of chief executives ("U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics," 2021) and in a study of 22,000 publicly traded organizations, only 40% have even one female board member ("Peterson Institute for International Economics," 2016).

Poor representation of women in leadership creates a disadvantage for women, companies, and society. Women are disadvantaged because educational investments result in lower return. Women were conferred 60.9% graduate degrees in the 2018-2019 school year ("National Center for Education Statistics," 2020), however, even when women show signs of early academic achievement, such as a high GPA, men demonstrating less potential will still supervise more employees at work (Qian & Yavorsky, 2021). When women are appointed to a leadership role, they are more likely to be in precarious leadership positions, such as leading failing companies or in low-impact, token positions, referred to as the “glass cliff” (For counter

evidence, see (Bechtoldt, Bannier, & Rock, 2019)) (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Ryan & Haslam, 2005; Ryan et al., 2016).

Poor representation of women also creates a disadvantage for companies, with research suggesting that women board members contribute to higher financial performance (Hoobler, Masterson, Nkomo, & Michel, 2018), increased corporate social responsibility (Bernardi & Threadgill, 2011; Setó-Pamies, 2015), and higher employee satisfaction (Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; B. M. Bass, B. J. Avolio, & L. Atwater, 1996; Vinkenburg, Van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2011). Further, organizations do not benefit from the unique talents and perspectives provided by women and may get a poor return on the investments they have made in training (Appelbaum, Audet, & Miller, 2003). Finally, society benefits from increased leadership equality through higher workforce participation and more equitable outcomes in societal decision making, such as new legislation (Herrera, Duncan, Green, & Skaggs, 2012; Qian & Fuller, 2020).

While research related to gender and leadership is growing in importance, prior research is not without flaws. First, there is a lack of theoretical integration related to the role of gender in leadership. Many authors cite theories such as role congruity theory (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 2002), social role theory (Alice H Eagly & Wood, 2011), status characteristics theory (Ridgeway, 1991), the backlash effect (Rudman & Phelan, 2008; Williams & Tiedens, 2016), and signaling theory (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011) as possible drivers of discrimination against women, but few present a holistic view of the context in which these can be expected to impact women's leadership emergence, behavior and evaluation. Gender theory itself has also separated itself into two major camps – first, that any differences between gender behaviors and outcomes are context dependent and minimal; second, that women are unique and

differentially advantaged in certain ways (Bird & Brush, 2002; Cellar, Sidle, Goudy, & O'brien, 2001). The second camp has been criticized as creating an entry-point for inequality between the genders, as these differences have unequal value in society, as in the example of comparing agentic to communal behavior in leadership (Martin, 2004; Risman, 2018). This paper will ultimately draw upon signaling theory and status characteristics theory as parsimonious, foundational theoretical frameworks to integrate these gender theories and leadership research.

Second, in much of the extant leadership research, there is conflation of actual leadership behaviors and their evaluation. For instance, Banks, Woznyj, and Mansfield (in press) demonstrated that only 3% of the variables in leadership and organizational behavior research capture actual behavior (Banks, Woznyj, & Mansfield, 2021)(in press), which limits our ability to understand actual behavioral differences between men and women in leadership. For instance, men and women may both enact righteous anger over an injustice or dominate a conversation in terms of speaking time, which has been linked to leader emergence, but may be evaluated differently for those same behaviors (MacLaren et al., 2020; McClean, Martin, Emich, & Woodruff, 2018; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Accurate measurement of leader behaviors is crucial to determining how to train effective leader behaviors that work well regardless of one's gender (Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011).

Finally, the current literature does not offer a comprehensive review of leader behaviors and their outcomes through the lens of gender. Through this study, I offer a comparison of common leadership style frameworks and relevant supporting gender theories, thus offering the most comprehensive overview of gender and leader behaviors to date. Through the use of a second order meta-analysis, effect sizes will be calculated based on the standardized mean differences between men and women as they relate to leader behavior. There is no existing

primer on gender and leadership in which all of the major leadership styles are included in order to examine the nomological network of gender and evaluations of leaders.

The purpose of this dissertation is to build a framework of leadership and gender theories through the lens of signaling theory to create a comprehensive perspective of the aspects of leadership where gender does and does not lead to differences in outcomes. A second order meta-analysis will be completed to consolidate and explain existing research results – moving towards an integrated framework of gender and leadership. Understanding the current research on leadership and gender will allow organizations to further assess both the rationale and pathway to improve female representation in leadership positions.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In spite of more than 50 years of academic perspective regarding the complexity of leadership, most studies address a single leadership style in isolation, such as charismatic leadership, or a single leadership process, such as leadership emergence, rather than deconstructing how an individual becomes a leader, enacts leader behaviors, and is evaluated as an effective or ineffective leader. The inclusion of a moderator such as gender, where the relationship is unclear in much extant literature, only serves to create additional confusion in the literature.

The remainder of this dissertation is as follows: I begin by reviewing the gender and leadership literature including individual differences that lead to different leadership outcomes; a review of influential gender theories; leadership styles including transactional, transformational, laissez-faire, authentic, charismatic, ethical and servant leadership; and ultimately leader measures including leader emergence and follower evaluations.

Individual Differences and Leadership

Historically, leadership has been viewed through the lens of the "great man" theory, whereby leaders are presumably born, not made (Organ, 1996). Subsequent theory indicated that leadership is an iterative process (Riggio, 2018), and that leaders often emerge by fitting a prototype of leadership adopted by their followers (Brown, 2018). Today's understanding of the pathway to leadership is more complex, based upon the understanding of leadership as a contextual, iterative process, but also partially attributed to individual differences such as cognitive ability, personality traits and demographic features such as age, race or gender (Ensari, Riggio, Christian, & Carslaw, 2011).

Early cognitive ability has been demonstrated to predict a 6.2% increase in leader role occupancy later in life, suggesting that leadership potential is evident at an early stage of development (Daly, Egan, & O'Reilly, 2015). Leadership performance is dependent upon the leader's cognitive ability to employ the following leadership skills: problem definition, cause/goal analysis, constraint analysis, planning, forecasting, creative thinking, idea evaluation, wisdom, and sensemaking/visioning (Mumford, Todd, Higgs, & McIntosh, 2017). While cultural stereotypes persist that men outperform women on tests of mathematics and spatial skills, and women excel at verbal skills, meta-analysis indicates that men and women are similar on most cognitive variables (Hyde, 2016).

The impacts of personality have been controversial in the leadership literature. Early studies that indicated that leadership was solely personality or trait driven had fallen out of favor, but recent research has brought individual personality differences back to the forefront (Zaccaro, Gulick, & Khare, 2008). Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience have been positively linked to an authentic leadership style (Shahzad, Raja, & Hashmi, 2020; Spark & O'Connor, 2021). However, in a recent meta-analysis, researchers studied 26 cultures and demonstrated that gender differences in personality are relatively small when compared to individual variation within the genders, suggesting that gender may not be an individuating factor in determining leadership potential (Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001).

Demographic factors such as age, race and gender are frequently used in leadership research as control variables, however, researchers suggest that this is a misused strategy when it is not grounded in theory and that often results in small effect sizes (Bernerth, Cole, Taylor, & Walker, 2018). Nevertheless, understanding differences in leadership behaviors related to age,

race and gender remains a popular topic of study as each contribute to our understanding of how individual differences impact leadership style and behavior.

While research on age and leadership is limited, generational differences in leadership styles and outcomes have been demonstrated. Supervisors of varying ages have been shown to have differing approaches to leadership, with younger workers potentially engaging in more relationship-oriented activities (Gilbert, Collins, & Brenner, 1990) than older supervisors and that charismatic, change-oriented, and risk-taking styles seem to decline with age (Rosing & Jungmann, 2015).

While there have been calls for increased research and focus on race and leadership, the topic remains understudied. Research has called for increased understanding of how race impacts the ascent to leadership positions and how it impacts evaluation and performance after placement (Begeny, Wong, Kirby, & Rink, 2021). However studies frequently fail to address intersectionality, leading to unclear results (Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). Studies of leader prototyping indicate that similar to the gender theory of "Think Manager, Think Male" leader prototypes also fall into the standard of "Think Leader, Think White" increasing the call for more research to understand workplace stereotypes and the path to leader emergence (Gündemir, Homan, De Dreu, & Van Vugt, 2014; Rosette, Leonardelli, & Phillips, 2008).

Gender is the most widely studied demographic factor that affects the leadership process, with extensive theoretical grounding across the social sciences, management, and psychology (Hoyt & Simon, 2017). Gender scholars have introduced a significant body of literature with the intent of explaining why women in the workplace have different leadership outcomes, a phenomenon commonly referred to as a "broken rung" on the career ladder. For example, for every 100 men promoted to be a first-time manager, only 86 women make that first step

(McKinsey, 2021). Studies addressing the "broken rung" can broadly be placed into three categories of factors that precede entry into a leadership role: (1) *permission and support factors*, such as identification with leadership, occupational segregation, and/or workplace bias; (2) *supply-side factors*, such as education and leadership skills; and *desire factors*, such as motivation to lead (Elprana, Felfe, Stiehl, & Gatzka, 2015). The remainder of this paper will focus on permission and support factors and desire factors, which have been determined to be the biggest single contributor to on-going leadership bias (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Engen, 2003).

Gender Theory

A variety of theories have been introduced to explain why women have different leadership outcomes, ranging from the theory of gendered organizations (Acker, 1990) to role congruity theory (Ridgeway, 2006) and theories that demonstrate backlash to women who do not conform to traditional gender roles (Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman & Phelan, 2008). A summary of prominent leadership constructs and their relevant gender theories can be found in Table One.

While organizational efforts to reduce bias and actively promote women into leadership positions have been ongoing, less overt forms of bias, called second-generation bias, may be preventing women from advancement (Ely, Ibarra, & Kolb, 2011). These are defined as invisible barriers supported by cultural beliefs about gender and the female gender role, that explain why gender inequalities persist in spite of laws mandating equality and the increased workforce participation of women (Acker, 2012; Calás & Smircich, 2009; Ely & Meyerson, 2000). Even

Table One: Overview of Leadership and Gender

	Theoretical Definition	Role of Gender in Theory
Antecedents of Leadership Attainment		
Leader Salience	The process through which individuals internalize and personalize meanings behind the leadership role (Ramarajan, 2014)	Women are disadvantaged on three pathways to leader salience: • Role models identified with the leader role • Past leadership experience/high leader self-efficacy • Leadership role fitting with self-constructions of leadership
Motivation to Lead (MTL)	Characterized by a person's desire to be in charge and enjoy leadership, as well as a sense of duty to lead or to overlook the personal risk of engaging in leadership (Chan and Drascow, 2001)	• Women have been demonstrated to have lower MTL • Gendered differences in job attribute preferences and work values
Leader Emergence	Identifies the factors associated with someone being perceived as leader-like (Hogan, Murphy and Hogan, 1994)	Men emerge as leaders more frequently than even dominant women, potentially driven by to processes: • Women are reluctant to initiate leader behaviors due to lack of fit to gender role • Group members do not accept leadership behaviors when initiated by a women
Leader Styles/Behaviors		
Transformational Leadership	Characterized by how a leader meets the needs of their followers; has four dimensions idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Stock, 2020)	• Transformation leadership may be more consistent with the female gender role • "Think transformational, think female" leadership paradigm • While associated with woman leaders, workplace outcomes may still be better when these behaviors are enacted by men
Transactional Leadership	Characterized by a give-and-take relationship that appeals to a subordinate's self-interest (Kark and Eagly, 2010)	• Men are assumed to display more transactional behaviors; however, women are more

		likely to employ contingent reward • Women may be pressured to adjust their style to a more socially acceptable style, such as transformational leadership
Laissez-Faire Leadership (LFL)	Defined as a general failure to take responsibility for managing, marked by a general failure to make decisions or use authority, frequent absence and lack of involvement during critical juncture (Bass and Riggio, 2006)	There are gender differences in how LFL is perceived: • Men are more likely to retain leadership roles when using this style • Female subordinates are more likely to rate a leader as lower in this scale
Charismatic Leadership	Defined as a relational process between the leader and their subordinates, characterized by personalization, intimacy and trust	• Two studies indicate that there are no gendered differences in the ability to signal charismatic leadership in a virtual environment • Some elements, such as self-promotion, may not be compatible with female gender norms • Some feminist authors believe charisma is a gendered concept due to focus on individuality and autonomy
Servant Leadership	Emphasizes wisdom, emotional healing, and altruistic values that put other's interests before one's own, stewardship of the leader's legacy and purposeful contributions to society (Hock, Bommer, Dulebohn, and Wu, 2018)	• Characterized as a feminine leadership behavior due to focus on nurturing followers • Expectations for servant leadership are higher for women leaders • Feminist scholars believe that servant leadership could provide a path to fill both a leader role and female gender role authentically
Ethical Leadership	Signaling behavior by the leader (individual) targeted at stakeholders comprising the enactment of prosocial values combined with expression of moral emotions (banks)	No demonstrated difference in expectations for ethical behaviors, however, women may be more principled, more ethical, more likely to exercise self-regulation, and more likely to question unethical practices.

Authentic Leadership	"a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development."(Luthans, Avolio)	• Women were demonstrated as being perceived as having more authentic leader behaviors • May be more challenging for women because they experience a double bind of expectations for gender role and leader role
Leader Evaluation	Outcome variable that has been demonstrated to be unstable and conflate actual leader behaviors with perceptions of those behaviors (Banks, Woznyj, et al 2021)	Behaviors may be evaluated differently when enacted by a man vs. a woman. Variation in leader evaluations could be due to three factors: • Activation of gender stereotypes • Subordinate gender • Gendered nature of the task or role being evaluated

small amounts of bias can have large impacts in the workplace, with computer simulations indicating that even with bias estimates of 1-5% in workplace performance evaluations, only 29% of top leadership positions are ultimately filled by women (Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1996). The following section provides a review of the influential gender theories that inform the current understanding of gender, leadership and how second-generation bias may be contributing to the relatively low ascent of women into leadership roles.

Signaling Theory

Signaling theory is used to describe behaviors between two parties when each of the parties have different information, described as information asymmetry. The sender of the information thus has to decide how to relay a message and the receiver must then decide how to interpret that signal (Connelly et al., 2011). There are two different relevant attributes in

signaling theory: 1. Indices, which are inalterable pieces of data like gender, race or age and 2. Signals, which are alterable (Karasek III & Bryant, 2012; Spence, 1978). There are two type of information where asymmetry is important, when one party does not know fully about the characteristics of another party and when one party is concerned about another party's behavior or behavioral intentions, which is common in leadership dyads, hiring and promotion decisions, and leader evaluations (Stiglitz, 2000). Signaling theory operates on a general timeline such that 1. Signaler has an underlying quality 2. A signal is sent to the receiver 3. Receiver observes and interprets the signal and then 4. Feedback is sent to the signaler (Connelly et al., 2011). As summarized by Stiglitz, "Signaling theory provides a unique, practical and empirically testable perspective on problems of social selection under conditions of imperfect information" (Stiglitz, 2002).

Early research in signaling theory focused on the one-to-one relationship between sender and receiver, but it has subsequently evolved to include a social-constructivist perspective whereby the meanings communicated through signals are not only a function of the individual interpretation, but also societal beliefs about the signal (Connelly et al., 2011). Signals can be interpreted through the lens of gender under three influences: 1. Individuals and their gender identity; 2. The individual with whom one interacts and 3. The context or setting in which the interaction takes place (Deaux & Major, 1990).

Signaling theory has relevance to gender theory because women leaders signaling the female gender role then experience both the descriptions and prescriptions inherent in that gender role (Heilman, 2001; Spence, 1978). Signaling theory could be extended to leadership as a way to explain how specific behaviors contribute to the subsequent evaluation or perceptions of a leader, and other leadership outcomes such as leader emergence, performance, or well-being

(Stock, 2020). Leader signaling behavior may be evaluated differently dependent upon the gender mix of leader-subordinate dyads.

Theory of Gendered Organizations

Social-system-centered gender theories suggest that organizations themselves are inherently gendered, based on an "ideal worker" norm that is unencumbered and always available for work without the constraints of home and family (Acker, 1990). To say that an organization is gendered means that systems that advantage men are built into job requirements, salary determination, hierarchies, and expectations for appropriate behavior, creating a system of disadvantage for women (Acker, 2012).

Three ways that organizations are gendered are through the norms established for how a "good" worker is expected to behave, the value that is placed on certain gendered tasks, and through the social construction of work. First, ideal worker norms include expectations for long hours, visible busy-ness, ability to travel and responsiveness to "stay late" for unexpected work, which is inconsistent with a woman's gender role, which is expected to have greater domestic responsibility outside of work and primary caregiving responsibility for children or elders within the home (Kelly, Ammons, Chermack, & Moen, 2010). Second, within the workplace, higher value, and subsequently pay, is placed on traditionally masculine tasks involving physical labor than traditionally feminine tasks, such as caregiving (Slaughter, 2015) and norms for appropriate behaviors for managers align with traditionally masculine behaviors (Heilman, 2001). Finally, the social construction of work versus home also leads to the gendering of the workplace, with work within organizations being the domain of a "breadwinning" man and work within the home being the domain of the "caregiving" woman (Becker, 1985).

Describing organizations and social constructs as gendered has grown in popularity, with an informal search of the literature identifying 31,500 articles since 2021 describing something as "gendered," however, the theory is not without critics. First, granting gender ontological status makes it virtually untestable, and provides limited ability to measure if an organization is more or less gendered than another, suggesting that it is better defined as a framework for understanding inequality (Britton, 2000; Britton & Logan, 2008). Second, defining organizations as gendered makes it more difficult to imagine what a less bureaucratic, "ungendered" organization might look like, with many scholars indicating that the central challenge for organizations is to create a culture where gendered behaviors can be enacted without reproducing inequality (Gherardi, 1995). Third, most early theories of gendered organizations did not address gender as it intersects with race and class inequality, however, recent literature has begun the conversation regarding what Acker defined as 'inequality regimes' (Acker, 2012; Britton & Logan, 2008).

An important question is whether organizations have become less "gendered" over time. While traditional bureaucracy and hierarchies have shifted in favor of teamwork, career networking and career maps instead of ladders, women are still disadvantaged due to supervisor discretion in advancement opportunities, the importance of self-promotion in teamwork, and gender disadvantages caused in networking by not being part of the "boys club" (Williams, Muller, & Kilanski, 2012).

Status Characteristics Theory/Expectation States Theory

Status characteristics theory posits that certain characteristics, or signals, such as age, gender, class or beauty hold differing levels of value for society and the evaluation of these signals are used to ascribe differing levels of status to an individual based on their congruence

with these attributes (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch Jr, 1972). Gender provides an implicit background identity in the workplace and differentiates men from women in "socially significant ways" that are used to justify inequality and grant more respect, honor, and importance to men (Carli & Eagly, 1999; Ridgeway, 2001a; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999). Status characteristics theory emphasizes the social structural factors that create expectations for appropriate male and female behavior and explain differences that result in variation in the social positions of men and women (Carli & Eagly, 1999). In a complementary theory, expectations states theory further explains that status beliefs will shape the development of social hierarchies among individuals, affecting each individual's ability to attain influence and leadership (Ridgeway & Walker, 1995). This creates an important foundation for understanding decision processes related to leadership emergence and perceived competence.

Status beliefs are unique in several ways. First, status beliefs tend to be shared by both the dominant and subordinate groups. For example, when considering gender stereotypes, both men and women tend to believe that men are more likely to be leaders (C. L. Ridgeway, Boyle, Kuipers, & Robinson, 1998). Second, there exist both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes, based on the status characteristics, which are conceptualizations of both how a group does and should behave (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2001), more fully described through role congruity theory. Third, inequalities linked to gender status beliefs may differ across contexts, with differentiating factors including gender make-up of the group and norms regarding the gender appropriateness of a task, such as the stereotype that women should plan office social events (Wentworth & Anderson, 1984).

Both status characteristics theory and expectation states theory contribute to our understanding of leadership because they provide a framework to understand the mechanisms

through which men are accorded a higher status, and thus a greater likelihood to emerge as a leader, be perceived as having higher competence, and have greater congruity with the leader role (Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997).

Social Role and Role Congruity Theory

Social role and role congruity theories were developed to answer the question of how inequality in leadership persists, in spite of increased workforce participation of women, legal repercussions for discrimination, and a popular belief that women make better leaders (Ridgeway, 2011). Social construction theory explains that because men and women interact regularly, consensual status beliefs are continually created and reinforced (Ridgeway, 1991). Social role theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how social labor division leads to gender role beliefs in terms of shared assumptions about gender-specific attributes (Alice H Eagly & Wood, 2011). This theory includes two basic constructs related to gender inequality, gender roles and gender stereotypes. First, gender roles are defined as sets of norms prescribing the behaviors and activities appropriate for each sex (Alice H Eagly, 1987). Second, gender stereotypes are shared sets of beliefs about the psychological traits characteristic of men and women (Williams & Best, 1990).

Role-based theories of gender inequality traditionally assume two basic gender roles, men and women, with recent theory adopting a third gender role, androgynous (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006; Heilman, 2001; Koburtay, Syed, & Haloub, 2019). Male gendered behaviors include achievement-oriented behaviors, labeled in much of the extant literature as “agentic,” whereas feminine gendered behaviors, described as communal, are frequently social- and service-oriented traits (Heilman, 2001). Agentic traits include being competitive, self-confident, objective, aggressive, ambitious and able to lead (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989).

Communal traits are primarily concerned with the well-being of others and are described by traits such as affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, nurturing and gentle (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 2002). An androgynous gender role is defined as showing a balanced mix of both traditionally masculine and feminine characteristics (Kolb, 1997, 1999). Each of these gender stereotypes are both descriptive and prescriptive, they explain both typical masculine and feminine behavior, but also indicate norms that are suitable for each (Alice H Eagly, 1987).

The social and domestic roles of men and women reinforce gender roles within the workplace. Men are traditionally perceived as being the "breadwinner" and because of their lesser domestic responsibility are able to work more hours, travel to meet the demands of the job, and limit their time out of the office due to childcare issues (Wynn, 2017), while women continue to carry the "triple burden" of childcare, unpaid domestic work and the care of older and disabled family members (Hearn & Collinson, 2017). When these social roles are translated into the workplace, they have important implications for the roles that men and women are permitted to have, such that even when women are depicted as a leader or manager, they are characterized as being less achievement-oriented than men, fitting with a more communal social role (Heilman, Block, & Martell, 1995). Further, the importance of masculine characteristics may be the most extreme in the upper echelons, creating an additional barrier to achievement of the most elevated roles for women (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Leadership itself may be gendered, as explained by leader categorization theory, which claims that gender bias can be understood by examining societal leader prototypes (Scott & Brown, 2006). A "good manager" is typically described as having masculine characteristics (Heilman et al., 1989; Powell & Butterfield, 1989), management sub-roles, such as discipline, evaluation, and monitoring activities, are culturally masculine (Atwater, Brett, Waldman,

DiMare, & Hayden, 2004), and that these characteristics are essential to success in upper management (Martell, Parker, Emrich, & Crawford, 1998). A 2011 meta-analysis studied three paradigms of cultural masculinity in research, including (1) the *Think Manager, Think Male* paradigm (Schein & Davidson, 1993), which includes studies that measure the relationship between male and female stereotypes with leader stereotypes; (2) the *agency-communion paradigm* (Powell, Butterfield, & Jiang, 2021), which includes studies that measure the relationships of leader categories (ex: good manager) with masculine and feminine gender scales; and (3) the *masculinity-femininity paradigm,* which includes studies that test the masculine and feminine content of occupational stereotypes. The results of this meta-analysis indicated that consistent with the *think-manager, think male* paradigm, men were more likely to be associated with leadership roles; consistent with the *agency-communion* paradigm, participants rated leader groups as higher in agentic qualities; and consistent with the *masculinity-femininity* paradigm, occupations entailing leadership were classified as masculine (White & White, 2006).

The role congruity theory of prejudice towards women leaders proposes that incongruity between the female gender roles and leadership roles can lead to prejudice through perceiving women as less appropriate occupants of leadership roles and evaluating equivalent behaviors of men and women differently when enacted by a woman (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 2002). One important aspect of role congruity theory is that it is not only reinforced by men, but also women. An individual's own implicit leadership theories may affect their ability see themselves and others as a leaders (Elprana et al., 2015; Felfe & Schyns, 2014). The creation of mental images of leaders as men have been identified as early as childhood (Schyns, Tymon, Kiefer, & Kerschreiter, 2013) and reinforcement mechanisms have been demonstrated to include gendered titles, such as chairman (Archer & Kam, 2022). Further research indicates that there are differing

perspectives on the gender roles dependent upon generational cohorts (Murray & Chua, 2014) and that due to different social identities, women and men may differ in their expectations of their own behaviors in organizational settings (Ely, 1995).

Recent literature suggests that in a more contemporary organization, feminine traits may be more highly valued, creating a female advantage (Rosette & Tost, 2010). This is attributed to a higher likelihood that women will enact more transformational leadership behaviors (Stempel, Rigotti, & Mohr, 2015); feminized approaches to management (Alice H Eagly & Carli, 2003a, 2003b); and the stereotype content model, which indicates that there are circumstances where someone may be perceived as both communal and agentic (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008).

Shifting Criterion

The shifting criterion theory, which builds on status characteristics theory, suggests that attributes of evaluated subjects are valued according to the attributes of the higher status actor. For example, because men have a higher status, if a man in a comparison group has a higher level of education and a woman has greater work experience, the attribute of education will be given the higher weight in evaluation (Biernat & Thompson, 2002). Shifting criterion theory indicates that evaluators will shift their definitions of merit to advantage certain groups (Uhlmann & Cohen, 2005). The nature of the task can influence the degree of shift, such that men are perceived as more competent at "masculine" tasks and women are more competent at "feminine tasks" (Biernat, Manis, & Nelson, 1991). In another study, participants were more likely to rate a candidate for a job more favorably when their gender "matched" the job for which they applied (Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997). This research extends past the gender typing of occupational role. In a recent study, when a woman exhibited agentic behaviors, the criterion for

evaluation shifted to communal characteristics such as social skills as a pathway to justify hiring discrimination (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008).

The shifting standards model has important implications for leadership research, including leadership style and performance, because when subjective evaluations are being used, stereotype effects that may impact promotion and opportunities in practice may not be demonstrated through the research (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001). This theory has important practical impacts as well, with further research demonstrating that because of shifting standards, women are held to higher standards of competence for traditionally male positions, such as political office (Bauer, 2019). Women also had a higher standard to meet to prove ability, suggesting that women have to "work twice as hard to be perceived as half as good" (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; MacDonald, 1992). Shifting criterion is an example of a hidden bias that benefits gender typical applicants, which is particularly relevant when considering the typical gendered assumptions regarding the leadership role.

Backlash Effects and the Double Bind

Women also experience what has been described as a "double bind" – whereby acting feminine is associated with reduced competence and women who exhibit more masculine behaviors are perceived as violating their gender roles (Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997; Jamieson, 1995). Interpersonal theory indicates that people are initially evaluated on two dimensions, competence and warmth (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007). While dominance behaviors are, in general, neither desirable nor undesirable, women are evaluated more negatively when they enact them, termed "backlash" (Rudman & Glick, 1999). Because gender roles are in essence a social prescription, when they are violated there is a social cost, potentially because violators are perceived as threatening the existing social order (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts,

2012). Women are faced with a trade-off between being perceived as competent at work versus likeable (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Ely et al., 2011) and there appears to be a "narrow band of acceptable behavior" for women leaders that requires an appropriate balance of masculine and feminine behaviors (Morrison, White, White, & Van Velsor, 1987).

Violating gender prescription stereotypes can have further negative impacts. Women who do not act "womanly" and men who do not act "manly" are presumed to be less psychologically healthy and are evaluated poorly (Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, & Pascale, 1975). Successful women managers are also described as "interpersonally hostile" (i.e. devious, vulgar, quarrelsome, selfish, bitter, deceitful), regardless of ratings of their competence (Heilman et al., 1995). While women are increasingly viewed and described as more agentic (Diekman & Eagly, 2000), even descriptions of agency are split on dimensions of competence and competition, with women self-rating higher in the last 20 years on traits associated with competence, such as self-reliant, individualistic, and ambitious, but not competition, such as decisiveness, aggressiveness, and forcefulness (Spence & Buckner, 2000).

Further, behaving in a more masculine and self-promoting manner does not appear to help women reach leadership positions and may even backfire (Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007; Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). Perceived leadership role incompatibility has been demonstrated to impact perceptions of leadership effectiveness (Alice H Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr, 2014), leader emergence (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 1991), leader evaluations (Alice H Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992), and evaluations of leadership styles (Alice H Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Further, fear of backlash has been demonstrated to impact women's ability to negotiate aggressively, resulting in less beneficial outcomes in a negotiation, such as for salary (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010). Finally, having to

maintain the appropriate balance of communality and agency, a form of impression management, has also been demonstrated to cause anxiety that can diminish task performance (Riordan, Gross, & Maloney, 1994).

Leadership Process Model

The following section will introduce a framework for a leadership process model that addresses several antecedents to attainment of leadership status, enacted behaviors once leadership is attained, and, finally, evaluation of those behaviors. This framework will provide context for a discussion of ways that leadership attainment, behavior and evaluation differ between men and women.

Figure 1: Leadership Process Model

Antecedents of Leadership Attainment

Three internal barriers to leadership emergence, a well-studied antecedent to leader attainment, include likelihood to claim leadership, general attitude toward leadership (Epitropaki, 2018; Waldman, Galvin, & Walumbwa, 2013) and likelihood to display leader characteristics, such as behavioral participation in leadership roles (Mullen, Salas, & Driskell, 1989). These barriers can be different between men and women in several instances. First, women are less likely to attempt to claim leadership or self-identify in measures of leader emergence (Epitropaki, 2018; Kent & Moss, 1994). A potential leaders' attitude towards leadership and their

leadership experience were both demonstrated to be potential barriers to leader emergence (Kolb, 1997). Second, women were less likely to display participatory behaviors, like maintaining an active voice in interactions, which prompts others to assume someone is well-suited to the leader role (Badura, Grijalva, Newman, Yan, & Jeon, 2018; MacLaren et al., 2020; McClean et al., 2018). Finally, male leaders may also hold women to a higher performance standard to maintain or advance an advantageous power dynamic which could lead to women opting-out of leadership development opportunities (Bear, Cushenbery, London, & Sherman, 2017).

One explanation for the lack of women in upper leadership positions is that perhaps women do not desire leadership positions. Media reports indicate that there is a trend of "opting out," whereby women pursue other priorities at the expense of career growth (Kuperberg & Stone, 2008). Two explanations are that women may not identify with a leadership role or may not want to pursue a leadership position, constructs defined as identification with leadership or motivation to lead, respectively.

Leader salience is the process through which individuals internalize and personalize meanings behind a leadership role. If leadership does not fit with one's own perceptions of themselves, they may not step up to a leadership role should one become available (Ramarajan, 2014). Self-identification has been identified as a precursor to the desire for an individual to pursue a leadership position (Hoyt, 2005). Three ways that someone might come to identify with the leadership role include: having a role model that the individual identifies with in a leadership role; past leadership experience or high leader self-efficacy; or the leadership role fitting within the individual's own self-construction of what a leader should be. In all of these pathways to leader salience, women have a demonstrated disadvantage (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Felfe & Schyns, 2014; Sealy & Singh, 2010).

Research question (RQ) 1: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of leader self-efficacy?

Motivation to lead (MTL) is characterized by a person's desire to be in charge and enjoy leadership, as well as a sense of duty to lead or to overlook the personal risk of engaging in leadership (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). High MTL has been shown to not only predict future career ambitions, but to also predict leadership emergence (Felfe & Schyns, 2014), however, women were demonstrated to have a lower motivation to lead than men in a research study that spanned five decades (Powell & Butterfield, 2022), supporting the "opting out" hypothesis and suggesting that women's desire to lead has not improved over time.

One explanation for women's lower MTL is that women have different job attribute preferences or work values. Men are more likely than women to prefer jobs with higher earnings, promotions, freedom, challenge, leadership and power, while women were more likely to pursue jobs high in interpersonal attributes such as helping others, better hours or a shorter commute (Konrad, Ritchie Jr, Lieb, & Corrigall, 2000). There are also gendered differences in work values – with men more highly valuing extrinsic rewards, associated with higher leadership aspirations – and women more highly valuing security and intrinsic rewards, associated with lower leadership aspirations (Lechner, Sortheix, Obschonka, & Salmela-Aro, 2018). These preferences are strongly shaped by the traditional family structure, which allows men to rely on the unpaid labor of their spouses (Becker, 1985).

RQ2: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of motivation to lead?

Leadership emergence research has been defined as identifying "the factors associated with someone being perceived as leader-like" (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Studies of leadership emergence have important implications for the role of gender in leadership selection,

because in these studies the emergent leaders are neither elected nor appointed but instead receive their recognition as a result of their social interactions (Kolb, 1997). The study of leadership emergence continues to grow as organizations place greater importance on a team orientation, with team leaders being provided more opportunities to display their capabilities, and potentially move from these unofficial roles into official, hierarchical roles in leadership (Bettenhausen, 1991).

Leadership emergence research has demonstrated that men will emerge as leaders more frequently than even dominant women (Badura et al., 2018; Alice H Eagly & Karau, 1991; Kent & Moss, 1994; Ritter & Yoder, 2004), while other studies have indicated that differences in leadership emergence are either small (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 1991) or more tied to gender role than biological sex (Kolb, 1997). Theory indicates that this is driven by two processes: an internal barrier whereby women are reluctant to initiate leadership behaviors and an external barrier whereby group members do not accept leadership behaviors when initiated by a woman, due to the perceived role incongruity between their gender role and the leader role (O'Leary, 1974; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984). Through the lens of signaling theory, women choose not to signal leadership behaviors or potential, and group members may not accept these signals when they do. These processes create a feedback loop between sender and receiver that continually reinforces gendered prescriptions and descriptions (Ridgeway, 2011).

RQ3: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of leader emergence?

Leadership in groups emerges when characteristics of the potential leader align with follower/group member prototypes of group ideals, which provides the emergent leader with influence (Meuser et al., 2016). This implies that the individual's actual behaviors and the group's evaluations of those behaviors inform the decision process regarding who has the ability

to become a leader (Ridgeway, 2001b). It appears that in this process possessing masculine characteristics puts potential leaders at an advantage over those with more feminine characteristics (Fagenson, 1990).

Consistent with status characteristics theory, individuals with a higher salient status, such as gender, will receive more opportunities to make contributions to a group task, receive higher evaluation for contributions they make, and have higher influence within the group (Carli & Eagly, 1999). Further, group members with lower perceived status will also have less legitimacy within the group to act as a group leader (Ridgeway & Berger, 1986). Consistent with social role theory, men may be more likely to emerge as leaders because a more direct, autocratic style, consistent with the leader stereotype is also considered to be a masculine trait (Carli & Eagly, 1999).

Significant differences have been shown in likelihood for leadership emergence depending on the task type, with women more likely to emerge as a leader if the task is judged to be feminine or communal, such as planning a group lunch versus if the task type is judged to be masculine, such as investing an inheritance, suggesting that women have to be perceived as subject-matter experts to emerge as leaders (Alice H Eagly & Karau, 1991; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984).

Finally, women displaying more androgynous characteristics in one study were able to emerge as leaders, suggesting that feminine characteristics do not necessarily preclude a women attaining a leadership position, as long as she also displays masculine characteristics (Kent & Moss, 1994). In a recent study with same-sex dyads, only women who tempered their agency with communion were likely to emerge as leaders (Schock, Gruber, Scherndl, & Ortner, 2019).

In spite of the proliferation of literature regarding gender and leadership, many critical studies have indicated that most differences in leader behaviors are context dependent, rather than solely predicted by leader or follower gender (Alice H Eagly, 2005; Alice H Eagly & Carli, 2003a) and that the leader behaviors themselves may be influenced by how the leader chooses to enact leadership.

Leadership Styles Introduction

A significant body of literature has attempted to answer the question if men and women have different leadership styles or are the perceived differences the effects of bias (Maher, 1997). Several studies have indicated that there are not as many differences in leadership styles as stereotypes suggest (Alice H Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011), and many differences can be attributed to a failure to control for actual vs. perceived behavior (Bartol, 1978) and consensus among observers of behaviors due to shared stereotypes of the observers (Schmitt & Hill, 1977). Behaviors can be defined as "the internally coordinated responses (actions or inactions) of whole living organisms (individuals or groups) to internal and/or external stimuli, excluding responses more easily understood as developmental changes" (Levitis, Lidicker Jr, & Freund, 2009). Further, leadership research has failed to meet the conditions necessary to make causal claims (Antonakis, Bendahan, Jacquart, & Lalive, 2010).

The study of leadership styles and gender is further complicated due to the proliferation of leadership theories and methodological issues. First, a recent network analysis indicated that leadership theory integration is in its infancy, and the integration of theories related to leadership and gender has possibly not occurred at all (Meuser et al., 2016) with an additional critique that there is little to no gender specific theoretical development (Calás & Smircich, 1999). Second, many studies also conflate follower evaluation with actual leader behaviors, which can be

problematic in studies of gender and leadership where bias has been so thoroughly documented (Stock, 2020; Van Quaquebeke & Felps, 2018). Third, most research conducted attempts to capture broader concepts, such as "inspirational" rather than concrete behavioral acts, which prevents researchers from fully understanding organizational dynamics (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2016). Finally, because of the proliferation of theories, construct redundancy is an ongoing concern (Banks, Gooty, Ross, Williams, & Harrington, 2018).

In the next section, I will provide an overview of the most popular contemporary leadership styles, including transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, charismatic, authentic, servant and ethical leadership.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership has become one of the most dominant leadership paradigms in the organizational sciences and has been extensively studied over the last forty years (Dinh et al., 2014; Mhatre & Riggio, 2014). Transformational leadership is grounded in the perspective of how a leader meets the needs of their followers and has four dimensions: *idealized influence*, historically conflated with charisma, through which the leader encourages followers to identify with him or her (Bono & Judge, 2004; Stock, 2020); *inspirational motivation*, which is the degree to which a leader has an inspiring vision for followers (Banks, McCauley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016); *intellectual stimulation*, which involves encouraging risk-taking and growth; and finally, *individual consideration*, whereby a leader attempts to meet the needs of individual followers (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). This definition has been criticized because two of these four dimensions overlap with charismatic leadership and common definitions include tautologies (Stock, Banks, Voss, Tonidandel, & Woznyj, 2022).

Transformational leadership behaviors have been further redefined as "leader signaling through developmental and prosocial behaviors tailored for each unique stakeholder (e.g., person, dyad, group, organization" (Stock et al., 2022). Avolio summed up transformational leadership by explaining that "leaders develop followers into leaders in a morally uplifting way" (Avolio, 1999). Transformational leadership styles align with contemporary organizations desire to become "less hierarchical, more flexible, team-oriented, and participative" (Fondas, 1997). Transformational leadership has been accepted as a model of contemporary good managerial practice and has a positive relationship with leader effectiveness (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), employee performance, and organizational level outcomes (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999).

A significant body of research exists on gender differences in transformational leadership. According to the gender-centered perspective of leadership, men are more likely to adopt a masculine style of leadership, characterized by task-orientation and dominance and women are more likely to adopt a feminine style of leadership, characterized by caring and nurturance, described as a "feminized" style of management, which may be more consistent with a transformational leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 1992; Carless, 1998; Druskat, 1994). Leader-self ratings and superior ratings tend to rate women more highly on interpersonal aspects of transformational leadership (Carless, 1998; Rosener, 1990). In a meta-analysis, women exceeded men on three transformational scales: idealized influence, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration, with individualized consideration having the most significant difference, leading researchers to coin the phrase "think transformational leadership, think female" (Alice H Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Stempel et al., 2015).

While women are more likely to exhibit and be evaluated as having transformational leadership behaviors, workplace outcomes may still be perceived as better when the same

behaviors are enacted by men (Prentice & Carranza, 2004). For example, there is a significant, positive relationship between transformational leadership and innovative work behavior, however, employees reported more innovative leadership when the behavior was enacted by a man (Reuvers, Van Engen, Vinkenburg, & Wilson-Evered, 2008). Women also have difficulty establishing the legitimacy required to demonstrate intellectual stimulation, so this behavior can inspire backlash (Haslett, Geis, & Carter, 1992). Inspirational motivation is more important for promotion of a man while individualized consideration is more important for promotion of a woman. However in studies, leadership does not seem to value individualized consideration as much as other factors (Vinkenburg et al., 2011). Finally, research indicates that follower's work satisfaction is only impacted by a transformational leadership style when the leader is a man (Wolfram & Mohr, 2010).

Recent studies attempt to understand the impacts of an androgynous leadership style, which allows for using the best, most appropriate leadership styles of both men and women, believing that "transformational leadership requires a gender balance rather than the traditional leadership stereotype of masculinity" (Hackman, Hills, Furniss, & Paterson, 1992). In a study measuring androgyny, masculinity and femininity, androgyny was more closely related to transformational leadership, however, women paid a higher penalty for not being perceived as androgynous, defined in the study as blending femininity and masculinity (Kark, Waismel-Manor, & Shamir, 2012).

RQ4: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of transformational leader behavior?

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership styles are rooted in give-and-take relationships that appeal to a subordinate's self-interest (Kark & Eagly, 2010). Transactional leadership occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines the follower depending on the follower's behavior or performance, (Avolio et al., 1999; J. Martin, 2015). Transactional leadership has two dimensions: contingent rewards, where acceptable employee behavior is rewarded; and management-by-exception, characterized as either active or passive. Active management-by-exception is demonstrated by correcting behaviors and passive management-by-exception is demonstrated through not taking action until something goes wrong (Bass, 1990). Transactional leadership and transformational leadership are often defined dichotomously, however, many scholars believe that successful transactional leadership forms the groundwork from which transformational leadership emerges (Melody De Cara, 2000). Most leaders engage in both leadership behaviors, but in differing amounts (Bass, 1985). A primary differentiation between the two styles is that in transactional leadership there is no long-term vision that forms the relationship between leader and follower (Maher, 1997).

While men are assumed to display more transactional behaviors, and self-rate as more transactional, women actually exceed men on the transactional attribute of contingent reward (Alice H Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Rosener, 1990). However, women tend to employ the style more typical of their male colleagues in male-dominated hierarchies (Kark & Eagly, 2010). Women may also feel pressure to adjust their style to a more socially acceptable leadership style, such as transformational leadership (Alice H Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001) and that by not engaging in a transactional leadership style, women may be able to avoid social role violations through not giving a "masculine impression" through hierarchical control and agentic leader behavior (Yoder, 2001).

RQ5: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of transactional leader behavior?

Laissez-Faire Leadership (LFL)

Laissez-faire leadership (LFL) is defined as a general failure to take responsibility for managing (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), is the most inactive leadership style, and the most ineffective, marked by a general failure to make decisions or use authority, exhibiting frequent absence and lack of involvement during critical junctures (Bass & Riggio, 2006). LFL, by definition is characterized by a lack of "care" or "consideration," typically communal traits (Stempel et al., 2015). Through the lens of signaling theory, LFL could be described as lacking signaling behaviors that would indicate leadership. LFL is unique among the other leadership constructs because rather than describing behaviors, it instead describes a lack of leadership actions (Norris, Ghahremani, & Lemoine, 2021). Many scholars have disregarded LFL as the "inaction of poor managers disinterested in their followers," however, some research indicates that laissez-faire leadership may be a more complex phenomenon, with LFL behaviors potentially being confused with delegation, usually perceived to be a positive behavior. This study further demonstrates significant gender differences in how absence of leadership versus delegation is perceived depending upon subordinate gender and the perceived competence of their manager (Norris et al., 2021).

In meta-analysis, men exceeded women in scales related to LFL, suggesting that men may have greater ability to remain in leadership roles, in spite of poor performance (Alice H Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Interestingly, female subordinates were more likely to rate both male and female leaders as lower on the LFL scale (Bass et al., 1996).

RQ6: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of laissez-faire leader behavior?

Charismatic Leadership

While charismatic leadership has suffered from a lack of clarity in its definition, it has been defined most recently as "values-based, symbolic, and emotion-laden leader signaling" (Antonakis, Bastardoz, Jacquart, & Shamir, 2016). Charismatic leadership, therefore, is a relational process between the leader and their subordinates, characterized by personalization, intimacy, and mutual trust (Takala & Aaltio, 2004). Following an extensive examination of the definitions of charismatic leadership, three components of charismatic leadership were ultimately identified: Justifying a mission by appealing to values and engaging in emotional displays; communicating in symbolic ways to create a clear and vivid message; and demonstrating conviction and passion for the mission (Antonakis et al., 2016). Meta-analysis indicates that these components of charismatic leadership do predict outcomes of interest, including task performance, citizenship behaviors, and group or organization performance, but no gender differences were demonstrated in this study (Banks et al., 2017).

Charismatic leadership tactics (CLTs) are a collection of verbal and nonverbal behaviors that can be both trained and observed, and can be considered to be signals to followers. Twelve validated behaviors include: metaphors, stories or anecdotes, moral conviction, sentiment of the collective, setting high expectations, creating confidence regarding goal achievement, contracts, lists, rhetorical questions, body gestures, facial expressions and using an animated voice tone (Antonakis, Fenley, & Liechti, 2011; Ernst et al., 2022). Two studies on virtual charismatic leadership behavior and charismatic signaling in social media settings demonstrated no gender

differences in ability to effectively use CLTs (Ernst et al., 2022; Tur, Harstad, & Antonakis, 2021).

There is a positive relationship between charisma and femininity (Hackman et al., 1992), and leaders with greater social and emotional ability are more likely to display charismatic leadership behaviors (Groves, 2005). In an early study, women were found to exhibit more charismatic leader behaviors (Groves, 2005), however the definition used for charismatic leadership is not consistent with the generally accepted definition today. Some elements of charismatic leadership may not be compatible with female gender norms, which value modesty in women over self-promotion and assertiveness, which can hinder women when executive leadership is conflated with charismatic qualities, especially at the CEO level (Martell et al., 1998).

Some feminist authors believe charisma is a gendered concept because of its historical focus on individuality and autonomy (Takala & Aaltio, 2004), but this is inconsistent with the definition used today. Further feminist critique indicates that the word charismatic may itself relate to the masculine heroic notion, making it impossible to consider the behaviors of women as demonstrating positive charisma, however, current definitions that are based on values-based signaling may not have this limitation (Calàs, 2019).

RQ7: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of charismatic leader behavior?

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership emphasizes wisdom, emotional healing, and altruistic values that put other's interests before one's own, stewardship of the leader's legacy and purposeful contributions to society (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018). Servant leadership was

operationalized and measured through the Servant Leadership Questionnaire, which measures servant leader behavior on five dimensions: altruistic calling (positive intent to put aside self-interest to benefit followers), emotional healing (ability to provide emotional support following failure), wisdom (operationalized as the combination of knowledge and utility), persuasive mapping (ability to map issues, conceptualize possibilities and articulate those opportunities), and organizational stewardship (focus on community outside of the organization) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). In servant leadership, people take priority over issues, aligning organizational issues with human needs (Mayer, Bardes, & Piccolo, 2008; Reinke, 2004). In a meta-analysis of servant leadership outcomes, servant leadership was found to positively impact job performance and job-related employee attitudes, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust (Kiker, Callahan, & Kiker, 2019).

Servant leadership has been characterized as a feminine leadership behavior due to its focus on nurturing followers (Barbuto & Gifford, 2010), not by performing menial tasks, but by facilitating their personal and professional growth to support organizational goals (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Specifically, the dimensions of servant leadership defined as communal, include altruistic calling, emotional healing, and organizational stewardship (Barbuto & Gifford, 2010). In a study examining communal leadership, expectations for servant leader behavior for women were greater for a female leader versus a male leader and female raters expected more servant leader behaviors than male raters (Hogue, 2016). In another study that deconstructed the Servant Leadership Questionnaire into communal and agentic properties, no differences were found between men and women in their ability to employ these attributes (Barbuto & Gifford, 2010). However, it was demonstrated in other research that women were more likely to adopt a servant leadership style (Rodriguez-Rubio & Kiser, 2013). When considering workplace

outcomes, research indicates that in teams with higher feminine role composition, servant leadership has greater effects on prosocial motivation, follower servant leadership and performance (Lemoine & Blum, 2021).

Feminist scholars believe that servant leadership may be an avenue to overturn the hierarchical power structures that subordinate female leaders, associating serving with female gender roles and leadership with male gender roles (Reynolds, 2014). Similar to the perspective of transformational leadership scholars, servant leadership has been identified as a style that could allow female leaders to inhabit both their leader and gender roles authentically (Scicluna Lehrke & Sowden, 2017). Similarly, women portraying the role of servant leader may be able to rise to positions of influence without perceived role violations or gatekeeping by male colleagues (Duff, 2013). Feminist critiques of the theory pose servant and leader as gender-laden terms that continue to restrict the study of leadership to dichotomous terms, requiring a "perceived gendered choice" (Eicher-Catt, 2005).

RQ8: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of servant leader behavior?

Ethical Leadership

The demand for a theory of ethical leadership has increased in the wake of corporate scandals such as Enron, Wells Fargo and Volkswagen. Ethical leaders are seen to be honest, trustworthy, fair and principled decision-makers, and encourage ethical behaviors in their followers (Trevino, Hartman, & Brown, 2000). Ethical leadership theory has been criticized in the literature, however, because it conflates follower evaluations with actual leader behaviors and also is unclear in how ethical leadership impacts organizational outcomes, so an alternative definition has been proposed defining ethical leadership behavior as "signaling behavior by the

leader targeted at stakeholders comprising the enactment of prosocial values combined with expression of moral emotions" (Banks, Fischer, Gooty, & Stock, 2021).

Research regarding gender and ethical leadership is inconclusive, with some studies indicating that there is no difference in gendered expectations for ethical behavior (Goswami, Agrawal, & Goswami, 2020), and other indicating that women are more principled (Forte, 2004), more ethical (Ho, Li, Tam, & Zhang, 2015), more likely to exercise self-regulation (Politis, 2016), and more likely to question unethical practices (Jones & Gautschi, 1988). Ethical behavior also seems to have a greater impact on the organizational commitment of female employees, compared to their male colleagues (Karakuş, 2018) and varying gendered responses to displays of unethical behavior such that unethical male leaders are likely to stay in positions of power whereas female leaders are likely to be removed from leadership (Pandey, DeHart-Davis, Pandey, & Ahlawat, 2022).

RQ9: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of ethical leader behavior?

Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership places a high value on leaders behaving in accordance with who they are, with common definitions focusing on self-awareness (understanding one's goals, emotions and abilities), relational transparency (showing one's authentic self to others), balanced processing (objectively evaluated all information), and internalized moral perspective (self-regulation) (Banks et al., 2016; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). Other core elements of authentic leadership include positive self-development, transparency in decision making, seeking others' perspectives, and self-regulatory behaviors (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Authentic leadership studies have found positive relationships between authentic leadership and outcomes such as trust in leadership (Hunt, Gardner, & Fischer, 2008), follower

job performance (Wang, Van Iddekinge, Zhang, & Bishoff, 2019), leader and follower well-being (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005), supervisor satisfaction (Walumbwa et al., 2008), and organizational citizenship and commitment (Cottrill, Lopez, & Hoffman, 2014; Jensen & Luthans, 2006).

In research on authentic leadership and gender, female leaders had increased authentic leader perceptions, both overall and on four dimensions of authentic leadership, including self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing (Braun, Peus, & Frey, 2018). Research on positive work climate, psychological capital and authentic leadership suggested that the ways that male versus female followers interpret authentic leadership behaviors may be different (Woolley, Caza, & Levy, 2011). Authentic leadership entails not only acting in accordance with your values, but also having the organizational legitimacy that would enable a leader to promote those skills on behalf of the organization, which has been demonstrated to be more challenging for female than male leaders (Alice H Eagly, 2005).

Feminist interpretations of authentic leadership suggest that it is not gender neutral and is especially challenging for women. Authenticity is difficult in a work environment that places women in the "double bind" of their gender role paired with the conflicting leader role, organizations themselves are gendered and reward male behavior, and finally authentic leadership is self-focused rather than others-focused, a hallmark of female communality (Hopkins & O'Neil, 2015). In a study of four autobiographies, it was also concluded that embracing the female gender role was critical for these women to be considered "authentic" (Kapasi, Sang, & Sitko, 2016). Further research suggests that authenticity itself is something a

leader performs or signals and that this authenticity is tied to representing the gender norm expected within their context (Liu, Cutcher, & Grant, 2015).

RQ10: To what extent do men and women differ in evaluations of authentic leader behavior?

Leadership Styles Summary

A significant body of research has accumulated reviewing leadership styles, including attributes such as if there is a gendered difference in preference of style, association with that style, actual leadership style behaviors, and difference in leadership outcomes based on a leader's usage of an individual style. In spite of the research volume, it is difficult to answer questions such as do men or women have a leadership style advantage or are men or women are more effective as leaders for several reasons. First, in the case of newer leadership style theories, such as servant, authentic, and ethical leadership, lack of clarity regarding definitions of the leadership styles and their subsequent measurements has stymied efforts to create an integrated body of knowledge and accumulate data regarding gender. Second, the research indicates that the answers to these questions are heavily context dependent, depending upon factors such as the degree to which the organization is male-dominated (Alice H Eagly & Johnson, 1990), the gender make-up of the leader-subordinate dyad (Becker, Ayman, & Korabik, 2002), and the generational make-up of the organization and leader-subordinate pairs (Murray & Chua, 2014). Finally, the research suggests that in many cases leadership style is not being interpreted through the lens of actual behaviors, but rather a subordinate or superior's subjective interpretation of those behaviors, which have been demonstrated to be highly gendered based on role expectations by both gender and leader stereotypes (Koburtay et al., 2019).

Gender, Evaluations, and Actual Leader Behavior

The final stage of the leadership process model we will consider is follower evaluation, which has been demonstrated to be both unstable and conflate actual leader behaviors with perceptions of those behaviors, meaning that the same behaviors may be evaluated differently when enacted by a man versus a woman (Banks, Woznyj, et al., 2021; Butterfield & Bartol, 1977). Research suggests that variation in behavior ratings could be due to three primary factors: activation of gender stereotypes, subordinate gender, and the gendered nature of the task/role being evaluated.

Deaux and Major presented an early model of the impact of gender stereotypes on behavior, finding that when gender stereotypes are activated, perceivers of those behaviors also act in accordance with those stereotypes, so in the case of leader ratings, subordinates may be rating their male and female leaders according to gender stereotypes (Deaux & Major, 1987). Even when a leadership style is perceived as effective, it may not be evaluated the same. Evaluations of a leader vary more when the follower's gender is considered along with the leader's gender and leadership style (Hogue, 2016). Gender bias has been demonstrated in the evaluation of performance in task-oriented groups, with group members having the perspective that men are more competent and women must perform better to be perceived as equally competent (Foschi, 2000). Further, male leaders have been demonstrated to receive "extra credit" from their subordinates when they display behaviors like verbal consideration, whereas for women, it is expected behavior (Mohr & Wolfram, 2008).

Follower evaluation has also been demonstrated to follow the rules of the "double bind" whereby women who display stereotypically masculine qualities are less respected and admired by subordinates in reviews (Vial, Napier, & Brescoll, 2016), and held more personally accountable in the event of a failure (Lopez & Ensari, 2014). Further, women who display high

levels of physical attractiveness are evaluated as lower in trust and loyalty ratings when displaying a transformational leadership style (Braun, Peus, & Frey, 2012). Also, female leaders are penalized more in evaluations for displays of anger or sadness, than their male counterparts (Lewis, 2000).

Subordinate gender also impacts perceived relational quality with supervisors, as men and women were demonstrated to interpret and value different dimensions of the Leader-Member exchange theory, impacting how employees rated their leaders (Collins, Burrus, & Meyer, 2014). In one study, it was demonstrated that the relationship between a leader's self-report on transformational leadership and their subordinate's evaluation of their performance was less positive for female leaders with male subordinates than female leaders with female subordinates. If the leader was male, results regardless of gender of subordinate were similar (Ayman, Korabik, & Morris, 2009). Further, female subordinates are more likely to rate their leaders as more transformational and less abusive than male followers (Wang et al., 2019). In the case of negative reviews or subordinate discipline, female leaders tended to be perceived as both less fair and less effective than their male counterparts (Atwater, Carey, & Waldman, 2001). Masculine individuals expect more masculinity from their leaders (Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008). A recently proposed gender projection model theorizes that people are more likely to identify their own gender with a leadership prototype, but only when it benefits their ingroup, with men projecting masculine characteristics, but only when that leadership role is not at risk due to a failing company or a token role, providing partial explanation for the "glass cliff" phenomenon (Carrel, Gabarrot, Joerg, & Édith, 2022; Ryan & Haslam, 2005). In male-dominated teams, male leaders were rated to be more prototypical, however, in more gender-

balanced teams, this advantage was eliminated (Gloor, Morf, Paustian-Underdahl, & Backes-Gellner, 2020).

Finally, task and organization type has been shown to impact leader evaluations. Women tend to face a greater disadvantage when evaluated in roles perceived to be more masculine (Alice H Eagly & Carli, 2003a; Alice H Eagly et al., 1992) or more male-dominated (Alice H Eagly et al., 1995). Women are less likely to be recalled or acknowledged in leadership positions because it has been shown the counter-stereotypical information is more difficult to recall and the stereotype for leadership is male (Bordalo, Coffman, Gennaioli, & Shleifer, 2016).

While the gendered effects of follower evaluations have been demonstrated in the research for the last five decades, recent research suggests that the "good manager" stereotype has transitioned from being masculine to being more androgynous, perhaps reducing the barriers to women for positive follower evaluation (Powell et al., 2021).

RQ11: To what extent are gender and leadership studying actual behavior rather than evaluations of behaviors?

Personality and Follower Evaluation

Personality has also been demonstrated to be a predictor of follower evaluations of leader behavior (Bono & Judge, 2004; Shahzad et al., 2020). When considering personality as a predictor of follower evaluation, there are three important considerations. First, there are differences between men and women in their scores on select aspects of the Big Five Personality traits, for example women score higher on agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism than men. While extraversion is the strongest predictor of leader emergence out of the Big Five personality traits, emotional stability and agreeableness tend to be the least important (Carli & Eagly, 2011; Alice Hendrickson Eagly, Carli, & Carli, 2007). Second,

personality scores merely indicate that there are differences between men and women on average, not that an individual man or woman can't be stronger than that average or cannot enact those behaviors in a leadership context (Shahzad et al., 2020). Third, consistent with previously reviewed gender theories, as with many behaviors, these behaviors may be perceived by followers differently if that behavior is enacted by a man compared to a woman (Ridgeway, 2011). For example, while women tend to score higher on scores of emotional stability, this trait tends to be a stronger predictor of leader emergence in men than women (Neubert & Taggar, 2004).

RQ12: What is the relative importance of leader gender compared to Big Five personality traits in predicting follower evaluations of leader behavior?

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Systematic Search

A second-order meta-analysis was conducted consistent with past standards (Banks et al., 2018; Oh, 2020; Woznjy et al., in press). A systematic search was performed for published and unpublished meta-analyses about leadership, which included the terms "meta-analysis," "meta," "leadership," "lead" "gender," "men and women," "follower evaluation," or "performance evaluation," in either the title or the abstract. It should be noted that there is a normative and/or literal requirement in the social and natural sciences (e.g., the American Psychological Association) to include "meta-analysis" in the title and abstract of all publications that are in fact meta-analyses. ABI Inform source types included Dissertation and Theses, Scholarly Journals, Trade Journals and Working Papers. Google Scholar search was sorted by relevance with no time constraints, with the first 150 returned results examined. Following this initial search, other

meta-analyses were added to the database through forward and background references searches on the retrieved articles. A supplemental search was conducted for gender, Big Five personality traits, and the leadership styles previously mentioned. These supplemental searches were needed to fully populate the meta-analytic correlation matrix.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

Studies included in analysis were required to be a meta-analysis, and any primary studies were excluded from consideration. Each of the studies considered had to include quantitative data, including a correlation matrix for gender and one of the leader variables under consideration, including transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, charismatic, servant, authentic, or ethical leadership or leadership emergence, motivation to lead, identification with leadership, and follower evaluation.

Coding Process

Meta-analyses which examined any of the following dimensions of the leadership process were coded: Identification with Leadership; Motivation to Lead; Leadership Emergence; Transformational Leadership; Authentic Leadership; Transactional Leadership; Laissez-Faire Leadership; Servant Leadership; Ethical Leadership; Charismatic Leadership; and Follower Evaluation.

Analysis

Comparison of bivariate correlations. To test the research questions listed in the literature review, a meta-analytic correlation matrix was conducted, following guidance from Landis (Landis, 2013). These matrices were populated with meta-analytic estimates with large sample sizes, in order to reduce random sampling error (Borenstein, Cooper, Hedges, &

Valentine, 2009; Schmidt, 2015). The goal was to create a meta-analytic correlation matrix among the seven leadership behaviors and pre-cursors to leadership (including motivation to lead, leader salience, and identification with leadership, follower evaluation, and evaluation of followers).

When an estimate was included from multiple meta-analyses, I included the estimate with the larger sample size, to reduce random sampling error (Borenstein et al., 2009; Schmidt, 2015). Meta-analytic correlations were not combined due to potential overlapping samples across meta-analyses, consistent with prior research (Woznyj, Banks, Whelpley, Batchelor, & Bosco, 2022).

Relative weights analysis

Additional analyses were conducted to determine the relative importance of gender over and above other known predictors of leader outcomes, specifically, personality. The use of relative weights has become a widely adopted and accepted technique in meta-analytic studies to identify patterns of dominance among correlated predictor variables (Banks et al., 2016; LeBreton, Hargis, Griepentrog, Oswald, & Ployhart, 2007). In this analysis, I used the epsilon weight technique, where the resulting weights were summed to R^2 and then compared using ratios (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011).

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

In this section, I review the findings of this analysis. First, I review the meta-analytic procedures used to build the meta-analytic correlation matrix between gender, personality and each leadership construct. Second, I provide a review of each of the research questions that were introduced in Chapter Two of this dissertation. Third, I draw a comparison between these results and the relationship between Big 5 personality traits (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability). Finally, I conducted a relative weights analysis to provide an understanding of the relative importance of gender and personality when predicting relationships with leadership constructs.

Meta-Analytic Procedures

To test research questions 1-10, I created a meta-analytic correlation matrix (Landis, 2013), populating the table with meta-analytic estimates from prior meta-analysis. If two meta-analyses existed for a single construct, I selected the meta-analytic estimate with the largest sample size, to avoid random sampling error. Estimates were not combined from multiple meta-analyses to avoid duplication of primary studies. The final meta-analytic correlation matrix included 89 meta-analytic estimates (total k=1404; total n=366,329).

After coding the meta-analyses, there were relationships for which I was unable to identify an existing meta-analysis (3% of the desired study relationships). Specifically, these relationships were between gender, servant leadership, ethical leadership and authentic leadership. To fill in this missing data, I complemented my systematic search with an exploration of primary study findings, with studies identified from an existing meta-analysis of servant leadership, ethical leadership and authentic leadership (Hoch et al., 2018). These primary studies

were evaluated to determine if their correlation tables included gender. Any study that did not include gender was excluded. Additional meta-analytic procedures were used to analyze the primary samples identified in order to allow for the correction of measurement error (Schmidt, 2015).

In order to test the potential of moderating variables, for the primary studies, I calculated 80% credibility intervals using the corrected effect size estimate. This analysis provided evidence that within these leadership constructs, moderating variables are likely to be present.

Test of Research Questions 1 to 3 – Precursors to leader evaluations

I began my analysis by reviewing research results related to research questions 1-3, which were focused on the relationship between gender and pre-cursors to leader evaluations, including leader salience, motivation to lead and leader emergence. The full correlation matrix can be found in Table Two. Leader salience was not included in any existing meta-analysis, so for the purposes of this analysis, the construct leader self-efficacy was evaluated, a construct closely related to leader salience (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). No meta-analysis included a composite score for Motivation to Lead, so this construct was evaluated by looking at its components – affective identify, social normative, and non-calculative motivation to lead.

The strongest relationships in precursors to leadership were Non-Calculative Motivation to Lead (ρ=-0.09, k=23, n=6,319) and leader emergence (ρ=0.09, k=136, n=19,073), with women being associated with higher Non-Calculative Motivation to Lead and men being associated with higher leader emergence. Non-Calculative Motivation to Lead is a measure that indicates likelihood that someone will weigh the related pros and cons of becoming a leader, which may be more consistent with the idea that women do not self-associate with the leader role

Table Two: Meta-Analytic Correlation Matrix

		1	2	3	4	5	6
		Gender	**Openness**	**Conscientiousness**	**Extraversion**	**Agreeableness**	**Emotional Stability**
1	**Gender**	--					
2	**Openness**	ρ=0.03 (*k* =1; *n* =17,637)[a]	--				
3	**Conscientiousness**	ρ=-0.07 (*k* =1; *n* =17,637)[a]	ρ=-0.06 (*k* =338; *n* =356,680)[b]	--			
4	**Extraversion**	ρ=-0.06 (*k* =1; *n* =17,637)[a]	ρ=0.17 (*k* =418; *n* =252,004)[b]	ρ=0.00 (*k* =632; *n* =683,001)[b]	--		
5	**Agreeableness**	ρ=-0.09 (*k* =1; *n* =17,637)[a]	ρ=0.11 (*k* =236; *n* =144,205)[b]	ρ=0.27 (*k* =344; *n* =162,975)[b]	ρ=0.17 (*k* =243; *n* =135,529)[b]	--	
6	**Emotional Stability**	ρ=0.22 (*k* =1; *n* =17,637)[a]	ρ=0.16 (*k* =423; *n* =254,937)[b]	ρ=0.26 (*k* =587; *n* =490,296)[b]	ρ=0.19 (*k* =710; *n* =440,440)[b]	ρ=0.25 (*k* =561; *n* =415,679)[b]	--
7	**Leader Self-Efficacy**	ρ=0.07 (*k* =31; *n* =9,167)[c]	ρ=0.41 (*k* =17; *n* =7,233)[c]	ρ=0.34 (*k* =22; *n* =8,322)[c]	ρ=0.46 (*k* =23; *n* =8,475)[c]	ρ=0.27 (*k* =19; *n* =7,269)[c]	ρ=0.32 (*k* =21; *n* =7,973)[c]
8	**Motivation to Lead - Affective Identity**	ρ=0.05 (*k* =43; *n* =13,070)[c]	ρ=0.36 (*k* =26; *n* =8,799)[c]	ρ=0.31 (*k* =30; *n* =9,493)[c]	ρ=0.57 (*k* =32; *n* =10,049)[c]	ρ=0.11 (*k* =27; *n* =8,695)[c]	ρ=0.24 (*k* =28; *n* =9,435)[c]
9	**Motivation to Lead - Social Normative**	ρ=0.06 (*k* =43; *n* =8,836)[c]	ρ=0.25 (*k* =19; *n* =5,807)[c]	ρ=0.31 (*k* =21; *n* =5,930)[c]	ρ=0.41 (*k* =23; *n* =6,486)[c]	ρ=0.28 (*k* =20; *n* =5,734)[c]	ρ=0.20 (*k* =20; *n* =5,374)[c]
10	**Motivation to Lead - Non-Calculative**	ρ=-0.09 (*k* =23; *n* =6,319)[c]	ρ=0.15 (*k* =20; *n* =6,564)[c]	ρ=0.27 (*k* =22; *n* =6,687)[c]	ρ=0.20 (*k* =0.20; *n* =7,243)[c]	ρ=0.35 (*k* =20; *n* =6,360)[c]	ρ=0.23 (*k* =20; *n* =6,629)[c]
11	**Leader Emergence**	ρ=0.09 (*k* =136; *n* =19,073)[c]	ρ=0.24 (*k* =20; *n* =NR)[d]	ρ=0.33 (*k* =20; *n* =NR)[d]	ρ=0.33 (*k* =37; *n* =NR)[d]	ρ=0.05 (*k* =23; *n* =NR)[d]	ρ=0.24 (*k* =30; *n* =NR)[d]
12	**Transactional Leadership**	ρ=0.11 (*k* =7; *n* =NR)[e]					
13	Contingent Reward	--	ρ=0.03 (*k* =6; *n* =1,469)[f]	ρ=0.02 (*k* =6; *n* =1,469)[f]	ρ=0.14 (*k* =5; *n* =1,215)[f]	ρ=0.17 (*k* =7; *n* =1,622)[f]	ρ=0.10 (*k* =7; *n* =1,532)[f]
14	Management by Exception - Active	--	ρ=-0.04 (*k* =6; *n* =1,469)[f]	ρ=-0.02 (*k* =6; *n* =1,469)[f]	ρ=-0.03 (*k* =5; *n* =1,215)[f]	ρ=-0.11 (*k* =6; *n* =1,469)[f]	ρ=-0.02 (*k* =7; *n* =1,532)[f]
15	**Transformational Leadership**	ρ=-0.05 (*k* =44; *n* =29,770)[g]	ρ=0.15 (*k* =19; *n* =3,887)[f]	ρ=0.13 (*k* =18; *n* =3,516)[f]	ρ=0.24 (*k* =20; *n* =3,692)[f]	ρ=0.14 (*k* =20; *n* =3,692)[f]	ρ=0.17 (*k* =18; *n* =3,380)[f]
16	**Laissez-Faire Leadership**	ρ=0.16 (*k* =16; *n* =NR)[g]	--	--	--	--	--
17	*Passive Leadership**	--	ρ=0.04 (*k* =7; *n* =1,564)[f]	ρ=-0.11 (*k* =7; *n* =1,564)[f]	ρ=-0.09 (*k* =6; *n* =1,310)[f]	ρ=-0.12 (*k* =7; *n* =1,564)[f]	ρ=-0.05 (*k* =8; *n* =1,627)[f]
	Charismatic Leadership						
18	Idealized Influence (Attribution)	ρ=-0.07 (*k* =14; *n* =12,565)[h]	ρ=0.14 (*k* =4; *n* =596)[h]	ρ=0.13 (*k* =4; *n* =596)[h]	*p* =0.13 (*k* =5; *n* =744)[h]	ρ=0.15 (*k* =4; *n* =596)[h]	ρ=0.08 (*k* =5; *n* =744)[h]
19	Idealized Influence (Behavior)	ρ=-0.02 (*k* =15; *n* =12,995)[h]	ρ=0.10 (*k* =3; *n* =543)[h]	ρ=0.15 (*k* =3; *n* =543)[h]	ρ=0.11 (*k* =4; *n* =691)[h]	ρ=0.16 (*k* =3; *n* =543)[h]	ρ=0.06 (*k* =4; *n* =691)[h]
20	Inspirational Motivation/Vision	ρ=-0.02 (*k* =26; *n* =22,802)[h]	ρ=0.16 (*k* =11; *n* =1,993[h]	ρ=0.06 (*k* =9; *n* =1,760)[h]	ρ=0.25 (*k* =10; *n* =1,908)[h]	ρ=0.15 (*k* =10; *n* =1,863)[h]	ρ=0.14 (*k* =11; *n* =2,038)[h]
21	**Servant Leadership**	ρ=-0.0544 (*k* =6; *n* =1,562)[i]	ρ=0.653 (*k* =9; *n* =694)[j]	ρ=0.567 (*k* =12; *n* =894)[j]	ρ=0.317 (*k* =9; *n* =910)[j]	ρ=0.592 (*k* =13; *n* =1,236)[j]	ρ=-0.133 (*k* =6; *n* =793)[j]
22	**Ethical Leadership**	ρ=0.152 (*k* =29; *n* =7,398)[i]	ρ=0.058 (*k* =5; *n* =1,458)[j]	ρ=0.353 (*k* =9; *n* =1,939)[j]	ρ=0.123 (*k* =5; *n* =1,458)[j]	ρ=0.383 (*k* =9; *n* =2,066)[j]	ρ=0.208 (*k* =6; *n* =691)[j]
23	**Authentic Leadership**	ρ=0.0594 (*k* =11; *n* =2,985)[i]	ρ=0.411 (*k* =3; *n* =537)[j]	ρ=0.496 (*k* =3; *n* =537)[j]	ρ=0.452 (*k* =3; *n* =537)[j]	ρ=0.408 (*k* =3; *n* =537)[j]	ρ=0.351 (*k* =4; *n* =837)[j]

Notes: Alphabetical letters after the effect sizes denote the source of the data listed in Appendix II; negative correlations for gender indicate stronger relationship with women.

and thus, may consider entering into leadership more deeply. The remaining relationships between leadership and pre-cursors to leadership included: Leader Self-Efficacy (ρ=0.07; *k*=31; *n*=9,167); Motivation to Lead-Affective Identity (ρ=0.05; *k*=43; *n*=13,070); and, finally, Motivation to Lead – Social Normative (ρ=0.06; *k*=43; *n*=13,070).

Test of Research Questions 4-11 – Leader Behaviors

Research questions 4-9 measured the magnitude of the relationship between gender and each of seven leadership constructs: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, charismatic leadership, servant leadership, ethical leadership and authentic leadership. Transformational leadership had a stronger relationship (ρ=-0.05; *k*=44; *n*=29,770) with women leaders, however the relationship was relatively small, demonstrating that this construct may not lend itself to the idea "Think Transformational, Think Female". Transactional leadership (ρ =0.11; *k*=7; *n*=NR); and laissez-faire leadership (ρ =0.16; *k*=16; *n*=NR) demonstrated stronger relationships with gender, favoring men, which is consistent with prior research.

Four emerging leadership constructs were also reviewed: charismatic leadership, servant leadership, ethical leadership and authentic leadership. The existing meta-analysis on charismatic leadership did not provide a composite correlation between gender and charismatic leadership, so it was reviewed as a function of its components – idealized influence-attribution, idealized influence-behavior, and inspirational motivation/vision. Servant leadership, ethical leadership and authentic leadership did not have existing meta-analyses that addressed correlations with gender, so a primary study exploration was conducted to complete this part of the correlation matrix. Correlations between charismatic leadership components and gender indicated a weak

relationship: idealized influence-attribution (ρ =-0.07; *k*=14; *n*=12,565); idealized influence-behavior (ρ =-.02; *k*=15; *n*=12,995); and inspirational motivation/vision (ρ =-0.02; *k*=26; *n*=22,802), with all evaluations slightly favoring women. Servant leadership (ρ =-0.0544; *k*=6; *n*=1,562) and authentic leadership (ρ =.0594; *k*=11; *n*=2,985) primary studies resulted in nearly identical results, indicating a weak relationship between gender and follower evaluation of these constructs. Ethical leadership (ρ =0.152; *k*=29; *n*=7,398) showed a stronger relationship between gender and follower evaluation, favoring men.

A primary focus of this study has been understanding the degree to which leadership studies are attempting to understand actual leader behaviors. In the meta-analyses used in this study, only motivation to lead and leader-self-efficacy used self-report data, all remaining meta-analyses used follower evaluation. The primary studies that were used for the exploration of authentic, servant and ethical leadership were 100% measured using follower evaluation. Prior research indicates that follower evaluation is subject to bias as it is measuring the followers' perceptions of those constructs, rather than actual behaviors (Banks, Woznyj, et al., 2021).

Test of Research Question 12 - Personality

In order to understand relative importance of personality compared to gender, the components of the Big 5 Personality traits were also included in the meta-analytic correlation matrix. Depending on the source, some meta-analyses included neuroticism in the Big 5 personality traits, while others included emotional stability. Where neuroticism was included, I reversed the sign to make consistent with the emotional stability measure. For the construct of transactional leadership, no composite score was provided in existing meta-analysis, so the correlation between transactional leadership and personality is shown through its component measures – contingent reward and management by exception – active. Laissez-faire leadership

was measured as a function of the construct passive leadership. Similar to the treatment of transactional leadership, charismatic leadership is shown as a function of its components.

The correlations between personality and each of the leadership constructs suggests that the strength of the relationship between personality and leadership is stronger than gender, with the strongest relationships in the following constructs: Motivation to Lead-Affective Identity and Extraversion (ρ =0.57; *k*=32; *n*=10,049); Servant Leadership and Openness (ρ =0.065; *k*=9; *n*=694); Servant Leadership and Conscientiousness (ρ =0.592; *k*=12; *n*=894); and Servant Leadership and Agreeableness (ρ =0.592; *k*=13; *n*=1,236).

Relative Weights Analysis

Using the data from the meta-analytic correlation table, I conducted a relative weights analysis in order to determine if gender or personality attributes explained the most variance in follower evaluation for each of the constructs. Relative weights analysis is a method used to partition explained variance among multiple predictors to understand the role each of the predictors plays in a regression equation (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011).

For many of the constructs, extraversion was the most dominant predictor, including leader efficacy (34.92% of R^2 = 0.4767), motivation to lead – affective identity (39.61% of R^2 = 0.4232), motivation to lead – social normative (42.86% of R^2 = 0.3307), transformational leadership (45.16% of R^2 = 0.0991), inspirational motivation (54.22% of R^2 = 0.0911). Conscientiousness was the most dominant predictor for leader emergence (42.68% of r^2= 0.1602), idealized influence – behavior (34.91% of R^2= 0.0534), and authentic leadership (33.22% of R^2= 0.6317). Agreeableness was the most dominant predictor of motivation to lead – non-calculative (39.85% of R^2= 0.2008) and ethical leadership (42.5% of R^2= 0.2609). Openness

was the most dominant predictor for idealized influence – attribution (27.33% of R^2= 0.0601) and servant leadership (34.53% of R^2= 1.2487).

Gender was not the dominant predictor for any of the leadership constructs, with relative weights for each of the attributes as follows: leader self-efficacy (1.48% of R^2= 0.4767); motivation to lead – affective identity (0.98% of R^2= 0.4232); motivation to lead – social normative (2.22% of R^2= 0.0.3307); motivation to lead – non-calculative (3.7% of R^2= 0.2008); leader emergence (4.69% of R^2= 0.1602); transformational leadership (2.9% of R^2= 0.0991); idealized influence – attribution (6.65% of R^2= 0.0601); idealized influence – behavior (0.26% of R^2= 0.0534); inspirational motivation (0.61% of R^2= 0.0911); servant leadership (0.37% of R^2= 1.287); ethical leadership (11.57% of R^2= 0.2609); and authentic leadership (1.18% of R^2= 0.6317).

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Theoretical Contributions

While there has been an ever-increasing body of literature related to leadership behaviors and subsequent calls for research to help identify pathways to increase the number of women in leadership positions, there has been very little integration of theory that allows for a clear roadmap for future research and improvements in practice. This study provided five theoretical contributions to the literature.

First, in order to address the proliferation of theory, in this review, I presented a framework of gender and leadership through the lens of signaling theory and status characteristics theory. To form the foundation of this framework, I introduced a leadership process model that demonstrates the constructs that precede entry to leadership such as leader salience/leader self-efficacy, motivation to lead, leader emergence. This process model concludes with leader behavior and subsequent follower evaluation. Gender theory was then layered onto this leadership framework in order to demonstrate how gender impacts ability and interest to attain leadership and then, subsequently, be evaluated positively as a leader. Signaling theory and status characteristics theory served as a critical lens to demonstrate how gender bias is perpetuated in leadership. Gender is a status characteristic that culturally implies a certain fit or misfit for positions of leadership. Because women attempting to attain certain leadership positions are aware of these cultural perceptions of gender, consistent with signaling theory, they will adapt their behaviors to influence the way that they are perceived – in some cases attempting to act more agentic or communal, depending on the audience. Receivers of these signals may

then interpret these signals through the lens of their bias, influencing follower evaluation of the women's actual leader behaviors.

The second theoretical contribution of this dissertation is that it offers a primer on gender and leadership, with relevant theoretical definitions and the role of leadership constructs in gender theory. This primer offers an overview of the antecedents and outcomes of leadership attainment, including leader salience, motivation to lead, leader emergence and follower evaluation. It also offers an overview of leader styles/behaviors, including transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, charismatic leadership, servant leadership, ethical leadership, authentic leadership. Gender theories reviewed include: theory of gendered organizations, status characteristics/expectation states theory, social role and role congruity theory, shifting criterion theory, and backlash effects and the double bind. Gender studies and leadership studies are often considered as two separate disciplines and this dissertation serves as an entry point for scholars to begin to have a conversation about gender and leadership through the lens of each. Meta-analytic results indicate relatively small levels of variation in follower evaluations of leader behaviors, however, statistical data related to women's ascent into leadership positions suggests that cultural expectations related to gender are still impacting these outcomes, whether through the amplification of bias as women climb the ladder or through other structural attributes of the workforce, including occupational segregation of labor and unequal caregiving responsibilities of women.

Third, this dissertation includes a second order meta-analysis examining the reviewed leadership constructs, gender and Big Five personality traits. Because no extant meta-analysis for gender and servant, ethical and authentic leadership existed, a primary exploration was conducted on these constructs. Next, a relative weights analysis was conducted to understand the

dominant predictors of follower evaluation when considering the Big 5 personality traits and gender. Finally, this dissertation offers an exploration and interpretation of these results. Through this meta-analysis, it was demonstrated that there are differences in follower evaluation of leader behaviors across a variety of constructs, ranging from pathways to leadership attainment to evaluation of leadership behaviors. In only four instances does this variance favor women: motivation to lead – non-calculative, transformational leadership, idealized influence – attribution and servant leadership. The subsequent relative weights analysis demonstrated that gender was not the dominant predictor for any of the key constructs when compared to personality, but it is important to note that follower interpretation of various personality traits may vary depending on leader-follower gender combinations, as is the case with leader voice (Ernst et al., 2022).

Fourth, this dissertation synthesizes the literature and develops a future research agenda based on the findings of the leadership exploration and meta-analyses to advance the field of gender and leadership studies. In many ways, this dissertation offers more questions than it does answers. In most cases, men and women are getting very similar evaluations across the studied leadership constructs, however, there remains a gap in leadership outcomes such as leadership attainment. Offered research recommendations are focused on a few primary research outcomes. First, shifting the focus in leadership research to specific behaviors in order to provide actionable insight to practitioners to help support women who hope to attain a leadership position. Second, to understand the role of moderators such as follower gender, leader gender and occupational context. In most cases, research does not currently identify both the follower gender and leader gender in survey results, which creates ambiguity in results. Third, I recommend the development of a framework for how leader signaling behaviors are modified by gender – either

due to anticipation of backlash or through actual backlash. Finally, perceptions of women leaders have remained stable over time, in spite of increased funding and interest in driving workplace equality. My finally research recommendation is to develop theory as why gender bias continues to persist in spite of shifting workplace values and company investment.

Finally, this dissertation further amplifies a methodological gap in the literature related to the degree to which leadership research is measuring actual behaviors versus follower evaluations of the behaviors, which may be subject to bias. I provided complementary evidence to several recent studies that show that actual behaviors are not currently being studied (Banks, Fischer, et al., 2021; Banks, Woznyj, et al., 2021; Fischer, Hambrick, Sajons, & Van Quaquebeke, 2020) . In this study, the only data presented that was not based on evaluation were meta-analysis related to leader self-efficacy and motivation to lead, both of which are self-report data.

Practical Implications

This dissertation has four primary implications for practitioners who want to improve the likelihood of advancement for women into leadership positions. First, it provides a framework for practitioners to understand the phases of leadership development and how they are impacted by gender. Prior to leadership attainment, women are less likely to perceive themselves as having leadership potential and may be less motivated to lead. Following leadership attainment, bias in follower evaluations may prevent women from being perceived as strong leaders and fail to advance in their careers.

Second, this dissertation illuminates the need for leadership training to be modified to help men and women leaders understand when different behaviors may need to be used to fit the

context. Women leaders are more likely to experience backlash for agentic behavior, which in a man could be perceived as being a strong leader, which subsequently impacts follower evaluation. Learning how to flex different behaviors situationally can help reduce the impacts of bias in the workplace. A pending question in the literature asks if certain leadership styles (ex: servant, authentic, transformational) were more effectively used by men or women, however, research indicates that this is not the case, and that in different contexts there is a need for varying approaches. Follower gender, leader gender and occupational context were all moderators that should be considered.

Third, this paper builds on prior research to demonstrate that follower evaluation is subject to bias because in many cases what is being measured is the perception of leader behaviors rather than the actual behaviors that are being performed. This paper, however, largely demonstrates that followers are evaluating men and women similarly for most leadership constructs. This has significant implications for how performance evaluations should be used when considering potential leaders for advancement, as research indicates that these evaluations may not tell the entire story when it comes to leadership potential and attainment.

Finally, from a social standpoint, this paper also suggests that more work needs to be done regarding structural inequalities that continue to drive inequality in the workplace. Further research needs to be done to study leader behaviors, but also the structural inequalities that drive poor penetration of women in leadership positions, including things like occupational segregation of labor, which women being placed into less hierarchical occupations, and unequal caregiving responsibilities that primarily negatively impact women.

This dissertation brings to light that largely, men and women are getting similar evaluations across leadership constructs, however, there are some outstanding questions that

have been raised through the current research that will support efforts by practitioners to create impactful avenues, such as training, for women to attain and retain leadership positions. First, further evaluation is needed to understand what actual behaviors men and women enact to that lead to similar evaluations and to what degree are these behaviors similar or different. Second, further research is needed as to which moderators should be studied and acknowledged both in theory and in practice. For instance, should women or men modify their behaviors if an occupation is heavily sex-segregated? Or if the industry is sex-segregated? Finally, further research is required to determine the degree to which even the small bias demonstrated in this study impacts long term outcomes creates real differences in advantage for women.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This research has several limitations that warrant discussion. First, this second-order meta-analysis fails to address gender roles outside of the gender binary. Most studies with gender as a moderating variable include only the male and female gender role. Some studies further this research by attempting to understand evaluation impacts of androgynous leader behaviors – which are defined as enacting both masculine and feminine behaviors (Powell et al., 2021). Because research to understand how non-binary gender roles affects leadership behavior and evaluation is still emerging, no meta-analyses were found for inclusion in this study.

Second, the results of this research are based on meta-analytic estimates and results are bound by those data and the inherent limitations that come with them. There are five limitations that warrant discussion. First, inclusion and exclusion criteria review authors used to select the studies could bias the estimates. Several of the meta-analyses reviewed are heavily weighted to United States or European samples, which have a high gender egalitarianism, which could

decrease evidence of bias. Further, the included meta-analyses needed to include gender as a moderator, which eliminated a substantial number of meta-analyses from consideration. Second, in many cases, I was unable to collect information such as study artifacts, measurement details or various demographic factors that could be used as moderating variables, outside of the variable of interest, gender. Primary examples of moderators of interest include occupational context, age, and race. Such information could be used to help explain focal relationships better, as research results have been demonstrated to vary under different conditions and under different circumstances. For instance, research results may vary in a male vs. female dominated industry or under conditions of a struggling versus a high-performing company. Third, different scales were used for measurement of some of the focal constructs. Several of the emerging leadership constructs, where key definitions and measurement criteria are still under academic discussion are particularly subject to this limitation. For instance, ethical leadership and moral leadership are both used in meta-analyses, with ethical leadership being the focus in western culture and moral leadership being the focus in eastern culture. Different scales were also used within and between these measures. Further research indicates that the number of scale points used in Likert scales can impact the degree to which gender bias impacts results, with a recent study indicating that shifting scales from a 10-point rating to a 6-point rating reduced gender bias in results (Rivera & Tilcsik, 2019). Fourth, in much of the research it was difficult to determine if the research was conducted in a lab or field study, which has been shown to impact results related to gender. Finally, through this research we are unable to determine causal relationships – gender and personality are exogenous variables. As more moderators, outcomes and antecedents are identified, further research will need to be conducted to address this concern, particularly regarding the iterative modification and interpretation of gendered leader signals.

A third limitation of this research is that contextual moderating variables should be identified in future research, including variables such as cultural gender egalitarianism and occupational gender segregation in measured samples. For instance, it has been demonstrated that bias against women is amplified in male-dominated occupations and industries. Also, a more thorough understanding of the gender composition of leader-follower dyads, and the level of the studied leader could also support research understanding. Gender concordance, an emerging field of gender research, has been demonstrated to impact patient outcomes, with women more likely to survive heart attacks when attended by a female physician (Greenwood, Carnahan, & Huang, 2018). Extending this research into the study of leadership outcomes could provide insight on the role of mentorship and female leadership on advancement. Finally, a more thorough study of the intersectionality of gender, age and race could aid in understanding the interactions of the focal constructs.

A final limitation of this research is that it cannot fully explain how leader signaling impacts evaluations of women leaders and subsequent outcomes. Results of this meta-analysis indicated relative parity in performance evaluations for men and women, however, in practice, men and women are not at parity in pay, opportunities for promotion or incentives, such as bonuses and pay increases. Men and women could be using different behaviors and be evaluated the same. Two scenarios that warrant further research include: men and women do enact the same behaviors and are evaluated the same or women do more of certain behaviors and still receive the same outcomes. Further, research should attempt to understand the selection effects behind continued advancement of women. Recent research suggests that these selection effects create a scenario whereby only highly competent women advance, but these same selection effects do not prohibit less competent men from advancing, resulting in a higher level of

variation in talent for men than women in the upper echelons (Besley, Folke, Persson, & Rickne, 2017).

Roadmap for Future Research

A final contribution of this dissertation is to translate the results of this study into actionable research directions to further extend the field of gender and leadership. The future research directions I offer are intended to help further define the conditions under which gender impacts the ascent of women into leadership positions. To accomplish this, I identify four main takeaways from my results, identify relevant research questions related to these results, and offer the expected theoretical contribution from each of these recommendations, summarized in Table 3.

Table Three: Agenda for Future Research on Gender and Leadership

Key Finding	Sample Research Question	Theoretical Consequence
Recommendation #1: Shift focus in gender and leadership studies to research on specific behaviors to understand the impact of actual behaviors on leadership outcomes.		
Few, if any, research studies measured impacts of actual leader behaviors, but rather, measured follower evaluations of those behaviors, which are subject to bias.	How does leader gender impact follower evaluation of actual behaviors associated with leadership styles such as servant, ethical, etc.	Supports the identification of specific behaviors that can help women improve women's associations with leadership and behaviors that are subject to increased bias in follower evaluation.
Recommendation #2: Clarify the relationships between follower gender, leader gender, and occupational context.		
Follower gender, leader gender, and occupational context have been identified as moderators of follower evaluation, but no integrated framework has been presented to summarize these relationships.	How do follower gender, leader gender and occupational context impact follower evaluation of leader emergence and leader behaviors?	Clarifies the patterns of relationships among follower gender, leader gender and occupational context.
Recommendation #3: Develop a framework for understanding the interplay between leader signaling, interpretation of those signals, and leader beliefs regarding signal interpretation, through the lens of gender.		
Leader signaling is a dynamic process heavily influenced by gender dynamics in the workplace, with women leaders anticipating signal interpretation and modifying their behaviors to fit those expectations.	How and under what conditions do leaders modify their behaviors to fit context and expectations of follower evaluations?	Extends signaling theory and status characteristics theory to increase understanding of leader modifications of behavior based on organizational context and expectations for follower signal interpretation.
Recommendation #4: Develop theory related to the stability of perceptions of women leaders, when research suggests that communal characteristics are increasing in demand in the workplace.		
Research has demonstrated that communal characteristics are in higher demand in the workplace, however, perceptions of women leaders have remained stable over time	How and under what conditions does increased workplace importance placed on communal characteristics improve perceptions of women in the workplace?	Identifies boundary conditions of shifting workplace values' impacts on gender bias in follower evaluation.

Recommendation #1: Shift focus in gender and leadership studies to research on specific behaviors to understand the impact of actual behaviors on leadership outcomes.

The first proposed recommendation is to shift focus in gender and leadership studies to focus on specific actual behaviors. Prior research indicates that relatively few studies measure actual behaviors as opposed to follower evaluations of those behaviors (Banks, Woznyj, et al., 2021). Outside of self-report studies related to motivation to lead and leader self-efficacy, most of the leadership constructs measured as part of this study are measured through follower perceptions of those behaviors, which have been demonstrated to be subject to bias (Hoyt & Burnette, 2013; Neschen & Hügelschäfer, 2021). This is particularly important to understand as small amounts of bias have been demonstrated through simulation to increase disparities in hiring in upper leadership. The practical implication of this research extension is that it will provide a framework for women leaders to understand which actual behaviors will drive positive follower evaluation and leader perceptions.

Recommendation #2: Clarify the relationships between follower gender, leader gender, and occupational context.

The second recommendation is to clarify the relationships between follower gender, leader gender and occupational context. Leadership studies indicate that follower and leader gender dyad composition can lead to variation in follower evaluations (Wang et al., 2019) and that occupational context is a significant predictor for gender-based bias (Maume Jr, 1999). Extending the literature to present a framework for how follower gender, leader gender and occupational context interact will help support future research studies on leadership attainment and follower evaluation through the presentation of a more holistic view of how dyad gender and occupational context influence bias and inequality in the workplace.

Recommendation #3: Develop a framework for understanding the interplay between leader signaling, interpretation of those signals, and leader beliefs regarding signal interpretation, through the lens of gender.

The third recommendation of this research roadmap is to develop a framework that extends signaling theory and status characteristics theory to increase understanding of leader modifications of behavior based on organizational context and expectations for follower signal interpretation. Leader signaling is a dynamic process heavily influenced by gender, with women leaders anticipating signal interpretation and modifying their behaviors to fit those expectations in order to avoid backlash and be viewed as an appropriate fit to the leadership role (Rudman & Phelan, 2008). Extant leadership research has leaned into follower evaluations of leader behaviors, but very little research has attempted to understand how leaders make a choice to enact authentic behaviors or modify their behavior to account for potential workplace bias.

This framework will further clarify key relationships between gender and leadership theory that impact women's ability to enact authentic behaviors in the workplace and further define how signaling is impacted by perceived bias. More focused research on the role of gendered organizations could support this research. This theory indicates that women are less likely to be promoted because organizations are structured to more highly value working more than fifty hours per week, consistent with an ideal worker norm, which is inconsistent in many cases with the typically female caregiving role.

Recommendation #4: Extend theory related to the stability of perceptions of women leaders, when research suggests that communal characteristics are increasing in demand in the workplace.

Research has suggested that modern leadership constructs such as transformational, servant, ethical and authentic leadership styles may lend themselves more to the communal characteristics more closely associated with women (Kapasi et al., 2016; Stempel et al., 2015), however, perceptions of the appropriateness of women in leadership positions have remained relatively stable over the last few decades (Kolb, 1997). This lends itself to the research question regarding why women are not being perceived more favorably as workplace values have evolved. The literature could benefit from an exploration of how shifting workplace values shift the importance of attributes in identifying appropriate leaders and subsequent evaluation of those leaders.

Conclusion

Concerns about the continued poor ascent of women into upper leadership positions have continued to grow, particularly in light of shifts in workplace models as a result of Covid-19. While there is a proliferation of research on leadership behaviors and gender theory related to leadership, the volume of literature available and conflicting results makes it difficult for researchers to answer a basic question - “When and how does gender matter when considering leadership attainment and follower evaluation of leader behaviors?” The current second-order meta-analysis presents a comprehensive view of the current landscape of gender and leadership relationships and suggests that bias, while small, exists across most of the major measures of leadership. Further analysis indicated that gender was a relatively poor predictor of evaluations of leaders, especially when compared with the Big 5 personality traits. This is problematic because while bias is small in this study, the substantial difference in leadership outcomes for men versus women suggests that substantial structural inequalities are still driving disadvantage for women.

This suggests that significant gaps in the literature need to be filled in order to more fully explain continued gender bias in the workplace that impacts women's ability to attain and retain leadership positions, through further exploration of moderators of gender and leadership outcomes, a better understanding of actual behaviors that should be enacted to support leadership perceptions, and new frameworks for understanding leadership signaling.

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs and Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139-158. doi:10.1177/089124390004002002

Acker, J. (2012). Gendered organizations and intersectionality: Problems and possibilities. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 215.

Amanatullah, E. T., & Morris, M. W. (2010). Negotiating gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women's fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 98*(2), 256.

Antonakis, J., Bastardoz, N., Jacquart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift.

Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., & Lalive, R. (2010). On making causal claims: A review and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(6), 1086-1120.

Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2011). Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*(3), 374-396.

Appelbaum, S. H., Audet, L., & Miller, J. C. (2003). Gender and leadership? Leadership and gender? A journey through the landscape of theories. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

Archer, A. M., & Kam, C. D. (2022). She is the chair (man): Gender, language, and leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 101610.

Atwater, L. E., Brett, J. F., Waldman, D., DiMare, L., & Hayden, M. V. (2004). Men's and women's perceptions of the gender typing of management subroles. *Sex Roles, 50*(3), 191-199.

Atwater, L. E., Carey, J. A., & Waldman, D. A. (2001). Gender and discipline in the workplace: Wait until your father gets home. *Journal of Management, 27*(5), 537-561.

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*: Sage.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 72*(4), 441-462.

Ayman, R., Korabik, K., & Morris, S. (2009). Is transformational leadership always perceived as effective? Male subordinates' devaluation of female transformational leaders 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(4), 852-879.

Badura, K. L., Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Yan, T. T., & Jeon, G. (2018). Gender and leadership emergence: A meta-analysis and explanatory model. *Personnel Psychology, 71*(3), 335-367.

Banks, G. C., Engemann, K. N., Williams, C. E., Gooty, J., McCauley, K. D., & Medaugh, M. R. (2017). A meta-analytic review and future research agenda of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*(4), 508-529.

Banks, G. C., Fischer, T., Gooty, J., & Stock, G. (2021). Ethical leadership: Mapping the terrain for concept cleanup and a future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly, 32*(2), 101471.

Banks, G. C., Gooty, J., Ross, R. L., Williams, C. E., & Harrington, N. T. (2018). Construct redundancy in leader behaviors: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly, 29*(1), 236-251.

Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(4), 634-652.

Banks, G. C., Woznyj, H. M., & Mansfield, C. A. (2021). Where is "behavior" in organizational behavior? A call for a revolution in leadership research and beyond. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 101581.

Barbuto, J. E., & Gifford, G. T. (2010). Examining gender differences of servant leadership: An analysis of the agentic and communal properties of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Leadership Education, 9*(2), 4-21.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300-326.

Bartol, K. M. (1978). The sex structuring of organizations: A search for possible causes. *Academy of Management Review, 3*(4), 805-815.

Bass. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*: Collier Macmillan.

Bass. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31.

Bass, Avolio, & Atwater. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied psychology, 45*(1), 5-34.

Bass, & Avolio, B. (1992). *The transformational and transactional leadership behavior of management women and men as described by the men and women who directly report to them.* Paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Montreal, Canada.

Bass, & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*: Psychology press.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied psychology, 45*(1), 5-34.

Bauer, N. M. (2019). Shifting Standards: How Voters Evaluate the Qualifications of Female and Male Candidates. *The Journal of Politics, 82*(1), 1-12. doi:10.1086/705817

Bear, J. B., Cushenbery, L., London, M., & Sherman, G. D. (2017). Performance feedback, power retention, and the gender gap in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*(6), 721-740.

Bechtoldt, M. N., Bannier, C. E., & Rock, B. (2019). The glass cliff myth?–Evidence from Germany and the UK. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(3), 273-297.

Becker. (1985). Human Capital, Effort, and the Sexual Division of Labor. *Journal of Labor Economics, 3*(1, Part 2), S33-S58. doi:10.1086/298075

Becker, Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2002). Discrepancies in self/subordinates' perceptions of leadership behavior: Leader's gender, organizational context, and leader's self-monitoring. *Group & Organization Management, 27*(2), 226-244.

Begeny, C. T., Wong, C. E., Kirby, T. A., & Rink, F. (2021). Gender, race, and leadership. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Psychology*.

Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch Jr, M. (1972). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 241-255.

Bernardi, R. A., & Threadgill, V. H. (2011). Women directors and corporate social responsibility. *EJBO: Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organizational Studies*.

Bernerth, J. B., Cole, M. S., Taylor, E. C., & Walker, H. J. (2018). Control variables in leadership research: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Management, 44*(1), 131-160.

Besley, T., Folke, O., Persson, T., & Rickne, J. (2017). Gender quotas and the crisis of the mediocre man: Theory and evidence from Sweden. *American Economic Review, 107*(8), 2204-2242.

Bettenhausen, K. L. (1991). Five years of groups research: What we have learned and what needs to be addressed. *Journal of Management, 17*(2), 345-381.

Biernat, M., & Fuegen, K. (2001). Shifting standards and the evaluation of competence: Complexity in gender-based judgment and decision making. *Journal of social issues, 57*(4), 707-724.

Biernat, M., & Kobrynowicz, D. (1997). Gender-and race-based standards of competence: lower minimum standards but higher ability standards for devalued groups. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 72*(3), 544.

Biernat, M., Manis, M., & Nelson, T. E. (1991). Stereotypes and standards of judgment. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 60*(4), 485.

Biernat, M., & Thompson, E. R. (2002). Shifting standards and contextual variation in stereotyping. *European review of social psychology, 12*(1), 103-137.

Bilimoria, D., & Liang, X. (2013). State of knowledge about the workforce participation, equity, and inclusion of women in academic science and engineering. *Women, Science, and Technology*, 21-50.

Bird, B., & Brush, C. (2002). A gendered perspective on organizational creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26*(3), 41-65.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901.

Bordalo, P., Coffman, K., Gennaioli, N., & Shleifer, A. (2016). Stereotypes. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131*(4), 1753-1794.

Borenstein, M., Cooper, H., Hedges, L., & Valentine, J. (2009). Effect sizes for continuous data. *The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis, 2*, 221-235.

Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 103*(1), 84-103.

Braun, S., Peus, C., & Frey, D. (2012). Is beauty beastly? Gender-specific effects of leader attractiveness and leadership style on followers' trust and loyalty. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 220*(2), 98.

Braun, S., Peus, C., & Frey, D. (2018). Connectionism in action: Exploring the links between leader prototypes, leader gender, and perceptions of authentic leadership. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 149*, 129-144.

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological science, 19*(3), 268-275.

Britton, D. M. (2000). The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization. *Gender & Society, 14*(3), 418-434. doi:10.1177/089124300014003004

Britton, D. M., & Logan, L. (2008). Gendered organizations: Progress and prospects. *Sociology Compass, 2*(1), 107-121.

Brown, D. J. (2018). In the minds of followers: Follower-centric approaches to leadership.

Butterfield, D., & Bartol, K. (1977). Evaluators of leader behavior: A missing element in leadership theory. In JG Hunt & LL Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge.

Calàs, M. B. (2019). Deconstructing charismatic leadership: Re-reading Weber from the darker side. In *Postmodern Management Theory* (pp. 353-376): Routledge.

Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1999). From the 'woman's point of view': Feminist approaches to organization studies. *Studying organization: Theory and method, 212*, 251.

Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (2009). Feminist perspectives on gender in organizational research: What is and is yet to be. *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods*, 246-269.

Carless, S. A. (1998). Gender Differences in Transformational Leadership: An Examination of Superior, Leader, and Subordinate Perspectives. *Sex Roles, 39*(11), 887-902. doi:10.1023/A:1018880706172

Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender effects on social influence and emergent leadership.

Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (2011). Gender and leadership. *The Sage handbook of leadership*, 103-117.

Carrel, T., Gabarrot, F., Joerg, D., & Édith, S.-W. (2022). Gender Projection Model: A New Motivational Approach of Women Under-representation in Organizations.

Cellar, D. F., Sidle, S., Goudy, K., & O'brien, D. (2001). Effects of leader style, leader sex, and subordinate personality on leader evaluations and future subordinate motivation. *Journal of business and psychology, 16*(1), 61-72.

Chan, K.-Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 481.

Collins, B. J., Burrus, C. J., & Meyer, R. D. (2014). Gender differences in the impact of leadership styles on subordinate embeddedness and job satisfaction. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(4), 660-671.

Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management, 37*(1), 39-67.

Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 81*(2), 322.

Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J., & Pascale, L. (1975). When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 11*(6), 520-530.

Cottrill, K., Lopez, P. D., & Hoffman, C. C. (2014). How authentic leadership and inclusion benefit organizations. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*.

Cuddy, Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2004). When Professionals Become Mothers, Warmth Doesn't Cut the Ice. *Journal of social issues, 60*(4), 701-718. doi:10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00381.x

Cuddy, Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 40*, 61-149.

Daly, M., Egan, M., & O'Reilly, F. (2015). Childhood general cognitive ability predicts leadership role occupancy across life: Evidence from 17,000 cohort study participants. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(3), 323-341.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological review, 94*(3), 369.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1990). A social-psychological model of gender. *Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference*, 89-99.

Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N. E., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 7-52.

Diekman, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(10), 1171-1188.

Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 36-62.

Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *The Leadership Quarterly, 5*(2), 99-119.

Duff, A. J. (2013). Performance management coaching: Servant leadership and gender implications. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Engen, V. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological bulletin, 129*(4), 569.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). Reporting sex differences.

Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 459-474.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003a). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 807-834.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003b). Finding gender advantage and disadvantage: Systematic research integration is the solution. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 851-859.

Eagly, A. H., Carli, L. L., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders* (Vol. 11): Harvard Business School Press Boston, MA.

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of social issues, 57*(4), 781-797.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 108*(2), 233.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 60*(5), 685.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological review, 109*(3), 573.

Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 117*(1), 125.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 111*(1), 3.

Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2011). Social role theory. *Handbook of theories in social psychology, 2*, 458-476.

Eicher-Catt, D. (2005). The myth of servant-leadership: A feminist perspective. *Women and language, 28*(1), 17.

Elprana, G., Felfe, J., Stiehl, S., & Gatzka, M. (2015). Exploring the sex difference in affective motivation to lead. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*.

Ely, R. J. (1995). The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(3), 589-634.

Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*(3), 474-493.

Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Theories of gender in organizations: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in organizational Behavior, 22*, 103-151.

Ensari, N., Riggio, R. E., Christian, J., & Carslaw, G. (2011). Who emerges as a leader? Meta-analyses of individual differences as predictors of leadership emergence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(4), 532-536.

Epitropaki, O. (2018). Self-selection bias in leadership. *What's Wrong With Leadership?: Improving Leadership Research and Practice*.

Ernst, Banks, G. C., Loignon, A. C., Frear, K. A., Williams, C. E., Arciniega, L. M., . . . Subramanian, D. (2022). Virtual charismatic leadership and signaling theory: A prospective meta-analysis in five countries. *The Leadership Quarterly, 33*(5), 101541. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101541

Fagenson, E. A. (1990). Perceived masculine and feminine attributes examined as a function of individuals' sex and level in the organizational power hierarchy: A test of four theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(2), 204.

Felfe, J., & Schyns, B. (2014). Romance of leadership and motivation to lead. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

Fischer, T., Hambrick, D. C., Sajons, G. B., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2020). Beyond the ritualized use of questionnaires: Toward a science of actual behaviors and psychological states. *The Leadership Quarterly, 31*(4), 101449.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in cognitive sciences, 11*(2), 77-83.

Fondas, N. (1997). Feminization unveiled: Management qualities in contemporary writings. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(1), 257-282.

Forte, A. (2004). Business ethics: A study of the moral reasoning of selected business managers and the influence of organizational ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics, 51*(2), 167-173.

Foschi, M. (2000). Double standards for competence: Theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21-42.

Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55*(1), 51-61.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 343-372.

Gherardi, S. (1995). *Gender, symbolism and organizational cultures*: Sage.

Gilbert, G. R., Collins, R. W., & Brenner, R. (1990). Age and leadership effectiveness: From the perceptions of the follower. *Human Resource Management, 29*(2), 187-196.

Gloor, J. L., Morf, M., Paustian-Underdahl, S., & Backes-Gellner, U. (2020). Fix the game, not the dame: Restoring equity in leadership evaluations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 161*(3), 497-511.

Goswami, M., Agrawal, R. K., & Goswami, A. K. (2020). Ethical leadership in organizations: evidence from the field. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*.

Greenwood, B. N., Carnahan, S., & Huang, L. (2018). Patient–physician gender concordance and increased mortality among female heart attack patients. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(34), 8569-8574.

Groves, K. S. (2005). Gender differences in social and emotional skills and charismatic leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 11*(3), 30-46.

Gündemir, S., Homan, A. C., De Dreu, C. K., & Van Vugt, M. (2014). Think leader, think white? Capturing and weakening an implicit pro-white leadership bias. *PloS one, 9*(1), e83915.

Gurdijian, H., and Lane. (2014). Why leadership-development programs fail. *McKinsey Quarterly*. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/leadership/why-leadership-development-programs-fail

Hackman, M. Z., Hills, M. J., Furniss, A. H., & Paterson, T. J. (1992). Perceptions of gender-role characteristics and transformational and transactional leadership behaviours. *Perceptual and motor skills, 75*(1), 311-319.

Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2008). The road to the glass cliff: Differences in the perceived suitability of men and women for leadership positions in succeeding and failing organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(5), 530-546.

Haslett, B., Geis, F. L., & Carter, M. R. (1992). *The organizational woman: Power and paradox*: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Hearn, J., & Collinson, D. (2017). Men, masculinities and gendered organizations.

Heilman. (2001). Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent Up the Organizational Ladder. *Journal of social issues, 57*(4), 657-674. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00234

Heilman, Block, C. J., & Martell, R. F. (1995). Sex stereotypes: Do they influence perceptions of managers? *Journal of Social behavior and Personality, 10*(4), 237.

Heilman, Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(6), 935.

Herrera, R., Duncan, P. A., Green, M. T., & Skaggs, S. L. (2012). The effect of gender on leadership and culture. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 31*(2), 37-48.

Ho, S. S., Li, A. Y., Tam, K., & Zhang, F. (2015). CEO gender, ethical leadership, and accounting conservatism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 127*(2), 351-370.

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 44*(2), 501-529.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American psychologist, 49*(6), 493.

Hogue, M. (2016). Gender bias in communal leadership: Examining servant leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

Hoobler, J. M., Masterson, C. R., Nkomo, S. M., & Michel, E. J. (2018). The business case for women leaders: Meta-analysis, research critique, and path forward. *Journal of Management, 44*(6), 2473-2499.

Hopkins, M. M., & O'Neil, D. A. (2015). Authentic leadership: Application to women leaders. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 959.

Hoyt, C. L. (2005). The role of leadership efficacy and stereotype activation in women's identification with leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 11*(4), 2-14.

Hoyt, C. L., & Burnette, J. L. (2013). Gender bias in leader evaluations: Merging implicit theories and role congruity perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(10), 1306-1319.

Hoyt, C. L., & Simon, S. (2017). Social psychological approaches to women and leadership theory. In *Handbook of research on gender and leadership* (pp. 85-99): Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hunt. (2005). Explosion of the leadership field and LQ's changing of the editorial guard. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(1), 1-8. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.10.003

Hunt, Gardner, W., & Fischer, D. (2008). Leader emotional displays from near and far: The implications of close versus distant leadership for leader emotional labor and authenticity. In *Leader emotional displays from near and far: The implications of close versus distant leadership for leader emotional labor and authenticity* (pp. 41--63): Information Age Pub Incorporated; Charlotte, NC.

Hunter, S. T., Bedell-Avers, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). The typical leadership study: Assumptions, implications, and potential remedies. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(5), 435-446.

Hyde, J. S. (2016). Sex and cognition: gender and cognitive functions. *Current opinion in neurobiology, 38*, 53-56.

Jamieson, K. H. (1995). *Beyond the double bind: Women and leadership*: Oxford University Press on Demand.

Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Relationship between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and their authentic leadership. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 254-273.

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*(1), 39-60.

Jones, T. M., & Gautschi, F. H. (1988). Will the ethics of business change? A survey of future executives. *Journal of Business Ethics, 7*(4), 231-248.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755.

Kapasi, I., Sang, K. J., & Sitko, R. (2016). Gender, authentic leadership and identity: analysis of women leaders' autobiographies. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*.

Karakuş, M. (2018). The moderating effect of gender on the relationships between age, ethical leadership, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies, 5*(1), 74-84.

Karasek III, R., & Bryant, P. (2012). Signaling theory: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 11*(1), 91.

Kark, R., & Eagly, A. H. (2010). Gender and leadership: Negotiating the labyrinth. In *Handbook of gender research in psychology* (pp. 443-468): Springer.

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*(3), 620-640.

Kelly, E. L., Ammons, S. K., Chermack, K., & Moen, P. (2010). Gendered Challenge, Gendered Response:Confronting the Ideal Worker Norm in a White-Collar Organization. *Gender & Society, 24*(3), 281-303. doi:10.1177/0891243210372073

Kent, R. L., & Moss, S. E. (1994). Effects of sex and gender role on leader emergence. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(5), 1335-1346.

Kiker, D. S., Callahan, J. S., & Kiker, M. B. (2019). Exploring the boundaries of servant leadership: A meta-analysis of the main and moderating effects of servant leadership on behavioral and affective outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 31*(2), 172-117.

Kılıç, M., & Günsel, A. (2019). The dark side of the leadership: The effects of toxic leaders on employees. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(2), 51-56.

Koburtay, T., Syed, J., & Haloub, R. (2019). Congruity between the female gender role and the leader role: A literature review. *European Business Review*.

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*(4), 616.

Kolb, J. A. (1997). Are we still stereotyping leadership? A look at gender and other predictors of leader emergence. *Small Group Research, 28*(3), 370-393.

Kolb, J. A. (1999). The effect of gender role, attitude toward leadership, and self-confidence on leader emergence: Implications for leadership development. *Human resource development quarterly, 10*(4), 305-320.

Konrad, A. M., Ritchie Jr, J. E., Lieb, P., & Corrigall, E. (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 126*(4), 593.

Kuperberg, A., & Stone, P. (2008). The media depiction of women who opt out. *Gender & Society, 22*(4), 497-517.

Landis, R. S. (2013). Successfully combining meta-analysis and structural equation modeling: Recommendations and strategies. *Journal of business and psychology, 28*(3), 251-261.

LeBreton, J. M., Hargis, M. B., Griepentrog, B., Oswald, F. L., & Ployhart, R. E. (2007). A multidimensional approach for evaluating variables in organizational research and practice. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(2), 475-498.

Lechner, C. M., Sortheix, F. M., Obschonka, M., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2018). What drives future business leaders? How work values and gender shape young adults' entrepreneurial and leadership aspirations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 107*, 57-70.

Lemoine, G. J., & Blum, T. C. (2021). Servant leadership, leader gender, and team gender role: Testing a female advantage in a cascading model of performance. *Personnel Psychology, 74*(1), 3-28.

Levitis, D. A., Lidicker Jr, W. Z., & Freund, G. (2009). Behavioural biologists do not agree on what constitutes behaviour. *Animal behaviour, 78*(1), 103.

Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 21*(2), 221-234.

Liu, H., Cutcher, L., & Grant, D. (2015). Doing authenticity: The gendered construction of authentic leadership. *Gender, Work & Organization, 22*(3), 237-255.

Lopez, E. S., & Ensari, N. (2014). The effects of leadership style, organizational outcome, and gender on attributional bias toward leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 8*(2), 19-37.

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership development. *Positive organizational scholarship, 241*, 258.

MacDonald, H. (1992). Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby, by Stephen L. Carter (Book Review). *Commentary, 93*(3), 60.

MacLaren, N. G., Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Sayama, H., Mumford, M. D., Connelly, S., . . . Kulkarni, A. (2020). Testing the babble hypothesis: Speaking time predicts leader emergence in small groups. *The Leadership Quarterly, 31*(5), 101409.

Maher, K. J. (1997). Gender-related stereotypes of transformational and transactional leadership. *Sex Roles, 37*(3), 209-225.

Martell, R. F., Lane, D. M., & Emrich, C. (1996). Male-female differences: A computer simulation.

Martell, R. F., Parker, C., Emrich, C. G., & Crawford, M. S. (1998). Sex Stereotyping in the Executive Suite:" Much Ado About Something". *Journal of Social behavior and Personality, 13*(1), 127-138.

Martin. (2004). Gender as social institution. *Social Forces, 82*(4), 1249-1273.

Martin, J. (2015). Transformational and transactional leadership: An exploration of gender, experience, and institution type. *portal: Libraries and the Academy, 15*(2), 331-351.

Maume Jr, D. J. (1999). Glass ceilings and glass escalators: Occupational segregation and race and sex differences in managerial promotions. *Work and Occupations, 26*(4), 483-509.

Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 17*(2), 180-197.

McClean, E. J., Martin, S. R., Emich, K. J., & Woodruff, C. T. (2018). The social consequences of voice: An examination of voice type and gender on status and subsequent leader emergence. *Academy of Management Journal, 61*(5), 1869-1891.

McKinsey. (2021). Women in the Workplace. Retrieved from www.womenintheworkplace.com

Melody De Cara, D. A. (2000). *An investigation of gender differences in transformational and transactional leadership styles*: Spalding University.

Meuser, J. D., Gardner, W. L., Dinh, J. E., Hu, J., Liden, R. C., & Lord, R. G. (2016). A network analysis of leadership theory: The infancy of integration. *Journal of Management, 42*(5), 1374-1403.

Mhatre, K. H., & Riggio, R. E. (2014). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Past, present, and future. *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*, 221-240.

Mohr, G., & Wolfram, H. J. (2008). Leadership and effectiveness in the context of gender: The role of leaders' verbal behaviour. *British Journal of management, 19*(1), 4-16.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking The Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach The Top Of America's Largestcorporations?* : Pearson Education.

Mullen, B., Salas, E., & Driskell, J. E. (1989). Salience, motivation, and artifact as contributions to the relation between participation rate and leadership. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 25*(6), 545-559.

Mumford, M. D., Todd, E. M., Higgs, C., & McIntosh, T. (2017). Cognitive skills and leadership performance: The nine critical skills. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*(1), 24-39.

Murray, D., & Chua, S. (2014). *Differences in leadership styles and motives in men and women: How generational theory informs gender role congruity.* Paper presented at the European Conference on Management, Leadership & Governance.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_318.10.asp

Neschen, A., & Hügelschäfer, S. (2021). Gender bias in performance evaluations: The impact of gender quotas. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 85*, 102383.

Neubert, M. J., & Taggar, S. (2004). Pathways to informal leadership: The moderating role of gender on the relationship of individual differences and team member network centrality to informal leadership emergence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(2), 175-194.

Norris, K. R., Ghahremani, H., & Lemoine, G. J. (2021). Is it laissez-faire l{Norris, 2021 #477}eadership or delegation? A deeper examination of an over-simplified leadership phenomenon. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 28*(3), 322-339.

O'Leary, V. E. (1974). Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. *Psychological bulletin, 81*(11), 809.

Organ, D. W. (1996). Leadership: The great man theory revisited. In (Vol. 39, pp. 1-4): Elsevier.

Pandey, S., DeHart-Davis, L., Pandey, S., & Ahlawat, S. (2022). Fight or flight: How gender influences follower responses to unethical leader behaviour. *Public Management Review*, 1-21.

Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., Walker, L. S., & Woehr, D. J. (2014). Gender and perceptions of leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contextual moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(6), 1129.

Peterson Institute for International Economics. (2016). Retrieved from https://www.piie.com/publications/wp/wp16-3.pdf

Phelan, J. E., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Competent yet out in the cold: Shifting criteria for hiring reflect backlash toward agentic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*(4), 406-413.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2016). Recommendations for creating better concept definitions in the organizational, behavioral, and social sciences. *Organizational Research Methods, 19*(2), 159-203.

Politis, J. D. (2016). *Do female managers cultivate more ethical leadership practices? An investigation on agency problems.* Paper presented at the the proceedings of The 4th International Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance.

Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (1989). The" Good Manager" Did Androgyny Fare Better in the 1980s? *Group & Organization Studies, 14*(2), 216-233.

Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (2022). Aspirations to top management over five decades: a shifting role of gender? *Gender in Management: An International Journal*.

Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Jiang, X. (2021). The "good manager" over five decades: towards an androgynous profile? *Gender in Management: An International Journal*.

Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2004). The Case of Gender Stereotypes. *The Psychological Foundations of Culture*, 259.

Qian, Y., & Fuller, S. (2020). COVID-19 and the Gender Employment Gap among Parents of Young Children. *Canadian Public Policy, 46*(S2), S89-S101. doi:10.3138/cpp.2020-077

Qian, Y., & Yavorsky, J. E. (2021). The Under-Utilization of Women's Talent: Academic Achievement and Future Leadership Positions. *Social Forces, 1*, 35.

Ramarajan, L. (2014). Past, present and future research on multiple identities: Toward an intrapersonal network approach. *Academy of Management annals, 8*(1), 589-659.

Reinke, S. J. (2004). Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership. *Global Virtue Ethics Review, 5*(3), 30.

Reuvers, M., Van Engen, M. L., Vinkenburg, C. J., & Wilson-Evered, E. (2008). Transformational leadership and innovative work behaviour: Exploring the relevance of gender differences. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 17*(3), 227-244.

Reynolds, K. (2014). Servant-leadership: A feminist perspective. *International Journal of Servant Leadership*.

Ridgeway. (1991). The social construction of status value: Gender and other nominal characteristics. *Social Forces, 70*(2), 367-386.

Ridgeway. (2001a). The emergence of status beliefs: From structural inequality to legitimizing ideology.

Ridgeway. (2001b). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of social issues, 57*(4), 637-655.

Ridgeway. (2006). Gender as an organizing force in social relations: Implications for the future of inequality. *The declining significance of gender, 265287*.

Ridgeway. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*: Oxford University Press.

Ridgeway, & Berger, J. (1986). Expectations, legitimation, and dominance behavior in task groups. *American Sociological Review*, 603-617.

Ridgeway, & Smith-Lovin, L. (1999). The gender system and interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 191-216.

Ridgeway, & Walker. (1995). Status structures. *Sociological perspectives on social psychology, 281*, 310.

Ridgeway, C. L., Boyle, E. H., Kuipers, K. J., & Robinson, D. T. (1998). How do status beliefs develop? The role of resources and interactional experience. *American Sociological Review*, 331-350.

Riggio, R. E. (2018). *What's Wrong With Leadership?: Improving Leadership Research and Practice*: Routledge.

Riordan, C. A., Gross, T., & Maloney, C. C. (1994). Self-monitoring, gender, and the personal consequences of impression management. *American Behavioral Scientist, 37*(5), 715-725.

Risman, B. J. (2018). Gender as a social structure. In *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender* (pp. 19-43): Springer.

Ritter, B. A., & Yoder, J. D. (2004). Gender differences in leader emergence persist even for dominant women: An updated confirmation of role congruity theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*(3), 187-193.

Rivera, L. A., & Tilcsik, A. (2019). Scaling down inequality: Rating scales, gender bias, and the architecture of evaluation. *American Sociological Review, 84*(2), 248-274.

Rodriguez-Rubio, A., & Kiser, A. I. (2013). An examination of servant leadership in the United States and Mexico: Do age and gender make a difference? *Global Studies Journal, 5*(2).

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

Rosette, A. S., Leonardelli, G. J., & Phillips, K. W. (2008). The White standard: racial bias in leader categorization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(4), 758.

Rosette, A. S., & Tost, L. P. (2010). Agentic women and communal leadership: How role prescriptions confer advantage to top women leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 221.

Rosing, K., & Jungmann, F. (2015). Leadership and aging. *Encyclopedia of geropsychology*, 1-9.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: the hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 77*(5), 1004.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of social issues, 57*(4), 743-762.

Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 48*(1), 165-179.

Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. *Research in organizational Behavior, 28*, 61-79.

Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of management, 16*(2), 81-90.

Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., Morgenroth, T., Rink, F., Stoker, J., & Peters, K. (2016). Getting on top of the glass cliff: Reviewing a decade of evidence, explanations, and impact. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(3), 446-455.

Sanchez-Hucles, J. V., & Davis, D. D. (2010). Women and women of color in leadership: Complexity, identity, and intersectionality. *American psychologist, 65*(3), 171.

Schein, V. E., & Davidson, M. J. (1993). Think manager, think male. *Management Development Review*.

Schmidt, F. L. (2015). History and development of the Schmidt–Hunter meta-analysis methods. *Research synthesis methods, 6*(3), 232-239.

Schmitt, N., & Hill, T. E. (1977). Sex and race composition of assessment center groups as a determinant of peer and assessor ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*(3), 261.

Schock, A.-K., Gruber, F. M., Scherndl, T., & Ortner, T. M. (2019). Tempering agency with communion increases women's leadership emergence in all-women groups: Evidence for role congruity theory in a field setting. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(2), 189-198.

Schyns, B., Tymon, A., Kiefer, T., & Kerschreiter, R. (2013). New ways to leadership development: A picture paints a thousand words. *Management Learning, 44*(1), 11-24.

Scicluna Lehrke, A., & Sowden, K. (2017). Servant leadership and gender. In *Servant leadership and followership* (pp. 25-50): Springer.

Scott, K. A., & Brown, D. J. (2006). Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 101*(2), 230-242.

Sealy, R. H., & Singh, V. (2010). The importance of role models and demographic context for senior women's work identity development. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 12*(3), 284-300.

Setó-Pamies, D. (2015). The relationship between women directors and corporate social responsibility. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 22*(6), 334-345.

Shahzad, K., Raja, U., & Hashmi, S. D. (2020). Impact of Big Five personality traits on authentic leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

Slaughter, A.-M. (2015). *Why women still can't have it all*: OneWorld Bloomsbury.

Spark, A., & O'Connor, P. J. (2021). State extraversion and emergent leadership: Do introverts emerge as leaders when they act like extraverts? *The Leadership Quarterly, 32*(3), 101474.

Spence. (1978). Job market signaling. In *Uncertainty in economics* (pp. 281-306): Elsevier.

Spence, & Buckner, C. E. (2000). Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, and sexist attitudes what do they signify? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*(1), 44-62.

Stempel, C. R., Rigotti, T., & Mohr, G. (2015). Think transformational leadership–Think female? *Leadership, 11*(3), 259-280.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2000). The contributions of the economics of information to twentieth century economics. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 115*(4), 1441-1478.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Information and the Change in the Paradigm in Economics. *American Economic Review, 92*(3), 460-501.

Stock. (2020). *An Investigation into Transformational Leadership Behaviors and Signaling Theory.* The University of North Carolina at Charlotte,

Stock, Banks, G. C., Voss, E. N., Tonidandel, S., & Woznyj, H. (2022). Putting leader (follower) behavior back into transformational leadership: A theoretical and empirical course correction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 101632. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101632

Takala, T., & Aaltio, I. (2004). Charismatic leadership and ethics from gender perspective. *EJBO-Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*.

Todd, A. (2018). Your Leadership Training is Probably a Waste of Money. Here's What's Missing. *Entrepreneur* Retrieved from https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/317137#:~:text=Just%2015%20percent%20of%20leaders,such%20corporate%20training%20is%20effective.

Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative importance analysis: A useful supplement to regression analysis. *Journal of business and psychology, 26*(1), 1-9.

Trevino, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California management review, 42*(4), 128-142.

Tur, B., Harstad, J., & Antonakis, J. (2021). Effect of charismatic signaling in social media settings: Evidence from TED and Twitter. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 101476.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2021). Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/womens-databook/2020/home.htm

Uhlmann, E. L., & Cohen, G. L. (2005). Constructed criteria: Redefining merit to justify discrimination. *Psychological science, 16*(6), 474-480.

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1228-1261.

Van Quaquebeke, N., & Felps, W. (2018). Respectful inquiry: A motivational account of leading through asking questions and listening. *Academy of Management Review, 43*(1), 5-27.

Vial, A. C., Napier, J. L., & Brescoll, V. L. (2016). A bed of thorns: Female leaders and the self-reinforcing cycle of illegitimacy. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(3), 400-414.

Vinkenburg, C. J., Van Engen, M. L., Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2011). An exploration of stereotypical beliefs about leadership styles: Is transformational leadership a route to women's promotion? *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(1), 10-21.

Waldman, D. A., Galvin, B. M., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2013). The development of motivation to lead and leader role identity. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 20*(2), 156-168.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34*(1), 89-126.

Wang, G., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Zhang, L., & Bishoff, J. (2019). Meta-analytic and primary investigations of the role of followers in ratings of leadership behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(1), 70.

Wentworth, D. K., & Anderson, L. R. (1984). Emergent leadership as a function of sex and task type. *Sex Roles, 11*(5-6), 513-524.

White, M. J., & White, G. B. (2006). Implicit and explicit occupational gender stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 55*(3), 259-266.

Williams, & Best, D. L. (1990). *Sex and psyche: Gender and self viewed cross-culturally*: Sage Publications, Inc.

Williams, Muller, C., & Kilanski, K. (2012). Gendered organizations in the new economy. *Gender & Society, 26*(4), 549-573.

Williams, & Tiedens. (2016). The subtle suspension of backlash: A meta-analysis of penalties for women's implicit and explicit dominance behavior. *Psychological bulletin, 142*(2), 165.

Wolfram, H. J., & Mohr, G. (2010). Gender-typicality of economic sectors and gender-composition of working groups as moderating variables in leadership research. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*.

Woolley, L., Caza, A., & Levy, L. (2011). Authentic leadership and follower development: Psychological capital, positive work climate, and gender. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 18*(4), 438-448.

Woznyj, H. M., Banks, G. C., Whelpley, C. E., Batchelor, J. H., & Bosco, F. A. (2022). Job attitudes: A meta-analytic review and an agenda for future research. *Journal of organizational behavior*.

Wynn, A. T. (2017). Gender, Parenthood, and Perceived Chances of Promotion. *Sociological Perspectives, 60*(4), 645-664. doi:10.1177/0731121416672426

Yoder, J. D. (2001). Making leadership work more effectively for women. *Journal of social issues, 57*(4), 815-828.

Zaccaro, S. J., Gulick, L. M., & Khare, V. P. (2008). Personality and leadership. *Leadership at the crossroads, 1*, 13-29.

APPENDIX ONE: PRIMARY META-ANALYSIS ARTICLES

Authentic Leadership

Aiken, D. L. (2010). Relationship between leadership behaviors of high school principals and teacher retention in Texas (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix).

Copeland, M. K. (2016). The impact of authentic, ethical, transformational leadership on leader effectiveness. Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 13(3), 79.

Hsiung, H. H. (2012). Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: A multi-level psychological process. Journal of business ethics, 107(3), 349-361.

Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Relationship between entrepreneurs' psychological capital and their authentic leadership. Journal of managerial issues, 254-273.

Leroy, H., Palanski, M. E., & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. Journal of business ethics, 107(3), 255-264.

Rego, A., Sousa, F., Marques, C., & e Cunha, M. P. (2012). Authentic leadership promoting employees' psychological capital and creativity. Journal of business research, 65(3), 429-437.

Remus Ilies, Petru L. Curşeu, Nikolaos Dimotakis & Matthias Spitzmuller (2013) Leaders' emotional expressiveness and their behavioural and relational authenticity: Effects on followers, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22:1, 4-14, DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2011.626199

Remus Ilies, Petru L. Curşeu, Nikolaos Dimotakis & Matthias Spitzmuller (2013) Leaders' emotional expressiveness and their behavioural and relational authenticity: Effects on followers, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22:1, 4-14, DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2011.626199

Wang, H. U. I., Sui, Y., Luthans, F., Wang, D., & Wu, Y. (2014). Impact of authentic leadership on performance: Role of followers' positive psychological capital and relational processes. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35(1), 5-21.

Weischer, A. E., Weibler, J., & Petersen, M. (2013). “To thine own self be true”: The effects of enactment and life storytelling on perceived leader authenticity. The Leadership Quarterly, 24(4), 477-495.

Azanza, G., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2013). Authentic leadership and organizational culture as drivers of employees’ job satisfaction. Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 29(2), 45-50.

Riggio, R. E., Zhu, W., Reina, C., & Maroosis, J. A. 2010. Virtue-based measurement of ethical leadership: The leadership virtues questionnaire. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62: 235-250.

Ethical Leadership

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. 2005. Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97: 117-134

Chan, S. C. (2014). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice: Does information sharing matter?. Human relations, 67(6), 667-693.

Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. Asian journal of social psychology, 7(1), 89-117.

Chughtai, A., Byrne, M., & Flood, B. 2014. Linking ethical leadership to employee well-being: The role of trust in supervisor. Journal of Business Ethics, 128: 653-663.

Copeland, M. K. (2013). The importance of ethical leadership in the accounting industry. Regent University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation

Copeland, M. K. (2016). The impact of authentic, ethical, transformational leadership on leader effectiveness. Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 13(3), 79.

De Vries, R. E. 2012. Personality predictors of leadership styles and the self–other agreement problem. The Leadership Quarterly, 23: 809-821.

Harvey, P., Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., Buckless, A., & Pescosolido, A. T. 2013. The Impact of Political Skill on Employees' Perceptions of Ethical Leadership. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21: 5-16.

Huhtala, M., Kangas, M., Lämsä, A. M., & Feldt, T. 2013. Ethical managers in ethical organisations? The leadership-culture connection among Finnish managers. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34: 250-270.

Jiang, J. Y., Law, K. S., & Sun, J. J. 2014. Leader–member relationship and burnout: The moderating role of leader integrity. Management and Organization Review, 10: 223-247.

Kalshoven, K., & Boon, C. T. 2012. Ethical leadership, employee well-being, and helping. Journal of Personnel Psychology, 11: 60-68.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. 2011b . Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. The Leadership Quarterly, 22: 51-69.

Li, C. (2013). Ethical leadership in firms: Antecedents and consequences. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama.

Liu, J., Kwan, H. K., Fu, P. P., & Mao, Y. (2013a). Ethical leadership and job performance in China: The roles of workplace friendships and traditionality. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 86(4), 564–584.

Liu, Y., Loi, R., & Lam, L. W. (2013b). Exemplification and supervisor-rated performance: The moderating role of ethical leadership. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 21(2), 145–154.

Palmer, N. F. (2013). The effects of leader behavior on follower ethical behavior: Examining the mediating roles of ethical efficacy and moral disengagement (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln).
Palmer, N. F. (2013). The effects of leader behavior on follower ethical behavior: Examining the mediating roles of ethical efficacy and moral disengagement (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln).
Resick, C. J., Hargis, M. B., Shao, P., & Dust, S. B. (2013). Ethical leadership, moral equity judgments, and discretionary workplace behavior. Human relations, 66(7), 951-972.
Riggio, R. E., Zhu, W., Reina, C., & Maroosis, J. A. 2010. Virtue-based measurement of ethical leadership: The leadership virtues questionnaire. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62: 235-250.
Ruiz-Palomino, P., Martı´nez-Ruiz, M. P., & Martı´nez-Can˜as, R. (2013). Assessing ethical behaviours in the Spanish banking and insurance industries: evidence and challenges. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24(11), 2173–2196.
Ruiz-Palomino, P., Martı´nez-Ruiz, M. P., & Martı´nez-Can˜as, R. (2013). Assessing ethical behaviours in the Spanish banking and insurance industries: evidence and challenges. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24(11), 2173–2196.
Shao, P. (2010). Ethics-based leadership and employee ethical behavior: Examining the mediating role of ethical regulatory focus.
Sweet Jr, K. M. (2012). A fit model of leadership and two empirical examinations. University of Houston.
Wu, M., Huang, X., & Chan, S. C. 2012. The influencing mechanisms of paternalistic leadership in Mainland China. Asia Pacific Business Review, 18: 631-648.
Wu, M., Huang, X., Li, C., & Liu, W. 2012. Perceived Interactional Justice and Trust-in-supervisor as Mediators for Paternalistic Leadership. Management and Organization Review, 8: 97-121.
Xu, X., Yu, F., & Shi, J. (2011). Ethical leadership and leaders'personalities. Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 39(3), 361–368.
Yidong, T., & Xinxin, L. (2013). How ethical leadership influence employees' innovative work behavior: A perspective of intrinsic motivation. Journal of Business Ethics, 116(2), 441–455.
Zhang, Y., Huai, M. Y., & Xie, Y. H. 2015. Paternalistic leadership and employee voice in China: A dual process model. The Leadership Quarterly, 26: 25-36.
Zhu, W. (2008). The effect of ethical leadership on follower moral identity: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. Leadership Review, 8(3), 62–73.

Servant Leadership

Chan, S. C., & Mak, W. M. (2014). The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes. Personnel Review, 43(2), 272-287.
De Clercq, D., Bouckenooghe, D., Raja, U., & Matsyborska, G. (2014). Servant leadership and work engagement: The contingency effects of leader–follower social capital. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25(2), 183-212.
Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on sales force performance. Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 29(3), 257-275.

Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. Personnel Psychology, 65(3), 565-596.
Wu, L. Z., Tse, E. C. Y., Fu, P., Kwan, H. K., & Liu, J. (2013). The impact of servant leadership on hotel employees' "servant behavior". Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 54(4), 383-395.
Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of identification and prototypicality. Journal of Business Research, 67(7), 1395-1404.

APPENDIX TWO: SECOND ORDER META-ANALYSIS REFERENCES

[a] Schmitt, D. P., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in Big Five personality traits across 55 cultures. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *94*(1), 168.

[b] Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, *78*(4), 679.

[c] Badura, K. L., Grijalva, E., Galvin, B. M., Owens, B. P., & Joseph, D. L. (2020). Motivation to lead: A meta-analysis and distal-proximal model of motivation and leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 105(4), 331.

[d] Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. Journal of applied psychology, 87(4), 765.

[e] Van Engen, M. L., & Willemsen, T. M. (2004). Sex and leadership styles: A meta-analysis of research published in the 1990s. Psychological reports, 94(1), 3-18.

[f] Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. Journal of applied psychology, 89(5), 901.

[g] Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. Psychological bulletin, 129(4), 569.

[h] Banks, G. C., Engemann, K. N., Williams, C. E., Gooty, J., McCauley, K. D., & Medaugh, M. R. (2017). A meta-analytic review and future research agenda of charismatic leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 28(4), 508-529.

[i] Original Meta-Analysis

[j] Lin, X., Luan, Y., & Zhao, G. (2021). Personality influences on ethical, servant, and authentic leadership: A meta-analysis. Journal of Psychology in Africa, 31(6), 588-594.