

Scientific Review of Literature Pertaining to Women in Management: With Special Reference to Management Styles and Managerial Effectiveness

JAYATILAKE L.V.K.

Department of Commerce and Financial Management
University of Kelaniya
Kelaniya
SRI LANKA
lakminij@yahoo.com

Abstract:-

The structure of the workplace is undergoing dramatic changes in the 2000s. The current trend towards change-an increasing number of women in the workplace, especially those visible in managerial position. The traditional hierarchical structure associated with male-dominated management ranks is inadequate to accommodate properly this trend. The growing impact of women in the workforce has kept the leadership style and managerial effectiveness of women on the research agenda. Reviews some of the current thinking on women and leadership, drawing on general management literature. Looks at alternative management structure theories which support the view of a genderless management structure. Conclude with a synopsis of some of the factors that may account for differences in leadership styles and managerial effectiveness. Recommends that managers should begin to adopt a nontraditional management style which will not only foster a blend of so-called masculine and feminine behaviors, but also lead to better leaders.

Keywords: Leadership, Women, Gender, Management Styles, Managerial Effectiveness, Managers.

1. Introduction

Businesses that hope to succeed in today's global marketplace need special leaders who are more than just accomplished administrators and managers. These leaders must be, able to convince their workforce to broaden and elevate their awareness of the purpose and mission of the organization in order to compete and gain a competitive advantage in this ever-changing marketplace. They face increased complexity and competition as a result of globalization, rapid information technology changes, more demanding customers, increased employees expectations and difficulties finding and retaining excellent talent (Fisk, 2002).

Writers often lament the fact that there are not more women in senior management positions worldwide and it seems that the common perception is that management is male (Schein and Muller 1992). Demographic workforce changes may require a new structure that equally includes men and women. Accordingly, this paper revisits the study of gender differences in management and women and leadership because leadership remains a central theme in management. The paper begins with a brief review of some of the models of leadership particularly pertinent to discussions of gender differences in leadership behavior. The paper then reviews some of the arguments that connect leadership style with gender and then moves to an examination of arguments de-linking

gender and managerial effectiveness. The paper concludes with a summary of some of the factors that could account for variation in managerial effectiveness.

2. Gender Differences in Leadership Behaviour and Leadership Styles.

Leadership style is the manner and approach of providing directions, implementing plans, and motivating individuals (Northouse, 2004). Researchers studying the style approach found that leadership is encompassed of essentially two general kinds of categories of behaviours: task behaviours and relationship behaviour (Northouse, 2004). Task behaviours facilitates goal accomplishments assisting individuals in the attainment of their objectives: whereas relationship behaviour help individuals feel comfortable with themselves, with each other, and with the situation in which they find themselves.

3. Leadership Behaviour

Leadership behaviour (i.e. leadership style) is often conceptualized as consisting of two independent dimensions: initiating structure and consideration, task behaviour and relationship behaviour: concern for production and concern for people (Blake and Mouton 1964). Blake and Mouton's Leadership Grid represent four Leadership styles (Country Club Management, Team Management, Middle-of-the-Road Management, Impoverished management and Authority- Compliance.

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1996), two dimensions of leader behaviour are defined as task dimension includes goal setting, organising, setting time lines, directing and controlling. By contrast, the relationship dimension includes giving support, communicating, facilitating interactions, active listening

and providing feedback. The four leadership styles represent combinations of tasks and relationship oriented leader behaviours including participant, selling, delegating, and telling styles.

House's (1996) Path-goal theory of leadership believed that leaders could exhibit more than one leadership style ranging from directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership to achievement-oriented leadership. Path-goal theory is designed to explain how leaders can help subordinates along the path to their goals by selecting specific behaviors that are best suited to subordinates' needs and to the situation in which subordinates are working by choosing the appropriate style, leaders increase subordinates' expectations of success and satisfaction.

Fielder's (1967) Contingency Leadership Model proposed that leaders have one dominant style that is resistant to change portraying a three dimensional model including leaders-member relations, task structure, and position power. Fielder suggested that leaders must learn to manipulate or influence the leadership situation in order to create a 'match' between their leadership style and the amount of control within the situation.

Many researchers have attempted to find the relationship between gender role leadership style. They assume that gender role is an important personality trait that influences leadership style. Thus, they have related masculinity with task-oriented leadership style and femininity with relationship-oriented leadership style.. These relationships have been empirically supported.

Burns (1978), in writing about political leaders, developed another theory which contrasted two alternative types of leadership. One of the types he called transactional. Transactional leadership displays a kind of accounting mentality

on the part of both leader and follower, when practised as a transaction, leadership exchanges rewards for services rendered. A politician might make promises to reward certain groups of people in return for their support on an issue or their votes. There is nothing necessarily reprehensible about transactional leadership, but it is limited and limiting, because there is not always a suitable reward available or within one's power to give, nor a suitable punishment to impose. The transactional leader can only be effective when a transaction can be accomplished. Transforming leadership, on the other hand, is about transformation and has the power to change the leader, the follower and the situation around them. The transforming leader, by communicating a vision of a possible future, enables herself and others to believe in, work towards and reach goals that previously seemed unrealistic and unattainable. The goals aim to change the situation for the better by, say, lowering the rate of local unemployment, or planting wild flowers on roadsides. For Burns, it is a given that transforming leadership is about the creation of the good in a normal sense. Other writers and researchers using his theory have tended to overlook the moral context of transforming leadership and have also changed his term to transformational rather than transforming, probably to make it seem a closer parallel to transactional as a paired term. However, transforming gives the more active feeling of a process of change, whereas transformational sounds more like a description after the event.

Interestingly, Burns believes that women are more likely to be transforming leaders than men, mainly because women have tended to see themselves as representative rather than independent from the groups they lead and have not fallen into the male trap of the false conception of leadership as 'command

and control'. Burns (1978) says that: As leadership comes properly to be seen as process of leaders engaging and mobilising the human needs and aspiration of followers, women will be more readily recognised as leaders and men will change their own leadership styles.

4. Women and Leadership Styles

Park (1996) has tested the relationship between gender role, decision style and leadership style. Reveals, from the results, strong support for the proposed relationships: masculinity / directive / analytical / task-oriented styles and femininity / conceptual / behavioral / relations-oriented styles. Provides implications / application questions for practitioners. For example that "linking the people with the strategic needs of the business" (i.e. strategic human resource management emphasizing competence acquisition, development and utilization) requires an in-depth analysis for many organizations.

Rosner, (1990) conducted a survey for the International Women's Forum. The survey included male and female executives with similar jobs, education and age. She concluded that women and men manage differently. She feels women are less likely to adhere to the traditional command and control leadership style that men follow. As more women enter into management 'they are drawing on what is unique to their socialization as women and creating a different path to the top (Rosner 1990). That path is described as 'transformational' leadership - 'getting subordinates to transform their own self-interests into the interests of the group through concern for a broader goal. Moreover, they ascribe their power to personal characteristics such as charisma, interpersonal skills, hard work or personal contacts rather than

organizational stature' (Rosner 1990). By contrast, men are more likely to describe themselves in ways that characterize them as 'transactional' leaders. 'That is, they view job performance as a series of transactions with subordinates – exchanging rewards for services rendered or punishment for inadequate performance. The men are also more likely to use power that comes from organizational position and formal authority' (Rosner 1990).

Rosner characterizes transformational – also referred to as interactive – leaders as possessing four qualities. First, they encourage others to participate so others feel they are part of the organization. Second, they share power and information to reinforce open communication and to create loyalty with subordinates. Third, they enhance the self-worth of others by giving praise and recognition. Fourth, they energize others with enthusiasm and motivation.

Although Rosner admits that not all transformational leaders are men, the qualities these leaders possess are similar to traits and behaviours with which women were traditionally inculcated. She implies women are transformational leaders by saying 'these behaviours that were natural and/or socially acceptable for them have been highly successful in at least some managerial settings. (Rosner 1990). She further implies 'As the work force increasingly demands participation and the economic environment increasingly requires rapid change, interactive leadership may emerge as the management style of choice for many organizations. Rosner views this style as an alternative choice for companies that want to move past the traditional command-and-control style of management and want to include women in management. According to Rosner, it seems that the woman's path to managing will gain acceptance in the workplace.

Women will mostly be categorized as transformational managers and men as transactional managers. Each style of management will complement the other to form a cohesive whole in the organization.

Eagly and Johnson (2000) reviewed 162 previous studies concluding that women do indeed adopt a more democratic style than men do. They also found support for the notion of 'gender congeniality' which involves encouraging women to play feminine roles rather than masculine roles. Women were rated poorer when using masculine traits such as directive or autocratic styles, and men were rated poorer when leadership was defined in less masculine terms. Eagly and Karau (1991) explained the emergence of leadership. Under laboratory and field studies, men emerged as leaders to a greater extent than women did. Men were often the leaders in short-term groups and for tasks that did not require complex social interaction. Women most often emerged as leaders in social situations, and female leadership enhanced group productivity. The evidence discussed (Maxwell et.al 2007) strongly suggests that transformational management styles together with supportive organizational cultures which limit reliance on impression management as a basis of promotion provide a congenial context for females' career development.

Valentine and Godkin (2000) using a national sample of 7,733 young working adults, the relationship between supervisor gender and perceived job design have been explored. Results indicated that a supervisor's gender did indeed influence subordinates' perceptions of their job, and the differences were attributed to the different leadership styles men and women frequently use in the workplace. Overall, subordinates who had female supervisors perceived greater

interpersonal aspect in their jobs, while subordinates who had male supervisors perceived greater structure in their jobs (Valentine and Godkin, 2000). Moore et.al(2005) analysed of covariance revealed that all managers with female supervisors reported significantly higher levels of mastery and social support at work, and lower levels of work to family conflict and depression. Women with female supervisors also reported significantly higher levels of job autonomy and work absences than did women with male supervisors or men with either male or female supervisors. The meditational role of work- based social support was explored as well as the gender ratio of the subordinate's work environment {Moore et. al (2005)}. Findings suggest that, for both men and women, there are some modest benefits associated with having a female supervisor and with working in a more female-dominated environment.

Leadership theories have attempted over the years to encapsulate the mystique, the magic ingredient of what makes leadership successful into a formula or model. The most widely held view of leadership during the 1980s and 1990s seems to be that derived from Burns' work in 1978, which contrasts 'transforming' leadership with 'transactional' leadership. Tremaine (2000) to explore the relationship between gender, success as a mayor in local government leadership and Burns' theory, New Zealand's women mayors were interviewed about their perceptions of leadership and their responses were linked to the concept of transforming leadership. The result suggests that women mayors do judge success as a leader in terms that are closely allied to transformational rather than transactional leadership. Women and men Army Officers have interviewed do lead in different ways with women demonstrating a gender management

aspect to their leadership {Dunn (2007)}. The research also identified that women officers experience an 'armoured glass' ceiling in terms of career progression, the research developed a conceptual model of military leadership that differs from the transformational/transactional leadership model. It also disconfirms contemporary leadership theory that conflates leadership and change management.

Muller and Rowell (2002) have found that interviewees' management style shares more in common with the feminine approach to management and less in common with the traditional Mexican management approach. Some elements of the women's style are characteristically Mexican, such as their emphasis on maintaining harmonious interpersonal relationships. Their general approach, however, seeks to lessen status differences, and in this respect, departs from tradition Mexican custom. Generally, the women transcended the organisational constraints of their gendered work contexts and used their style in a non-traditional manner (Muller and Rowell, 2002).

In Sri Lanka Gunewardena and Lekamge (2002) analysis of data revealed that, in general there are similarities in the rating of leadership attributes by men and women managers, so that significant differences were minimal. Men and women in administrative positions did not exhibit more traditionally male / traditionally female attributes. This is in conformity with the current thinking on gender and management, that given equivalent levels of responsibility within an organization, men and women exhibit the same leadership behaviour. However, in this study by 'interpersonal social skills' was not borne out by this study.

Kulasingham (2000) has been studied on whether leadership styles defined for

male and female leaders of western countries is applicable to leaders in Sri Lanka organisations. The study sample consisted of top and middle level managers in government and private sector organisations. It found that women incline to one style, both show a combination of styles depending on different situations, attitudes of leaders and their subordinates.

Pitiyage (2000), assessed the extent to which the differences in leadership styles between male and female managers contribute to gender inequality at senior management levels in the financial sectors. The study suggests that there is gender inequality.

Thayanithy (1998), examines whether any differences that may be observed in leadership behaviour of male and female managers could be ascribed to the social constructs of masculinity and femininity. The study has as its objectives the examination of whether male and female managers differ in gender characteristics of masculinity and femininity, observation of distinctions in leadership styles; and ascertaining the extent of influences of gender characteristics on leadership styles of male and female managers.

5. Gender Differences in Managerial Effectiveness

The review on gender differences in management deals with differences in effectiveness and other criteria for managerial advancement and performance identified that feminization of management' phenomenon, takes differences as women's strengths, and claims that 'women are apposite and superior as managers'. According to surveys conducted by Rosener (1990), women managers who have broken the glass ceiling in medium-sized, non-traditional organizations have proven that

effective leaders do not come from one mould. These second-generation managerial women are drawing on what is unique to their socialization as women and creating a different path to the top.

Keeton (1996) has been described a survey of international city / country Management Association female members in professional, mid-level management, and upper level management positions to determine the factors they see as important to their career success. The questionnaire contained measures of three models (human capital, socio-psychological, systemic) which are cited as explanatory of the success achieved by women. According to Keeton (1996), the majority of women, regardless of position in the organisation, attribute their success to variables that are within their purview. These include self-confidence, education, intelligence, competence, on the job, hard work, and motivation. Assistance from others such as mentors was seen as important but not a significant factor in career advancement. Measures representing distribution of power and distribution of opportunity (systemic model indicators) were not viewed as being as important to career success as measures representing the human capital and Socio-psychological models. The absence of a perceived importance of measures of the systematic model suggests that the socialization and education of women needs to stress the importance of these indicators in an overall strategy to achieve career goals (Keeton 1996)

In a Meta-analysis of studies on gender differences in leader effectiveness, no significant differences were found aggregated across all studies by Eagly et. al., 1995. However, managers of both genders were considered more effective when they acted in a way which conformed with their stereotypical gender role in jobs that required task abilities

(for men) versus interpersonal abilities (for women). Robert Quinn's (1988) competing values framework identified eight managerial roles that managers must display if they are to be effective. The eight roles are innovator, broker, producer, director, co-ordinator, monitor, facilitator, and mentor. In Vilkinas (2000) study 509 managers, 127 of whom were females, responded to a survey exploring the extent to which they displayed each of Quinn's managerial roles. Each manager's staff were asked to respond to the questionnaire. When the gender of the managers and that of their significant others (staff, peers and boss) were taken into account there was no significant difference reported in the extent to which the eight roles were displayed nor the effectiveness level of male and female managers. The result of this study indicates that the gender of the manager does not impact on how they are perceived by their significant others. Rather it is how effective they are as managers that determines their significant others' perceptions.

Reported on the study (Vilkinas and Cartan, 1997) where 149 managers, of which 35 per cent were female, responded to a survey exploring the extent to which they displayed each of Quinn's managerial roles. The self-perception of all managers was that the female managers displayed co-ordinator, monitor and mentor roles more than did male managers. For each manager, their staff, peers and boss were also asked to respond to the questionnaire. Their staff has been reported that their female managers displayed five roles (Innovator, producer, director, co-ordinator and mentor) more frequently than did the male managers. Peers have reported a difference in two of the managerial roles: broker and mentor (female displaying each role more frequently). Bosses have not seen the male and female managers differently. Vilkinas and Cartan (1997)

have been found that the managers and their peers reported that female managers were more effective than male managers.

In addition, women are not passive actors. They have campaigned for an end to their subordinate status and to traditions which prevent their full self-expression. It is clear that in a multitude of ways, they have challenged the limits on their lives prescribed by society, although they have not always succeeded. However, while women legally are no longer second class citizens, their lives remain culturally constrained. For examples although women managers no longer have to resign from work on marriage or motherhood, it is clearly difficult to maintain a career, marriage and family (Rendall, 1990).

Eagly et al, (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies on transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles to examine gender differences in leader effectiveness. In this study researchers found that female leaders were transformational and used more contingent reward behaviour, a component of transactional style, more often than male leaders. The male leaders alternatively, used two other components of transactional leadership and a laissez-faire leadership style more. The result of the meta-analysis indicates small, but significant differences between male and female leaders. The implications are that the factors that female leaders rated higher on "relate positively to leaders' effectiveness" and those dimensions on which men exceeded women "have negative or null relations to effectiveness".

Kabacoff (2000) conducted a study of senior level executives. The participants consisted of 13 male and 13 female CEOs and 73 male and 73 female senior vice presidents in 88 North American

companies. 'Male and female senior executives were matched on type of industry, years of management experience, and organisation level'. Several differences in leadership behaviour/ styles were observed between the male and female senior executives. Several notable differential correlations were obtained from ratings provided by bosses. Specifically, focusing on sort-range hands-on, practical strategies, and employing a forceful, assertive, and competitive approach to achieving results were seen as positively related leadership effectiveness for male senior executives and disadvantageous for female senior executives. Accommodating the needs of others and demonstrating an active concern for other people were seen as positively rated to leadership effectiveness for female senior executives and disadvantageous for male senior executives. Male executives also were seen to exert influence by seeking out positions of authority while female executives did not. These correlations suggest a traditional sex-role stereotyping by these bosses of senior executives. 'Despite differences in rated behaviours and differential correlations between behaviour and effectiveness, no differences in perceived leadership effectiveness were obtained when comparing male and female executives through boss, peer, or direct report ratings' (Kabacoff, 2000).

Above most of the literature fails to find gender differences in leadership effectiveness but consistently concludes that there are gender differences in approach and leadership style. Gallagher (2000) interviewed more than 200 top level female executives concluded that women from meaningful alliances as opposed to superficial network contacts. Prior advice to women seeking executive positions advised them to act professional and adopt a masculine leadership style. Based on her research findings of

executives women, Gallagher explained, 'you can't build genuine relationship based on what you think people want you to be'. 'It's powerful and effective for a woman to be herself'. Given the literature's failure to find differences in leadership effectiveness between men and women, this research opted to look beyond the literature's assertion that gender differences exist in leadership style to consider other possible factors impacting the low numbers of women in upper management positions, specifically women's aspirations beyond middle level management positions. As such, an overview of women in middle management positions, specifically their attitudes about promotion into higher level management positions is helpful.

In Sri Lanka Hettigoda, (2000) study was carried out with a sample of 50 executives in the management hierarchy. It suggests that the 'glass ceiling' does exist and that there is direct and indirect relationship between the financial background, cultural and traditional aspects on the hindrance to women's career progression.

Jayasena (1996), discussion pertaining to the four aspects connected with the functions of a manager highlights the fact that most managers feel that males are better skilled in areas such as decision making and in the ability to use power. She has found that a majority of the males had attributed the qualities of analytical abilities and innovative skills to male managers. This strengthens the belief that most of the males feel that they are efficient 'planners' and that they possess superior leadership qualities than their female colleagues.

6. Summary and Conclusion

The first part of this review, it has been observed that the gender differences in managerial behaviour and leadership

styles. Surprisingly, there are very few empirical studies of gender differences in actual managerial behaviour. Review that do include studies of behavioural differences mostly summarize the results as inconsistent; i.e. mostly there are no differences, sometimes there are 'stereotypical' differences (women behave in ways that conform to gender role stereotype); and sometimes there are non-stereotypical differences. According to the most of the studies women were more likely to describe themselves as having a transformational style (while men described transitional traits), engaging their staff's self-interest into the goals of the group while men used their positions to control resources and reward followers. Women were more interactive, encouraged participation, shared power and information, and energized subordinates. They have found that masculinity with task-oriented leadership style and femininity with relationship-oriented leadership style.

Secondly; it has been examined on gender differences in management deals with differences in effectiveness and other criteria for managerial advancement and performance. The literature fails to find gender differences in leadership effectiveness.

References

- Blake, R, Mouton, J(1964), *The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production Through People*, Gulf Publishing, Houston, TX.
- Burns, T, Stalker, G (1961), *the Management of Innovation*, Backs, Barnes and Nobel, New York, NY.
- Dunn, M (2007), *British Army Leadership: Is it Gendered?* *Women in Management Review*, Vol 22, No 6, MCB UP Ltd, pp.468-481.
- Eagly, A.H. and Johnson, B.T (2000), *Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-Analysis*. In J.L Pierce and J.W Newstrom (Eds), *Leaders and the Leadership Process, Readings, Self Assessments and Applications (2nd ed, Rev pp 49-59)*, Boston: Irwin Mc Graw-Hill.
- Eagly, A.H, Karau, S.J (1991), 'Gender and the Emergence of Leaders: a Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 60, No.5, pp.685-710.
- Eagly, A.H, Karau, S.J, Makhijani, M.G (1995), 'Gender and the Effectiveness of Leaders: a Meta-Analysis, *Psychological Bulletin*, Volume 117, No 1, pp 125-145.
- 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), pp 569-591.
- Fiedler, F (1967), *a Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness*, New York, NY:Mc Graw Hill
- Gallagher, C (2000), *Going to the Top*, New York: Penguin Books
- Gunawardena, C and Lekamge, D (2002), *Men and Women in Leadership Roles: a Study of the Open University of Sri Lanka*, *Eighth National Convention on Women's Studies*, 23rd- 26th March 2002, Centre For Women's Research, Colombo.

- Hersey, P and Blanchard, K (1996), a Comparison of the Original Theory and its Talent Version is Provided by P.Hersey and K. Blanchard, 'Great Ideas Revisited', *Training and Development*, 42-47.
- Hettigoda, A.H (2000), An Inquiry Into the Hidden Barriers to Progress of Sri Lankan Women Executives, *a Research Paper Submitted to the Post Graduate Institute of Management, University of Sri Jayawardenepura in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Master in Business Administration Degree, Colombo.*
- House, R.J (1996), Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory, *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- Jayasena, C (1996), Managerial Skills of Female Executives- Perceptions of Male Managers, *Fifth National Convention on Women's Studies*, 9th -11th March 1996, CENWAR, Colombo.
- Kabacoff, R.L (2000), Gender and Leadership in the Corporate Boardroom Retrieved March 1, 2001 from *Management Resource Group Web Site: <http://www.mrg.com/Publication.htm>*.
- Keeton, K.B (1996), Characteristics of Successful Women Managers and Professionals in Local Government: a national survey, *Women in Management Review*, Volum 11, Number 3, MCB UP Ltd, pp 27-34.
- Kulasingham, S.D (2000), The Influence of Gender on Leadership Styles and Its Effects in Organizations of Sri Lanka, a Research Paper Submitted to the Post Graduate Institute of Management, University of Sri Jayawardenepura in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Master in Business Administration Degree, Colombo, 2000.
- Maxwell, G.A, Ogden S.M, and Mc Tavish, D (2007), Enabling the Career Development of Female Managers in Finance and Retail, *Women in Management Review*, Vol 22, No 5 pp 353-390 MCB UP Ltd.
- Moore, S, Grunberg,L and Greenberg, E (2005), Are Female Supervisors Good for Employee Job Experiences, Health and Wellbeing? *Women in Management Review*, Vol 20, No 2, MCB UP Ltd, pp 86-95.
- Muller, H.J and Rowell, M (2002), *Mexican Women Managers, an Emerging profile*, Anderson Schools of Management, the University of New Mexico, IBM, Houston, Texas.
- Northouse, P.G (2004), *Leadership Theory and Practice (3rd ed)*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Park, D (1996), 'Gender Role, Decision Style and Leadership Style: *Women in Management Review*, Volume 11, Number 8, pp 13-17, MCB UP Ltd.
- Pitiyage, W.K (2000), Gender Inequality and Differences in Leadership Styles: Sri Lankan Banking and Finance Industry, *a Research Paper Submitted to the Post Graduate Institute of Management, University of Sri*

- Jayawardeneperura in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Master in Business Administration Degree, Colombo, 2000.
- Rendall, J (1990), *Women in an Industrializing Society: England 1750-1880*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Rosner, J.B (1990), 'Ways Women Lead', *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 68, No.6, pp 119-25.
- Schein, V. E, Muller, R (1992), 'Sex Role Stereotyping and Requisite Management Characteristics: a Cross Cultural Look', *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol 13, No 5, pp 439-47.
- Thayanithy, M (1998), Gender and Leadership Styles: a Comparative Study of Sri Lanka. Male and Female Managers in the Service Sector, *a Research Paper Submitted to the Post Graduate Institute of Management*, University of Sri Jayawardeneperura in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Master in Business Administration Degree, Colombo.
- Tremaine, M (2000), Women Mayors Say What it Takes to Lead: Setting Theory Against Lived Experience, *Women in Management Review*, Volume 15, Number 5/6, MCB UP Ltd, pp 246-252.
- Valentine, S and Godkin, L (2000), Supervisor Gender, Leadership Style, and Perceived
- Job Design, *Women in Management Review*, Volume 15, Number 3, MCB UP Ltd.
- Vilkinas, T and Cartan, G (1997), How Different are the Roles Displayed by Female and Male Managers?, *Women in Management Review*, Volume 12, Number 4, MCB UP Ltd, pp 129-135.
- Vilkinas, T (2000), The Gender Factor in Management: How Significant Others Perceive Effectiveness, *Women in Management Review*, Volume 15, Number 5/6, MCB UP Ltd, pp 261-272