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ABSTRACT

The effects of leadership style and sex-role deviation of female leaders on participant perceptions of leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction were tested. Sixty-four males and 64 females, ages 18 to 55 years, were recruited from undergraduate psychology classes at a southern California university to view four video vignettes depicting scenarios of a leader exhibiting either directive or participative leadership style, and acting in-role or out-of-role. Video presentation order was counterbalanced. A pilot questionnaire was distributed to 100 students to determine occupation and task for the vignettes. In-role task was identified as setting up a day care agenda and out-of role task was identified as establishing training procedures for hazardous material cleanup. It was expected that leaders would be perceived as more effective and, participants would have higher degrees of satisfaction for the leader and the task when the leader exhibited participative leadership styles over directive. Additionally, it was proposed that there would be significant differences with regard to sex-role deviation on
perceptions of the three dependent variables, with in-role conditions reporting greater degrees of satisfaction. Perceptions of leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction were assessed using the Leader Effectiveness Scale, Leader Satisfaction Survey, and Task Satisfaction Scale, respectively. A 2 X 2 within-subjects MANOVA was used to test for effects. Results showed main effects for leadership style and sex-role deviation of leaders. No interaction was found between leadership style and sex-role deviation on the dependent variables.
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INTRODUCTION

What are the attributes of a good leader? Some people may feel that a good leader is one who possesses extraordinary communication skills or exhibits an interpersonal style that motivates employees to perform to their highest capabilities. Some people may feel a good leader is an excellent planner who seeks feedback from subordinates in relation to goal-setting or decision-making processes. Others may form an attachment to a leader of the same gender as they may view the leader as a cohort. Still, some people may attribute leader effectiveness to a leader who leads in accordance with the subordinate's expectations. Whatever the case, leadership styles, as do individuals, differ.

Leadership

Interest in leadership dates back as early as the days of Plato and Caesar. The Chinese classics made mention of leadership and the counsel that leadership provided. In 1949, Franklin (as cited by Bass, 1981) stated that the ancient Egyptians made attributions to their king as having qualities which included authority, discrimination or power.
of making fine distinctions, and just behavior, where the
leader is guided by truth, reason, and fairness. One need
only to read excerpts from Homer's Iliad to understand the
Greeks' concepts of leadership. Agamemnon exemplified
judgment and justice, Odysseus exemplified shrewdness and
cunning, and Achilles personified valor and swift action.

As we move ahead to modern times, we find that the
traits which described leaders in Greek mythology have also
been applied to leaders of the past several decades. For
example, Gloria Steinam's ability to advocate equal rights
for women may reveal the same judgment and justice strengths
inherent in Agamemnon's leadership style. Achilles' swift
action can be identified in the traits of Lee Iacocca, whose
leadership rejuvenated an automobile company from near
bankruptcy to one which enjoyed an era of profitability.
Odysseus' capacity for cunning and shrewd tactics is the
same as the capacity by which coach Vince Lombardi elevated
the Green Bay Packers to become one of the most consistent
and dominating teams in the National Football League. One
needs only to refer to history to find examples where
leadership made a difference in an outcome. Throughout
history, military troops have won battles against more formidable foes under the strategic direction of a strong leader. Nations have risen to great power under the guidance of political leaders, and organizations have thrived amidst economic hardship under the guidance of organizational leaders.

Within the past 40 years, research has provided substantial evidence that leadership is an universal phenomenon. Regardless of culture, people want leadership (Bass, 1981). Attaining leadership can be thought of as a type of selection process or pre-determined appointment. Parenthood is one example of leadership which is pre-determined by the familial makeup of that group. Hierarchies are established by virtue of inheritance, whereby the leader is assigned based on family bloodline; by election, where a president or prime minister is voted in by the masses; or by natural emergence, whereby the leader emerges as a primary facilitator who guides the group in reaching a particular goal.

A significant portion of the human race has been fascinated by the power and influence by which individuals
have guided others to achieve a particular goal. For us to fully understand and appreciate the fascination, it is necessary to understand leadership and its concepts.

**Definition of Leadership**

What is leadership? Some say it is virtually impossible to define clearly the complex aspects of leadership, yet leadership has been defined in numerous ways. Broadly defined by Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly (1997), leadership is an attempt to use influence to motivate individuals to accomplish some goal. Leadership has also been defined by Michelner, DeLamater, and Schwartz (1990) as a group process that takes place whereby one member influences and controls the behavior of the other members toward some common goal. Fiedler (1986) defines leadership in his research as that part of management that involves the supervision of others; and leaders as those who, by ability, skills or resources, assist a collection of individuals in reaching their goals. According to Stogdill's authoritative *Handbook of Leadership* (Stogdill, 1974, p. 259), leadership has been defined as follows:

Leadership is an interaction between members of a
Leaders are agents of change, persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them. Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group.

For the purpose of this paper, leadership will be defined as a conglomeration of traits or characteristics within certain individuals which allows them to influence or motivate others to achieve an end product. Leadership may also be considered behaviorally based, whereby the leader's actions affects the motivation of an individual. This conglomeration of traits and/or behaviors can exhibit itself in a variety of forms and styles, and in many different settings. For the purpose of this study, the focus will be on organizational leadership, that is, the leadership which brings about progress and development of people within an organizational setting.

A Brief History of Leadership

Early Issues and Overview of Leadership Theory

What has been the focus of leadership study in the past? The study of leadership has generated vast literature
on the exercise of influence by leaders (Chacko, 1990). The earliest literature on leadership seemed to be concerned primarily with theoretical issues (Bass, 1981). Many theorists sought to explain leadership by identifying the different types of leadership and to determine how they related to the functional demands of a society. Early literature also focused on leadership traits and the conglomeration of traits became known as the "Great Man" approach. After a period of time, the focus of leadership study by the entire field was shifted to what leaders actually did, and several behavioral theories were developed (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fleishman, 1953; Likert, 1961). During this same period when researchers were examining behaviors, contingency theories arose which led to the exploration of leadership differences across situations. These theories became known as situational theories of leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1984).

Trait theory

Leadership Traits

As stated earlier, the earliest literature on leadership focused on the traits of the leader under the
premise that "leaders are born, not made." This approach has often been labeled as the "Great Man" approach. Traits identified through this approach were physical, cognitive or intellectual, personality, and social characteristics within an individual.

**Physical traits.** How does one identify strong leadership traits? As stated earlier, ancient civilizations and Greek mythology enumerated traits of their leaders as cunning, valor, swift action, resourcefulness, judgment and justice (Bass, 1981). For the past century, however, when researchers sought to identify strong leadership traits they usually approached different groups of individuals and asked them to list the traits which they believed were essential to leadership. The diversity of group members contributed to a diverse listing of traits. For example, some of the physical characteristics which were thought to be of importance to capable leaders included appropriate height, weight and physique or energy (Kohs & Irle, 1920). These traits were based on the characteristics of military leaders and leaders in athletics. Society thought that capable leaders should be taller and heavier than the average
person, and be in excellent physical shape.

**Cognitive traits.** Intelligence, scholastic ability and knowledge were yet another series of traits which suggested good leadership characteristics (Hunter & Jordan, 1939). One of the most significant findings concerning the relation of intelligence to leadership was that given superior groups of children to lead (i.e. children with above average levels of intelligence), the leading tended to be done by the gifted and more intelligently advanced children (Finch & Carroll, 1932). In other words, children who were superior academically than other children emerged as leaders in playground settings.

**Personality traits.** Traits considered to be important to leadership were revealed as an individual's capacity for soundness and finality of judgment, and the speed and accuracy of thought and decision. Soundness of judgment was defined as the degree to which common sense was used to render judgment, and the speed and accuracy of decision, or degree to which a problem was solved correctly and expeditiously, suggested that the individual was competent or accomplished in that particular area (Bellingrath, 1930;
Drake, 1944; Webb, 1915), and needed only a minimal amount of time to make a decision.

Other personality traits identified in the early 1900s were adaptability to changing situations (Eichler, 1934), dominance or desire to impose will (Drake, 1944), initiative and ambition (Dunkerley, 1940), and integrity and conviction (Michels, 1915). A leader's ability to adapt to change may have been regarded traditionally as an aspect of intelligence but it could have been due also to social components in that person's personality. Dominance was another trait which had perplexing implications. Results of these early studies have suggested that in some instances, leaders were found to be more dominating than nonleaders, while in other studies, leaders and nonleaders did not differ in terms of dominance (Eichler, 1934).

In the areas of initiative, persistence, and ambition, research findings seem to be in agreement. Initiative or willingness to assume responsibility was found to be a trait ascribed to leaders (Dunkerley, 1940; Drake, 1944) as was persistence in the face of obstacles and ambition or desire to excel. Integrity and strength of convictions were traits
which were ascribed more frequently to mature or adult leaders than to children or to nonleaders.

**Social traits.** There were many social traits ascribed to leaders in early research, the most dominant being self-confidence or self-assurance, mood optimism or controlled in mood, and emotional control or stability. Bellingrath (1930) found self-confidence to be just one factor possessed by different types of leaders. Drake (1944), and Webb (1915), found that a cheerful disposition was associated with leadership, as subordinates perceived even-tempered leaders as more in control of moods, thereby reducing the imposition of negative feelings into the mission or task.

The trait for which there were inconsistent findings was emotional control. Several studies showed a high correlation between self-control or stability and leadership qualities (Bellingrath, 1930; Drake, 1944), yet Cox (1926) found that leaders exhibiting high-excitability were rated higher for leaders than nonleaders.

As stated earlier, leadership styles differ, as do individuals. Traits ascribed to effective leaders in past
research have been identified but these traits have not been conclusive. Perceptions of traits necessary for effective leadership, which have been ascribed to leaders by nonleaders, have shown variance based on personalities of the leaders and the situation given the leader. As our social, political, and organizational demands become more complex and demanding, so does the breadth of the traits ascribed to the leaders of today.

Outcomes of early trait theories. After a century of literature and research on trait theory, have we been able to narrow down and identify significant physical, cognitive, or personality traits of leadership? Trait theory involving physical characteristics of leadership has largely been abandoned (Kenny & Zaccaro, 1983). Reviews of the leadership literature demonstrate that "no single trait or group of characteristics has been isolated which distinguishes the leader from members of the group" (Murphy, 1941, p. 674), although in Stogdill's (1948) review, height of the leader was shown to be a trait associated with male leaders according to subordinate perceptions. Athletic prowess and appearance were two other traits which were thought to be
associated with leadership ability but have not been shown to be related to leader effectiveness (Mann, 1959).

**Present-Day Leadership Traits**

Have ascribed leadership traits changed from past to present? For the most part, leadership traits identified in the past are still ascribed today (Lord, Devadar, & Alliger, 1986). However, as goals and tasks have become more complex, so have trait descriptives.

The most frequently studied characteristics of leadership included intelligence, dominance, adjustment, and masculinity. Mann (1959), and Stogdill (1948), found intelligence to be the trait most highly associated with leadership ability. Recent literature in favor of trait approach has been examined by Lord et al., (1986). These researchers performed a study on personality traits and leadership perceptions and leader emergence. They performed a meta-analysis and found that leadership correlated with intelligence at .50, with masculinity at .34, extraversion at .26, adjustment at .24, and dominance at .13. Statistical significance was found for only three of the traits, intelligence, masculinity, and dominance across studies. One
conclusion which can be drawn from these correlations is that based on subject and situational difference, intelligence, masculinity, and dominance are the personality traits which are significantly related to leadership skill yet today.

In terms of physical characteristics, we find that people ascribe the same traits to leadership as in the past. Height, weight, and appearance of the leader remain somewhat stable in subordinates' perceptions. Height and appearance still seem to be the most prominent traits ascribed to leaders but these traits have not been empirically supported (Jackson & Ervin, 1992).

Societal, political, and organizational changes have contributed to increases in the list of personality traits ascribed to leaders from past to present. As the use of technology in business has increased and with downsizing, leaders have had to adapt to very different situational constraints. Changes in job structure associated with reorganization and focus on customer satisfaction have resulted in the expansion of personality traits. These new characteristics include adjustment and normality, alertness,
enthusiasm and energy, originality or creativity, and tolerance for stress (Stogdill, 1974; Kanter, 1977).

Adjustment or normality, and tolerance for stress are now ascribed as a necessary component for leaders to be able to function effectively in a dynamic, stressful, and ever-changing environment (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Alertness and enthusiasm are now considered traits which are also necessary for a leader to possess in order to be able to motivate a diverse group of individuals. As our measurement focus has broadened to include those who are being lead, it makes sense to include these two characteristics.

Having examined the most common leadership traits ascribed to leaders by leaders and nonleaders alike, it must be stated that the premise that some leadership traits are absolutely necessary for effective leadership has not been substantiated in several decades of trait research. Leader effectiveness is not guaranteed simply because a leader possesses many of these particular traits (Stogdill, 1974). The relative importance of differing traits may be dependent upon the nature of the leadership situation and the members
of the group being lead. Differing forms of leadership may also be dependent upon situation or relationship with group members.

Forms of Leadership

Behavioral Theories

Ohio State studies. During the 1950s and 1960s, the focus of leadership study shifted from traits to behaviors, with the intent to identify the behaviors of effective leaders (Fleishman, 1953). What actions did these leaders perform that enabled them to be perceived as effective by their subordinates? This question was answered, at least in part, in the results of the Ohio State leadership studies. Psychologists sought to determine effective leadership behavior through questionnaire research. Their initial task was to identify behaviors which promoted leadership effectiveness. Through distribution of questionnaires, subordinates were asked to describe the behaviors of their leader and a list of approximately 1800 examples of leadership behavior was compiled. Most of the statements were assigned to several subscales. The list was then reduced to 150 items that appeared to be good examples of
important leadership functions (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957). A factor analysis was performed on these items and two primary behaviors emerged: Initiating structure (IS) and consideration (C). Initiating structure was defined as the degree to which a leader defines and structures subordinates' roles in task completion or in attainment of organizational goals (Yukl, 1994). IS could involve, for example, detailing the tasks or providing a structure for completion of a task to subordinates, or by showing subordinates how to perform a task by performing the task. Yukl (1994) also cites examples of IS as the leader emphasizing the importance of meeting deadlines, criticizing poor work, maintaining definite standards of performance, and coordinating subordinate activities.

Consideration is defined as "degree to which a leader acts in a friendly and supportive manner, shows concern for subordinates, and looks out for their welfare" (Yukl, 1994, p. 54). Consideration behavior could involve the leader actively listening to subordinate concerns, and encouraging and supporting subordinates in their efforts. In addition, other examples might include a leader consulting with
subordinates on important decisions, going to bat for a subordinate, or being willing to accept subordinate suggestions.

From the independent factors that were identified as IS and C, three questionnaires were developed which are still used today for describing leadership behaviors. The Supervisor Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) is a listing of leader behaviors which is filled out by subordinates who are instructed to identify their leaders' behaviors by how frequently the leader exhibits each behavior on the list. The second questionnaire was named the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and this questionnaire has been revised and is now known as the LBDQ--Form XII (Stogdill, 1963). This form is the most widely used of the two subordinate questionnaires as it measures aspects of leadership behavior (e.g. representation, integration), traits, and skills (i.e. persuasiveness, predictive accuracy). The third questionnaire is a self-description report, the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ).

Although the questionnaires have reliability
coefficients ranging from .76 to .89, there are inherent concerns which arise when utilizing these questionnaires. The concerns are that subordinates do not always see the leader behaviors so they may answer the questions based on their implicit beliefs regarding their leader. When self-reports are used, as is the case when using the LOQ, bias may be present when a leader is asked to rate him/herself (Yukl, 1994).

**Outcomes of initiating structure and consideration.** A significant correlational study by Fleishman and Harris (1962) in a truck manufacturing plant revealed robust relationships between IS and C. These researchers found that as consideration behaviors increased, employee turnover and written grievances decreased. When consideration was low, turnover and grievances increased. When consideration was high, turnover was low regardless of the level of initiating structure. As IS increased, the grievances also increased. Fleishman and Harris discovered a curvilinear aspect in their results which indicated a threshold in the interaction between IS and C. According to these researchers, there appeared to be critical levels beyond which decreased IS or
increased C had no effect on turnover or number of grievances filed.

The "bottom line" in the study by Fleishman and Harris (1962) is that consideration is necessary for employee satisfaction and when an organization has high consideration, IS will be more accepted by subordinates. Furthermore, when identifying behavioral characteristics of leaders today, IS and C are the two behaviors which are most prevalent in changing workplace environments. Leaders tend to exhibit these behaviors more frequently than other behavioral leadership characteristics.

To what degree should leaders exhibit these behaviors to be considered effective? In 1982, Blake and Mouton expanded research of the Ohio State studies and developed a managerial grid separating leadership behaviors by initiating structure and consideration. They contended that leadership behavior, showing concern for both task (IS) and people (C), is qualitatively different from leadership behavior showing a concern for only task or only people. Leaders who show concern for both task and people are, in their terms, "high-high" leaders, and conversely, those who
show little concern for task or people are "low-low" leaders. Leaders who show high concern for task and little concern for personnel are thought of as being "authoritative" or "high-low" leaders, while those who show little concern for task but high concern for people are referred to as "Country Club" or "low-high" leaders.

 Typical behaviors of a "high-high" leader would be encouraging participative goal-setting by subordinates, and also interacting with subordinates to gain their input in improving departmental or organizational quality (Blake & Mouton, 1982). For this reason, high-high leadership is thought of as a form of "team management." Leaders who are "high-low" may establish difficult or challenging goals but will not seek employee input for determining the goals. They will pressure subordinates to improve quality. "Low-high" leaders may ignore quality problems but may show concern for subordinates in an attempt to make the workplace a more pleasant environment (Yukl, 1994), while the "low-low" leader ignores task and quality problems while showing indifference to subordinates' needs. Blake and Mouton (1982) refer to this type of leader as "impoverished."
Based on these leadership behavior descriptives, Misumi (1985) proposed that effective leaders are those who show high concern for task and high concern for people. An additive version of this theory suggests that task-oriented behavior and person-oriented behavior have additive, yet independent effects on leadership effectiveness. For example, task-oriented behaviors facilitate role clarification and understanding of roles by subordinates, and facilitate better resource utilization. Person-oriented behaviors may be instrumental for promoting teamwork and organizational commitment. If both outcomes are important to the organization, then both behaviors are necessary but may be exhibited independently. The effective leader is one who can achieve the goals through the efforts of employees while utilizing subordinates' feedback and showing concern for these employees (Misumi, 1985).

**Michigan State studies.** At approximately the same time as the Ohio State studies were being conducted, a major contribution to research on leadership behavior was being conducted at the University of Michigan (Yukl, 1994). The focus of the Michigan questionnaire research was to compare
behaviors of effective and ineffective leadership behaviors by identifying relationships among leader behavior, group processes, and group performance measures.

Likert (1961) summarized the results from these studies which were gathered regarding supervisory employees employed by manufacturing plants (Katz & Kahn, 1952), and insurance companies (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950), along with supervisors of railroad section gangs (Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, & Floor, 1951). Three behaviors (task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and participative leadership) were identified by survey responses which differentiated between effective and ineffective leaders.

Task-oriented behavior was the initial behavior identified. This behavior is somewhat aligned with the IS behaviors presented in the Ohio State studies in that with this behavior, leaders provide structure and clarify the roles of the subordinate. The differentiation between effective and ineffective leaders was that effective leaders concentrated more on the planning and scheduling of work assignments, providing necessary tools and resources, and coordinating the subordinate activities rather than
performing the work themselves (Likert, 1961).

The second behavior identified was relationship-oriented behavior, whereby the leader interacts with employees and shows genuine concern for their problems. According to Yukl (1994), examples of relationship-oriented behaviors are showing confidence, acting friendly and considerate, listening to subordinate concerns, understanding employee problems, and assisting and supporting subordinates in the development of their career. This behavior resembles the behavior described by the Ohio State studies as consideration.

Likert (1961) suggested that leaders who use general supervision rather than close supervision, and who are considerate, supportive, and helpful to subordinates tend to be perceived as more effective than leaders who tend to "micro-manage" subordinates. Relationships with employees may be necessary to foster employee trust and commitment, but the benefits of group relations are also to be considered.

Participative leadership, the third behavior, is simply the use of group supervision of subordinates. Instead of
supervising each subordinate separately, a leader may utilize work groups to monitor actions of subordinates, while he/she facilitates conversations and promotes cooperation between group members (Coch & French, 1948). Subordinates are also encouraged to participate in decision-making processes with the leader. Participative leadership has been shown to be effective in that subordinate participation in decision-making tends to result in higher subordinate satisfaction and performance (French, 1950).

Implications of behavioral theory. Behavioral theories of leadership have helped to explain the interaction between leader behavior and followers' reactions to that behavior. The two prevalent behaviors identified are initiating structure and consideration. It has been established that task-related behaviors are necessary to clarify subordinate roles and providing structure for completion of the task. It has also been established that subordinates tend to prefer leaders who interact with them, seek their input, and show genuine concern for their problems. Reciprocal exchanges between leader and follower provide the level of interaction
Leadership Styles

Leadership styles are behaviorally-based. A leader can be characterized as possessing a certain style of leadership based on the frequency and consistency of display of a certain type of behavior. This consistency of behavior may become a "trademark" of that leader's style, according to subordinates (Bass, 1990; Berlew & Heller, 1983; Sargent & Miller, 1971). Since there are many situations that require leadership, which leadership styles tend to be exhibited most frequently?

Directive Leadership

Bass (1981) broke down leadership into two distinct categories: directive and participative. Directive leadership style has been characterized as authoritative and autocratic. The directive leader may give directions or orders to subordinates. The leader then takes on an active role in problem identification and decision making. The decision is ultimately made by the leader and the leader expects the subordinates to follow his/her plan.

Directive or direction leadership can be broken down
further into three different sub-styles. The first style is exhibited when the leader decides and/or announces a decision without consulting subordinates beforehand, usually when the decision is of utmost importance to the organization or when time is a factor for implementation of an activity or decision. Although it may appear that subordinate feedback may be beneficial for expedient decision-making in this situation, there may be covert factors as to why subordinate feedback is not sought. The decision may be one which is not popular, or it may be that the organization desires confidentiality with the decision. In this case, the decision is usually made by the leader without explanation so this style of leadership has been named "telling." The second style which is referred to as "negotiating," varies to the degree of input sought from subordinates toward the decision-making process. The leader who incorporates this style of leadership may manipulate, sell, or negotiate an idea to a group in lieu of giving orders (Bass, 1990). Berlew and Heller (1983) expand upon this idea even further by suggesting that leaders may try to use persuasion, logic and reason to get their ideas "sold"
to subordinates. They may also assert a need or expectation and then use pressure tactics or even rewards to gain acceptance. This style of leadership has been termed "selling."

Eagly and Karau (1991) elaborate on Stogdill's (1974) definition of directive leadership style by defining directive leadership qualities as independent, masterful, assertive and competent. In a later study by Eagly and Johnson (1993), these qualities were broadened to include task-oriented, forceful and dominant. The behaviors associated with directive leadership would be exhibited when a leader behaves autocratically and discourages subordinates from participating in decision-making processes, or when a leader simply informs subordinates as to what their roles are, what is expected of them in terms of performance and productivity levels or "telling" subordinates about a decision already made, without asking for their input. An example of directive communication (Sargent & Miller, 1971) is described as a leader stating, "I want you to. . .," or "You will be expected to. . ."
Participative Leadership

The second major form of leadership style is participative. This style is dramatically opposed to directive. Stogdill (1974) discusses three levels of participative interaction with subordinates. In the first level, the leader consults with subordinates before deciding what is to be done. Subordinates are asked for ideas and input in a democratic forum of open discussion. The second level requires full participation by both superior and subordinate to reach a decision, and the third level is characterized as a delegating or empowering stage. The superior delegates the task, defines each member's role, and facilitates the movement toward goal attainment. The superior basically relinquishes power and empowers the subordinates to make decisions.

Berlew and Heller (1983) further discussed differing forms of participative-style leadership. These researchers mentioned drawing others in, actively listening to subordinates' concerns and ideas, and gaining acceptance through engaging subordinates in the planning and decision-making processes. Leaders who exhibit
participative-style leadership may possess a friendly demeanor and unselfish behavior. They may also be emotionally expressive, helpful to subordinates, and they may show genuine concern for their subordinates' needs. With this style of leadership, the leader remains an active member but also may treat subordinates as equal contributors. The leader equalizes power and there is a sharing of ideas and consensus in the decision-making process. The leader also assists in helping to make the subordinates feel comfortable enough to participate freely in discussions or problem-solving tasks. This assistance is usually accomplished by the leader asking questions, reacting positively to suggestions and ideas, and creating an open forum environment. According to Sargent and Miller (1971), an example of participative communication is described as a leader asking, "What are your thoughts about this?" or "What do you think can we do?" Based on the characteristics of leaders who use participative leadership, the leader is usually perceived as having strong social and interpersonal communication skills (Eagly & Karau, 1991).

**Multiplicity of styles.** It is important to note that
very few leaders use only a single leadership style (Bass & Valenzi, 1974). As stated earlier, the nature of the task or the urgency of making a critical decision might influence the leader into assuming a leadership style which is uncharacteristic of the normal style exhibited on a daily basis. If a task has an outcome which critically impacts the organization, the leader may not have the time to interact with subordinates to form a strategy. The decision must be made immediately and the leader may need to incorporate a directive style to gain acceptance of the plan from subordinates at a later time. Conversely, if a leader has a complex task or decision, he/she may adopt a more participative style to gain input from subordinates and may delegate portions or all of that task to the group.

To examine the multiplicity of leadership styles. Bass and Valenzi (1974) performed a study which examined the frequency of change of leadership style and the variability of sub-styles of leadership. The subjects were 124 subordinates who were asked to describe how frequently their superiors used six styles or sub-styles of leadership. The six sub-styles ranged from deciding without explaining
(directive) to delegating decisions to subordinates (participative). A leader was classified as exhibiting a singular approach if the subordinate indicated that the leader exhibited only one of the styles or sub-styles. Leaders were classified as exhibiting a dual approach if they were described as displaying two styles "very often" and/or "always" with the remaining styles "seldom" or "never." Of the 124 subordinates, 117, or 95% of the cases, indicated that their boss exhibited a multi-style approach versus only 4% who indicated that their superior exhibited a single or dual approach.

Leadership Studies

The trait and behavioral theories of leadership demonstrate that there are many methods for examining leadership effectiveness. Researchers have examined relationships between differing leadership characteristics and subordinate job satisfaction, job performance and productivity, and perceptions of leadership ability and effectiveness (Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993). As prior studies focused primarily on employee perceptions, attitudes and behaviors toward different styles of leadership, this study
will examine participant perceptions and responses to differing leadership styles.

Building upon the multiplicity of styles concept, it makes sense to investigate which leadership style is most commonly used, according to both subordinates and leaders. According to Maier (1965), subordinates will prefer participation rather than direction if they are seeking personal growth, if they are highly interested in the task objectives, or if they are looking for opportunities for becoming more creative. Gillespie (1980) concluded, from self-reports of 48 manufacturing executives, that participative leadership was most frequently used, especially among the top executives. In agreement with Gillespie's findings, Kraitem (1981) found that participative leadership was favored in self-reports of top executives of financial institutions, especially when the style displayed was primarily consultative in nature. Directive approaches were exhibited less frequently. However, certain situations or crises may warrant directive leadership and subordinates may agree with their superior that direction is called for in these instances (Stogdill,
1974). Some subordinates may want to avoid the pressure of dealing with conflict and may actually feel relieved when the decision is "out of their hands."

It is important to note that different behaviors may be combined to define a particular leadership style. For example, directive leadership involves behaviors similar to initiating structure, task-oriented behaviors, and authoritative leadership. Participative leadership, on the other hand, encompasses consideration, relationship-oriented behaviors, and democratic leadership. Leadership style is determined by the leader showing consistency in the display of these behaviors. A leader may exhibit both directive and participative behaviors at different times, but the predominant style attributed to the leader is the style which he/she consistently displays.

**Outcomes of directive and participative leadership.**

What effects on productivity and job satisfaction occur when one style is used over another? In many organizations, the leadership "culture" is determined by the leadership style that is prevalent among its hierarchy. Some organizations support participative leadership style and promote leaders
who are capable of exhibiting that style. Conversely, organizations might employ a workforce where leaders need to be directive in order to be effective. An example of this culture might be an organization which is unionized.

Beehr and Gupta (1987) reported results from a study which they performed in 1972. The study examined the relationship between organizations' managerial styles and employee responses. The organizations' management styles were either directive (autocratic) or participative (democratic). Employee responses were measured as attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction), and behaviors (e.g., absenteeism). These researchers collected data from two organizations which manufactured automobile accessories. Organization A employed about 400 people and their leaders exhibited a participative or democratic approach. Leaders within this organization often questioned employees and sought their input to improve processes. Examples of the participative approach included the use of work groups or teams. These teams participated in decisions concerning procedures, work methods and quality-of-work-life policies. Organization B consisted of 600 employees and its leaders incorporated a
traditional managerial style. (This organization was also unionized). Organization B emphasized hierarchical authority, and employees had little or no direct input on matters which affected their work. Leaders in Organization B did not seek input from subordinates and they utilized a "telling" style of leadership. The decisions were made by the leader and upper management.

Beehr and Gupta (1987) found that leadership style had a main effect on job-related attitudes: job satisfaction and job involvement. In each case, the participative style of leadership in Organization A was related to more positive attitudes, i.e., greater satisfaction, greater involvement and lower job search intent. The behaviors, perceptions and work-related attitudes of employees in Organization A were more favorable than among employees in the traditional, hierarchical organization.

Recent findings. More recently, studies have been performed which examine relationships between supervisory leadership styles and job satisfaction. Wilkinson and Wagner (1993) were interested in employee responses to differing styles of leadership. The employees were all vocational
rehabilitation counselors employed in the state of Missouri. In this study, Wilkinson and Wagner defined the leadership construct as having two styles, directive (the extent to which the leader engaged in one-way communication) and supportive (the extent to which the leader engaged in two-way communication). The supportive style consisted of all of the characteristics which are associated with participative leadership. These researchers investigated leadership effects on job satisfaction, and how the degree of satisfaction affected performance and productivity.

The results from Wilkinson's and Wagner's (1993) study suggested that intrinsic satisfaction (satisfaction inherent in the work itself) was greater with supportive leadership than with directive. In predicting satisfaction with the supervision, there was greater satisfaction with supportive leadership coupled with "coaching" or encouraging employees. The supportive leadership style paralleled participative leadership. The greatest level of satisfaction was reported when leadership was high in support and low in direction, indicating that some degree of directive leadership is necessary for monitoring performance, especially when
coupled with coaching/supportive leadership.

Productivity of these vocational rehabilitation employees was evaluated in terms of outcome measures taken for a one-year period. Productivity was measured as the number of applications taken, number of initial rehabilitation plans developed, number of successfully rehabilitated cases, and the number of successfully rehabilitated severely disabled cases. After having determined the satisfaction levels with leadership style, the counselors were divided into high and low satisfaction groups. The high satisfaction group reported increased productivity in terms of the productivity criteria. When subordinates experience high satisfaction with the leader, productivity tends to improve. When subordinates hold lower levels of satisfaction with leadership, productivity may suffer (Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993).

Subordinate preferences for leadership styles were again examined in another study which was performed in a health care organization. Preferred and actual leadership styles were determined with the incorporation of several new variables. The relationship between work-related values and
selected leadership contingencies, including gender, hierarchical position, and preferred and actual leadership style was examined (Jensen, White, & Singh, 1990).

Jensen et al., (1990) described leadership style in an ordinal fashion. The leadership labels ranged from 1 to 4. Manager 1 was described as having directive qualities which were defined as the leader making decisions promptly and communicating them to his/her subordinates clearly and firmly, expecting the subordinate to carry out the decisions loyally, without raising difficulties. Manager 4 was described as exhibiting participative or consulting qualities which were defined as the leader calling meetings of his/her subordinates to discuss an important decision. The leader puts the problem before the group and invites discussion. He/she accepts the majority viewpoint as the decision. The characteristics of Managers 2 and 3 were slightly different from Managers 1 and 4, with Manager 2 exhibiting directive qualities, but to a lesser degree. Manager 3 was described as being mostly participative, but also to a lesser degree. Each manager was asked to describe his/her leader in an ordinal fashion as to degree of
The results of this study showed a significant effect of satisfaction with work environment only for gender. Males were found to be less concerned with work environment than females. The perceived leadership effect of employees having Type 1 managers (managers described as having Manager 1 qualities) indicated less harmony with the job. Overall, employees who had managers exhibiting participative (Manager 4) characteristics reported the greatest values of harmony. Supervisory personnel desired more change in their immediate supervisor's leadership style (i.e., more participatory) than did their own subordinates (Jensen et al., 1990). With regard to hierarchy or position effect, nurses indicated less harmony with the job, followed by administrators. These findings complement the findings of Beehr and Gupta (1987) that leadership style may be perceived (or practiced) differently as a function of hierarchical level, and with Wilkinson and Wagner (1993) that employees generally prefer participatory leadership styles.

Leadership styles of women. There has been a marked increase in the proportion of women in managerial and
leadership positions in the past several decades. In 1964, women made up 34% of the workforce in the United States. In 1994, women accounted for up to 46% and comprised 42% of all managers and professionals (Solomon, 1995). Moreover, nearly 3 out of 10 lower and middle managerial positions in private industry are now held by women, triple the percentage of 9.6% in 1966 (Belsky & Berger, 1995). Over the past five years, the number of women-owned businesses has increased 42% to almost 8 million. These businesses employ 35% more workers in the United States than all of the 1994 Fortune 500 companies. Although affirmative action has played a major role in opening doors for women in managerial positions, women have broadened their skills through education and job experience (Lott & Maluso, 1995). As a result, women have been able to secure positions of higher salary and this increase in salary has been a major factor contributing to the increased percentage of women-owned businesses (Solomon, 1995).

**Personality differences by gender in leadership traits.**

To gain a better understanding of subordinate reactions to leaders and subordinate perceptions of leadership ability,
it becomes necessary to identify some characteristics or traits of leadership as attributed by gender. Ashmore and Del Boca (1979) identified personality differences by gender in leadership traits as perceived by subordinates. They broke down these characteristics into two categories: "hard" and "soft" traits.

"Hard" traits were predominantly ascribed to male leaders. Personality characteristics included scientific thinking, critical, inventive, stern, shrewd, and dominating. The "soft" personality traits were ascribed mainly to female targets. These traits consisted of the leader being sentimental, naive, wavering, and squeamish.

Earlier research by Schein (1973, 1975) examined requisite management characteristics in terms of leadership attributes and leadership traits. In her study, Schein incorporated a Descriptive Index of 92 adjectives describing personality attributes and traits of male and female leaders. The Descriptive Index was transcribed into survey form and distributed to 167 female, and 300 male managers. Male managers perceived a successful manager to have characteristics more commonly attributed to males than to
females. Female managers attributed characteristics more commonly ascribed to males. The attributes associated with women middle-line managers were modest, creative, and cheerful, while the traits associated with women, in general, included intuitive, helpful, humanitarian values, awareness of others, and caring. The strongest traits identified were competitive, self-confident, objective, aggressive, forceful, ambitious, emotionally stable, steady, analytical ability, logical, consistent, and well-informed, and these traits were more commonly ascribed to male leaders (Schein, 1975). In addition to identifying the perceptions of subordinates toward attributions and traits of effective leaders, it may also be advantageous to gain an understanding as to how these characteristics are incorporated into leadership styles.

Women are entering positions which have substantial impact on the organization. They must be able to motivate and guide employees to help their organizations thrive in a competitive market. As the number of female leaders has increased, it has become beneficial to examine employee reactions to the differences in leadership styles of men and
women. The evaluation of female leaders is essential as earlier research on leadership focused mainly on subordinates evaluating male leaders.

As stated earlier, characteristics of participative leadership included friendliness, helpfulness, emotional expression and concern. These characteristics appear to be more prevalent in traditionally female sex roles than in traditional male sex roles. In the business arena, the behaviors or attributes of female leaders have been taken into account by peers, superiors, and subordinates, and these groups tend to perceive leader competency based on these attributions.

Although women in leadership positions tend to exhibit the leadership characteristics which are considered the most effective in terms of subordinate productivity and subordinate job satisfaction, women have nevertheless reached a plateau in climbing the corporate ladder. Many researchers attribute sex-role stereotyping as one of the possible causes for this "leveling" or "glass ceiling" effect.
Stereotypes

Stereotyping has been defined as an overgeneralized, oversimplified, and self-perpetuating belief about people's personal characteristics (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1997). These researchers explain stereotyping as a four-step process where we first categorize people into groups by criteria such as age, gender, race or even occupation. Secondly, we infer that all people within a particular category possess the same traits or characteristics. The third process occurs as we form expectations about people in these groups and, finally, we interpret behavior according to these stereotypes. Stereotypes are self-perpetuating because people tend to form self-confirming biases by noticing things that reinforce their expectations of that stereotype and not noticing things that do not. Ashmore and Del Boca (1979, p. 225) reformulated the generic definition of stereotype as a "structured set of inferential relations that link a social category with personal attributes."

Sex-stereotyping. Sex-stereotyping has been defined by researchers in four different ways. First, a sex stereotype is generally regarded as a cognitive scheme. It is a belief,
perception, judgment or expectation about the traits of an individual or group. Second, a sex stereotype is defined as an assemblage of beliefs. Third, a sex stereotype is seen as a collection of beliefs about what women and men are like, particularly the "psychological traits" or "personalities" of women and men. Finally, a sex stereotype includes a set of beliefs about personal characteristics of men and women, which are shared by members of a group (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1979).

Lott and Maluso (1995 p. 14) distinguish sex stereotyping as "well-learned, widely shared, socially validated general beliefs or cognitions about women, which reinforce, complement, or justify the prejudices and often involve an assumption of inferiority." These stereotypes often have an effect on perceptions of women as leaders or managers in the business arena, as they may become apparent when a woman is denied promotion or advancement, thus becoming sex-role stereotypes.

**Sex-Role Stereotyping**

Sex role stereotyping is the belief that differing traits and abilities make men and women particularly
well-suited to different roles (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1994). Society has defined specific expectations regarding the roles of men and women. As these expectations are reinforced, they become norms, and when violation in norms occur (i.e. sex-role deviation), there may be penalties for the man or woman who assumes a role contrary to those expectations (Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek, & Pascale, 1975; Isaacs, 1981; Schein, 1973). Examples include a family who has an ill family member and asks for a female nurse when a male nurse is available, or when a woman in an upper-level leadership position is ignored in conference meetings.

**Sex-Role Socialization.** Early in their development, women and men begin to understand what their expected roles are (Maccoby, 1988). Maccoby concluded that gender-differentiated play styles and modes of exerting peer influence affect social relationships from preschool through puberty. Because schooling reflects many of our values and beliefs as a society, it facilitates the manner by which gender differences are learned, fostered, and encouraged. For example, athletics has long been a primary activity in
secondary schools in the United States for males, but female athletic participation and support has not been similarly fostered. Little boys are encouraged to be athletes, and as athletes are taught to be competitive and achievement-oriented. In many cases, females are given the role of spectator or cheerleader, where essential characteristics include poise, attractiveness, and charm. Furthermore, these young women learn that being a supporter of men is an expected role for their gender. In their sex-role socialization, women are expected to be passive, nurturing, and social. Men, on the other hand, are taught that dominance, independence, aggressiveness, and creativeness are attributes which will enable them to be successful in their lives and livelihoods (Rosenkrantz, Bee, Vogel, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968). Based on sex-role socialization, men are conditioned to shape their behaviors and to perfect their skills which relate to leadership ability, while women are conditioned to play a more passive role.

Negative outcomes of occupational sex stereotyping. The existence of sex role stereotypes have been documented by
numerous researchers (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1979; Gibson et al., 1994; Lott & Maluso, 1995; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Schein, 1973). There are numerous situations in business where sex stereotyping may have a negative affect on women. Sex stereotyping can be an immobilizing factor in recruiting and hiring (Gibson et al., 1997), performance appraisal outcomes (O'Leary & Hansen, 1983), litigation (Lott & Maluso, 1995), occupational training and information (Lott & Maluso, 1995), differences in pay scales between men and women (Lott & Maluso, 1995; O'Leary & Hansen, 1983) and promotional opportunities (Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Schein, 1973). In some instances, the stereotype may have an adverse effect when a woman does not "get in the door" or is overlooked in the hiring or recruiting phases of personnel selection. If the position to be filled is one that does not typically fit the traditional gender role within that stereotype, there may be a tendency for the female candidate to be discriminated against (Gibson, et al., 1997). According to Schein, one reason for the limited number of women managers and executives is that traditional male attitudes towards women at the professional and managerial levels continue to block
change. Halpern (1996) suggests that when females do not fare as well as males on standardized selection tests, which have a tendency to show adverse impact, they may find themselves placed in low status professions, earning less pay than their male counterparts. Judging from the high ratio of men to women in managerial positions, by the aspects of the job position itself, and by the attributes ascribed to successful leaders, the managerial job may be classified by some as a masculine occupation.

**Sex-Role Deviation**

Sex-role deviation occurs when a person is acting out of his/her expected role. Sex-role deviation takes place when a woman attempts to gain entrance into a field which is predominantly male-oriented (Colwill, 1987; Goktepe & Schneier, 1989; Lott & Maluso, 1995). A recent example of this can been witnessed by the controversy that accompanied Shannon Faulkner's entrance into the Citadel, a military academy. The Citadel, prior to Faulkner's arrival, was strictly a male institution. Faulkner's new role in the Citadel was contrary to the traditional norms. As a result, she was considered to be out of her role. A person is said
to be in-role when he/she takes on an expected societal role, and is said to be out-of-role when he/she takes on a role which is uncharacteristic of his/her gender norm (Colwill, 1987).

**Occupational sex-role deviation.** Denmark (1993) discusses socialization of men and women in relation to their assignment of occupational roles. She states that traditional male occupational roles emphasize competitiveness and achievement-related skills, while typical female socialization involves instead only preparation for domestic roles as wife and mother, or lower-level traditional jobs in the workplace (e.g. secretary, receptionist). As a result, women may tend to feel that the roles they are suited for are the traditional roles society has imposed.

According to Entine and Nichols (1997), women are now beginning to relish the opportunities presented in the business arena and these opportunities may run counter to prior societal sex-role expectations. Consequently, more women are emerging as leaders in corporate America.

**Leadership emergence.** Emergent leadership has important
implications for organizations in areas such as personnel selection, training, and the identification and development of leaders, including the emergence of women leaders (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989). Early leadership research was primarily focused on the behaviors of appointed or elected leaders. As these leaders were assigned their status, either through promotion or election, most of the studies were conducted largely with men, due to the organizational barriers which have prevented women from achieving a similar promotion. In the 1980s, as more women were promoted in organizations, researchers used the opportunity to study leader emergence among women.

Goktepe and Schneier (1989) examined the influence of sex and gender role characteristics on the selection of emergent leaders. The selection was based on subordinate reactions to gender role and gender of the leader. Their research demonstrated that sex is not a predictor of leader emergence, but that sex-role orientation (i.e., a masculine gender role) is associated with leader emergence. Those who had described themselves with masculine characteristics, based on the Bem Sex Role Inventory, emerged as leaders.
within groups significantly more than those with feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated gender roles (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989).

In the early 1990s, a succession of research contributed significantly to the area of leadership emergence. Eagly, in a series of three meta-analyses, investigated gender and leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), gender and the emergence of leaders (Eagly & Karau, 1991), and gender and evaluation of leaders (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). The purpose of Eagly and Johnson's (1990) meta-analytic study on gender and leadership style was to compare the leadership styles of men and women. They found that in contrast to the gender-stereotypic expectations that women lead in an interpersonally oriented style, characteristic of Ashmore and Del Boca's (1979) "soft" traits approach, and men lead in a task-oriented style, that female and male leaders did not differ in these two styles according to subordinate perceptions. Consistent with stereotypic expectations, however, the tendency to lead democratically (participative) or autocratically (directive) showed a tendency for women to
adopt a more democratic or participative style of leadership than men did.

The final meta-analysis examined the evaluations of men and women who occupy leadership roles. In Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky's (1992) analysis of experiments, leadership characteristics of the men and women were held constant but the sex of the leader varied which revealed more of a gender effect on the results of the evaluations, suggesting rater bias. The results of this analysis showed only a slight overall tendency for participants to evaluate female leaders less favorably than male leaders, and this tendency was more pronounced in the differences between leadership styles. More specifically, when the leadership style exhibited was perceived as being directive or autocratic, women in the leadership positions were devalued relative to their male counterparts, especially when the leadership was carried out in stereotypical masculine styles. In addition, the devaluation of women was greater when leaders assumed male-dominated roles and when the evaluators were men (Eagly et al., 1992).

When one reflects on the findings of Eagly et al.'s
(1992) meta-analytical research of gender differences in leadership style, it can be noted that follower perceptions to leadership ability were not significantly different between men and women when the leaders were congruent in their sex roles, but women were devalued more than men in situations where they were acting out-of-role. The devaluation was greater in the male subjects than the female subjects. As a matter of fact, women showed no gender bias and did not favor female over male leaders.

If women in leadership tend to exhibit leadership styles which resemble participative or consideration behaviors more so than their male counterparts, and, if subordinates respond more favorably to this style of leadership, how can we account for the small population of women in the leadership ranks? This question has prompted researchers to examine male and female roles based on traditional or social expectations.

The apparent penalties or consequences which occur when a man or woman is acting out-of-role may be a function of perception. Several questions arise when pondering the ways in which deviations from sex roles are perceived. What
attributions are made about individuals who deviate from our expectations and do these attributions differ depending on the gender of the person who acts out of expected role characteristics?

To provide answers to these questions, Jones, Davis, and Gergen (1961) demonstrated that when a person's behavior is in accordance with role expectations, it is perceived as externally or situationally caused, thus revealing very little of the individual's true disposition. Conversely, when an actor's behavior deviates from normative expectations, it is seen as internally caused and assumed that the personality of the individual is taking precedence over the situational demands.

The applicability of Jones et al.'s (1961) research was examined in a later study by Bond (1981). In this study, perceptions of behavioral deviations from sex roles on attributions for in-role and out-of-role behaviors were noted. Participants were asked to read two descriptions of an individual, Person X. The gender of Person X was not revealed immediately to the subjects, but the first description portrayed Person X as fitting in with
traditional expectations of a male in-role, and the second
description portrayed Person X as having female in-role
characteristics. For example, in the male in-role script,
Person X was described as 30 years of age and working as an
accountant. Person X was also portrayed as an athletic
person who enjoys football, the outdoors, and participating
on political committees. Also, this Person was described as
a "take charge" individual.

The second description portrayed Person X as a married,
30-year old with children, whose occupation is a first-grade
teacher. This Person enjoys working in the garden, playing
tennis, and participating in local charity drives. Also,
this Person was described as a follower, who prefers to take
the advice of others.

In the procedure, half of the subjects were told that
Person X was a female, while the other subjects were told
that Person X was male. The subjects were also instructed to
evaluate Person X on a 61 item, 8-point bipolar scale. The
scale consisted of male and female trait listings. Examples
of items included: (a) intelligent-unintelligent, (b)
weak-powerful, (c) active-passive, (d) highly
motivated—poorly motivated, (e) assertive—competent, and (f) dependent—_independent_.

Results of this study showed that out-of-role behavior led observers to make corresponding inferences from acts to actor dispositions only when observing out-of-role behavior of the same-sex others (male observers to male actors and female observers to female actors). This was particularly true of males. The out-of-role behaviors of the opposite sex were not interpreted as showing the true character of Person X (Bond, 1981). Among actors portrayed by the female in-role condition, male subjects rated male actors significantly lower on the assertive—competent factor than they rated females in the same condition. Not only did the male observers rate the females characterized by the female in-role description as higher on the assertive—competent factor, but also rated these females significantly higher than did the female evaluators.

An explanation of these findings may be that men and women sometimes consider in-role and out-role behaviors differently. The same female (or male) behavior could be considered as out-of-role by observers who are of one sex,
but considered as in-role by observers of the other sex. This can be further explained by Bond's (1981) results. Female actors who were rated by female subjects received the highest ratings on the assertive-competent factor in comparison to female's ratings of men who were portrayed with the same description. Male observers perceived actors performing within sex-role expectations to be more assertive and competent, but when a male actor acted out-of role, the male participants rated the actors significantly lower than did female raters.

These findings suggest that male subjects may be less tolerant of sex-role deviation, especially when the deviation comes from a member of their own sex. Males appeared to perceive female actors portrayed with in-role descriptions as competent, more so than the female subjects.

**Consequences and penalties for sex-role reversal.** As stated earlier, there are penalties when sex-role reversals occur. One penalty, which is experienced by women who deviate, is devaluation; where women are viewed as being inferior to their male counterparts, their work is devalued, and they are not recognized for their achievements (Eagly et
al., 1992; Goldberg, 1968; Lott & Maluso, 1995). Another penalty is presented when prejudicial attitudes affect the performance, mobility, or evaluation of women.

Isaacs (1981) formulated four hypotheses to examine prejudices associated with sex-role reversal. She predicted that both men and women would be prejudiced against women when the professional field is traditionally reserved for women (in-role), and the work of women in masculine fields (out-role) would be devalued by both men and women. Isaacs experimented further by introducing a status dimension into her hypotheses. She expected that prejudice against women would still exist even when the female actor was believed to be someone who had achieved status in her field. She finalized her hypotheses with the prediction that men and women, holding more traditional attitudes toward the rights and roles of women would tend to devalue the work of women to a greater degree than people with more modern attitudes toward women.

Isaacs (1981) found that there was no bias in the way college students judge the works of women when the professional field is traditionally reserved for women. Her
second hypothesis was partially confirmed in that men devalued the work of women in one male-oriented field (city planning), but did not devalue the work of women in law, which was identified as a field traditionally reserved for men. There was no difference in the way female students rated the work of women in either law or city planning. Isaacs's findings did not replicate those of Goldberg (1968), who found that women did devalue the work of women when the field was traditionally reserved for men.

Given what we know about penalties for norm violations in general, brought about by powerful expectations surrounding sex roles, it might be said that women's (and men's) fears about the consequences which befall successful women may be a realistic appraisal. If a woman sees that to be successful she must behave in an aggressive, masculine, dominant manner, she may be undecided as to whether the success is worth the negative social consequences (Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968). Women are not alone when penalized for acting out-of-role. A study of men in the nursing profession (Etzkowitz, 1971) described role conflicts created by their violation of the stereotype that
only women are nurses. The penalties incurred by the males in this study were both overt and covert. The subjects rarely identified the male as a nurse. He was acknowledged as if he was a doctor or an orderly. The covert consequence presented itself when the subjects created an expectation suggesting effeminate characteristics of the male, for being a nurse was contrary to "being a man." This expectation surfaced as subjects considered nursing a predominantly feminine occupation where femininity is a prerequisite.

Costrich et al. (1975) attempted to assess other's reactions to men's dependency and passivity and to women's aggression and self-assertion. These researchers predicted that when men and women were acting within their expected roles (aggressive-assertive men, passive-dependent women) they would fare well in social ratings. Conversely, when men and women were acting out-of-role (passive-dependent men, aggressive-assertive women), both would receive poorer popularity ratings. The results showed that the correlation between women's submissiveness and their popularity was near zero and not significant. These findings can be interpreted as males who deviate from traditional sex-role expectations
(out-role) are viewed by their own gender less favorably than when they behave according to societal norms (in-role), suggesting that some men react more strongly than women to sex-role violations.

Further examination of sex-role deviation and subordinates perceptions of leadership behaviors on job satisfaction was performed by Petty and Bruning (1980). Their study looked at a comparison of the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of supervisory behavior and measures of subordinates' job satisfaction for male and female leaders. The purpose of their study was to test Schein's (1975) sex-role congruency hypothesis. Schein posits that leader behavior which is consistent with sex-role stereotypes should be more positively related to subordinate satisfaction than behaviors that are not consistent with sex-role expectations. For example, female sex-role stereotypes indicate that a woman should exhibit consideration behaviors to increase subordinate satisfaction, as consideration is more commonly ascribed to female leadership. Similarly, initiating structure behaviors are believed to be more stereotypically male, so when a male
leader exhibits initiating structure behaviors, the behaviors will be more positively associated with subordinates' satisfaction for male leaders than for female leaders.

Petty and Bruning (1980) retested this hypothesis to determine the effects of sex-role congruency and leadership style on satisfaction with work and satisfaction with the supervisor, according to subordinate perceptions. Consideration behaviors correlated positively with subordinate satisfaction with supervision, regardless of leader gender and job classification of the leader. In addition, consideration behaviors were positively correlated with work satisfaction in all job classifications. Consideration was effective for both male and female leaders, and initiating structure behaviors were moderately, positively correlated with subordinates' satisfaction with supervision. Also noted was that in three of the six job classifications (clerical workers, front-line supervisors, and professional/technical support), subordinates of female leaders perceived significantly more consideration behaviors than did subordinates of male supervisors, supporting
gender-stereotypical expectations of behaviors of leaders (Petty & Bruning, 1980).

Requisites for leadership. Based on the available literature, can we confidently state the requisites necessary for effective leadership? The answer is, unfortunately, "no."

Leadership style is one factor to consider when determining what constitutes effective leadership. As we know, there are many different leadership styles and each serves a purpose for the leader in influencing subordinates to perform. Directive leadership is one style which is similar to autocratic leadership. Directive leaders are more concerned with task completion than building follower relations. Participative leaders differ from directive leaders in that they utilize subordinate feedback, encourage followers to participate in the task, and seek to build esteem in subordinates through interactions. When one describes the characteristics of participative leadership style, it may bring to mind Ashmore's and Del Boca's (1979) study where the findings indicated that females perceived two "soft" and positively evaluated types of women:
sentimental-honest-sincere (nurturant woman), and modest-reserved-meditative (quiet, thoughtful woman). The "hard" traits ascribed most often to male targets included trait clusters (stern, shrewd, dominating) which appear to resemble the behaviors associated with directive style of leadership. Since task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviors exemplify the essence of behavioral theories of leadership, it stands to reason that leaders who exhibit these behaviors in the appropriate situations, should be successful in their positions.

According to business surveys, it can be said that women still occupy fewer middle to upper-level leadership positions than their male counterparts (Belsky & Berger, 1995). Research has indicated the negative outcomes of stereotypes associated with women in general, as well as women in predominantly male positions. Sex-role stereotypes are indeed a factor to consider when taking into account the slow movement of women into leadership ranks (Lott & Maluso, 1995; Schein, 1973). People may tend to view middle and upper-level leadership positions as masculine positions, where effective leadership is partially the result of the
leader displaying forceful, dominant, masculine, and aggressive characteristics or behaviors, in order to influence and guide a group (Schein, 1973). Based on the categorization of women in sex-role stereotyping, women who display these behaviors may be acting in a manner that is contrary to societal expectations or values, deviating from their sex roles. As women gain entrance into predominantly male fields, they may encounter conflicts or barriers when trying to influence subordinates. If women exhibit behaviors which do not coincide with subordinate expectations, they may face negative consequences. Research has indicated subordinates tend to evaluate women more favorably when they are acting according to sex-role expectations than when they deviate from expectations (Bond, 1981; Eagly et al., 1992; Isaacs, 1981; Lott & Maluso, 1995; Petty & Bruning, 1980).

It may be important to mention Bond's (1981) finding that men and women sometimes differ in their perceptions of what they consider to be "in-role" and "out-of-role." A large portion of the literature, however, indicates that males' and females' perceptions of sex-role deviation tend to be consistent (Bond, 1981; Goldberg, 1968; Jones et al.,
Since society appears to foster sex-role expectations for men and women that differ even in positions within their occupations, it would be beneficial to examine people's perceptions of leadership effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leader when the leader is acting in-role or out-of-role. Likewise, it might be advantageous to determine if these individuals' perceptions of leadership tend to be more favorable if the leader exhibits directive/task-oriented behaviors, or participative/relationship-oriented behaviors. Building upon leadership style and sex-role deviation, it may be judicious to examine the differences in perceptions of leadership by people who are led by male or female leaders, in situations where the leaders may be perceived as being either in-role or out-of-role, and where the leaders incorporate either directive or participative leadership styles. Will leadership style serve to reduce the negative outcomes of the leader who is perceived to be acting out-of-role?

Given the knowledge that, in general, participative
leadership styles promote greater subordinate satisfaction with the leader (Beehr & Gupta, 1987; Gillespie, 1980; Kraitem, 1981; Maier, 1965) and with the task (Beehr & Gupta, 1987; Petty & Bruning, 1980; Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993) than directive styles, and knowing that subordinates tend to view leaders more favorably when they act in accordance with expected sex roles, it may be advantageous to combine these variables to determine perceptions as to leader effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and satisfaction with the task according to people who are not working directly under the leader. For the purpose of this study, participants will observe female leaders who exhibit either participative or directive leadership styles and who hold titles that are either predominantly female-oriented or male-oriented. Based on their occupational title, the leader will explain a task which pertains to the corresponding occupation.

The proposed study is an attempt to determine which leadership styles are perceived to promote optimal outcomes in in-and out-role gender-role situations for women. There are several means for obtaining this information.
Specifically, do participants' perceptions of leadership differ depending on whether the leader exhibits participative versus directive leadership styles, and whether the leader is acting according to or deviating from sex-role expectations?

As stated earlier, there has been a marked increase of women entering leadership positions over the past 30 years. Prior research during this time frame was conducted incorporating the use of both male and female leaders and subordinates were asked to make comparisons between the two, as to leadership ability and satisfaction with the leader (Bonds, 1981; Eagly et al., 1992; Goktepe & Schneier, 1989; Goldberg, 1968; Isaacs, 1981). This study is different from other research by examining perceptions of leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and satisfaction with the task when the leaders are women. It is also the objective of the researcher to determine if there are differences today in perceptions of leadership ability and satisfaction for the leader who happens to be a woman. The choice to incorporate only female leaders is to reduce possible bias which may occur when comparing male leaders to
female leaders. In using only female leaders, it is hoped that participants will be focusing on leadership characteristics rather than leader gender.

Also, in-role and out-of-role behaviors of female leaders will be manipulated by occupational title as well as task topic. Furthermore, participative and directive leadership styles will be combined with sex-role congruency/incongruency, and will be exhibited by female leaders through the incorporation of videotaped vignettes. The videos will present only the leader as a visual cue, the subordinates will be heard but not seen, so as to enable the participants/observers to focus entirely on the dialogue and behaviors of the leader.

According to Bass (1990), participative leadership has generally been found to generate greater satisfaction among subordinates. Subordinates may view leaders who exhibit participative leadership styles as more effective and report more favorable responses in terms of leader satisfaction than those who exhibit directive styles. As participative leadership styles tend to be more relationship-oriented, subordinates may be influenced to achieve the goal, leading
to greater perceptions of the effectiveness of the leader. Similarly, when a leader encourages subordinates, listens to their viewpoints, and incorporates their ideas into the process, followers tend to report more favorable responses in terms of leader satisfaction (Berlew & Heller, 1983). Therefore, with regard to leadership style, it is hypothesized that:

H1: Observers will perceive the leader as more **effective** when exhibiting participative leadership style over directive leadership style.

H2: Observers will have a greater degree of **satisfaction with the leader** who leads using participative styles over directive styles of leadership.

With regard to task satisfaction and job satisfaction, followers tend to report greater satisfaction with the job and components of the job (task) when leaders exhibit participative leadership styles (Bass, 1990; Beehr & Gupta, 1987; Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993). These findings may be influenced by the degree to which the leader consults with the followers and delegates portions of the task to
subordinates. Subordinates may perceive the task to be more satisfying when they feel that the leader seeks their input, makes use of their talents, and shares responsibilities for the task (Yukl, 1994). Therefore, it is proposed that:

H3: Observers will report a higher degree of satisfaction for task when the leader leads using participative styles than directive leadership styles.

Women in leadership positions tend to exhibit the leadership characteristics which are considered the most effective in terms of productivity and subordinate job satisfaction. However, when women deviate from expected sex-roles by nature of their position or subject matter of the task, devaluation of women may occur (Eagly et al., 1992; Lott & Maluso, 1995; Halpern, 1996; Schein, 1975). Women tend to be rated favorably when they are acting within sex-role expectations, therefore, with regard to sex-role deviation it is proposed that:

H4: In general, the leader who leads within sex-role expectations will be perceived as more effective than the leader who deviates from sex-role
expectations.

H5: Observers will report greater degrees of leader satisfaction for the leader acting within expected sex roles than acting out-of-role.

H6: Observers will report greater degrees of task satisfaction when the leader is acting within expected sex roles than acting out-of-role.

H7: It is proposed that there will be an ordinal interaction between leadership style and sex-role deviation on leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction and satisfaction with the task. Leadership style will serve to reduce the negative outcomes of the leader who is perceived to be acting out-of-role. Specifically, it is predicted that the leader who leads within sex-role expectations will be perceived as more effective and more satisfying to participants than the leader who deviates from sex-role expectations when exhibiting both participative and directive styles of leadership. However, the difference between in-role and out-role perceptions will be smaller
for participative than for directive styles of leadership.

In addition to the hypotheses stated, a test of gender differences on perceptions of leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction will also be performed. Since studies of leadership have shown contradictory results in relation to gender differences in perceptions of leader satisfaction (Bond, 1981; Eagly et al., 1992; Isaacs, 1981) when the leader deviates from sex-role expectations than acting in accordance with sex-role expectations, it may be beneficial to examine gender effects pertaining to the current study.

Prior to conducting the main experiment, two pilot studies were performed. The purpose of the first pilot was to determine people's perceptions of the gender-oriented nature of occupations and associated tasks and the degree of leadership associated with occupations and tasks. Based on the first pilot results, in-role and out-role conditions for the study were determined.

Pilot I

One hundred undergraduate students (ratio of women to
men was 2 to 1) enrolled in an introductory psychology class at a southern California university were recruited to participate for extra credit. Two questionnaires were developed listing 25 occupations and 25 tasks and were distributed to participants to assess perceptions of the gender-oriented nature associated with the occupations and tasks (See Appendix A). The Likert-type scale associated with each of the 50 items ranged from 1 (very masculine) to 5 (very feminine). Similarly, 25 identical occupations and tasks were presented in the second questionnaire and participants were asked to indicate their perceptions as to the degree of leadership associated with the occupation and the task (See Appendix B). As in the first questionnaire, the items were presented in a Likert-type format. The scale consisted of 50 items and ranged from 1 (no leadership) to 5 (great deal of leadership). The percentage of participants endorsing the occupation and task as either somewhat feminine (indicated by a score '4') or very feminine (indicated by a score of '5'), or somewhat masculine (indicated by a score of '2') or very masculine (indicated by a score of '1') were calculated. In addition, the
percentage of participants endorsing the leadership requisites of the occupation and task as requiring some leadership ("4") or a great deal of leadership ("5") were calculated.

The results of the pilot showed that participants perceived the occupations of day care superintendent, registered nurse, and elementary school teacher as highly feminine in nature. Firefighter, police office, and warehouse manager were among the occupations thought to be more masculine-oriented (See Table 1).

With regard to the gender-oriented nature of task, setting up a day care agenda and planning a field trip for elementary school children were deemed to be highly feminine, while planning forklift assignments, determining the promotional media for a professional football team, and determining procedures for cleaning a hazardous material spill were deemed as masculine (See Table 2).

Because the main study will examine leadership style, the tasks and occupations were also evaluated for their perceived leadership levels. Participants indicated that leadership was strongly associated with the occupations of
Table 1

Top Five Occupations Rated as Feminine and Masculine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminine Occupation</th>
<th>Somewhat Feminine ('4')</th>
<th>Very Feminine ('5')</th>
<th>Total (4+5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Day Care Superintendent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Registered Nurse</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elementary School Teacher</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dietician</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dental Hygienist</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine Occupation</th>
<th>Somewhat Masculine ('2')</th>
<th>Very Masculine ('1')</th>
<th>Total (2+1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Firefighter</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Warehouse Manager</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Politician</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parole Officer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Police Officer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine Task</td>
<td>Percentage Endorsing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Feminine</td>
<td>Very Feminine</td>
<td>Total (4+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting up a day care agenda</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Planning a field trip</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establishing a diet regimen</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepping a dental patient</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Setting up an IV drip</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine Task</th>
<th>Percentage Endorsing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Masculine</td>
<td>Very Masculine</td>
<td>Total (2+1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning forklift assignments</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determining media to promote NFL team</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procedures for cleaning a hazardous material spill</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procedures for handling parole violations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fire extinguisher training</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
high school principal, police officer, and elementary school teacher in terms of occupation (See Table 3).

With regard to task, leadership was strongly associated with initiating a neighborhood watch program, setting up an IV drip, creating a day care agenda, and explaining how to clean up a hazardous material spill (See Table 4).

Based on the results of the first pilot study, four video vignettes were created for the main experiment. The occupation of day care superintendent and the task of explaining how to create a new day care agenda were incorporated as the in-role condition, as participants perceived this occupation and task to be highly feminine and was rated highly for leadership. The occupation of environmental specialist and the task of creating training program for handling hazardous material spills were incorporated as the out-of-role condition. Although this occupation was not among the top five in the masculinity rating, 70% of the participants indicated that the task of explaining how to clean a hazardous material spill was characteristically masculine, and 70% indicated that the occupation required some to a great deal of leadership.
Table 3

Top Five Occupations Rated for Leadership Requisites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Some Leadership (4')</th>
<th>Great deal of Leadership (5')</th>
<th>Total (4+5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High School Principal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Elementary School Teacher</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Police Officer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Firefighter</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Politician</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Top Five Tasks Rated for Leadership Requisites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Some Leadership ('4')</th>
<th>Great deal of Leadership ('5')</th>
<th>Total (4+5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting up a day care agenda</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Initiating a neighborhood watch program</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Setting up an IV drip</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning field trip for elementary school students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explaining hazardous material cleanup procedures</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot II

A second pilot study was performed to determine the reliabilities of three scales, two of which were developed by the researcher, the Leadership Effectiveness Scale (LES) and the Task Satisfaction Scale (TSS). The third scale, Leader Satisfaction Scale (LSS), was modified from the Survey of Perceived Supervisor Support (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). These scales were utilized in the main experiment to measure leader effectiveness, satisfaction with the task, and satisfaction with the leader (See Appendices C, D, and E for scale items).

The LES and LSS were distributed to 80 undergraduate students enrolled in an undergraduate psychology course at a southern California university. The students were given extra credit for their participation. They were instructed to read two generic descriptions of leadership style, directive and participative (See Appendices F and G). These written vignettes described behaviors and common dialogue associated with directive and participative leaders. After having read each excerpt, participants indicated their perceptions of leader effectiveness and satisfaction with
the leader on the LES and LSS. Using SPSS, version 6.1, Cronbach's alphas for internal item reliability statistics were obtained. The Leadership Effectiveness Scale yielded coefficients ranging from .74 for directive leadership to .81 for participative leadership (See Table 5). Based on the pilot, Item 2, which was a negatively scored item, was transformed and reworded from "The leader had problems gaining commitment from subordinates" to "The leader did not gain commitment from subordinates." Item 4 was reworded from "The leader imposed strict guidelines" to "The leader established specific guidelines."

Initially, the reliability coefficients obtained for the LSS ranged from .91 for directive and .90 for participative (See Table 6 for item total correlations and alpha coefficients). Due to the length of the questionnaire, items 2, 9, and 13 were deleted from the 14-item scale. With the deletion of three items, the alpha coefficients were reduced to .80 for directive leadership and .88 for
Table 5

Item-Total Correlations and Alphas if Item Deleted for Leader Effectiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The leader explained the task clearly</td>
<td>.2921</td>
<td>.7399</td>
<td>.6465</td>
<td>.7733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The leader had problems gaining commitment from subordinates</td>
<td>.2871</td>
<td>.7394</td>
<td>.4669</td>
<td>.7940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The leader encouraged the group to ask questions</td>
<td>.6146</td>
<td>.6875</td>
<td>.6338</td>
<td>.7752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The leader imposed strict guidelines</td>
<td>-.1814</td>
<td>.7970</td>
<td>-.5235</td>
<td>.8930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The leader was not approachable</td>
<td>.4857</td>
<td>.7112</td>
<td>.4587</td>
<td>.7959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The leader implemented suggestions made by the group</td>
<td>.6134</td>
<td>.6924</td>
<td>.7370</td>
<td>.7684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The leader made use of the subordinate's individual talents</td>
<td>.4160</td>
<td>.7223</td>
<td>.6718</td>
<td>.7712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Subordinates were given a choice about their assignments</td>
<td>.2056</td>
<td>.7505</td>
<td>.5026</td>
<td>.7900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The leader provided positive feedback</td>
<td>.7084</td>
<td>.6761</td>
<td>.8577</td>
<td>.7487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I believe the leader was effective</td>
<td>.6524</td>
<td>.6867</td>
<td>.8238</td>
<td>.7565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates reverse scored items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Participative</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Participative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The leader would consider my goals and values</td>
<td>.6476</td>
<td>.8493</td>
<td>.9081</td>
<td>.8604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would not be allowed to share my ideas</td>
<td>.5447</td>
<td>.8165</td>
<td>.9120</td>
<td>.8987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The leader would listen to my concerns</td>
<td>.6205</td>
<td>.8527</td>
<td>.9091</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would probably not be able to count on the leader for help when</td>
<td>.5860</td>
<td>.7548</td>
<td>.9104</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The leader would take interest in my well-being</td>
<td>.7102</td>
<td>.8604</td>
<td>.9059</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The leader would take my best interests into account if she made</td>
<td>.6726</td>
<td>.8548</td>
<td>.9075</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The leader would not care about my opinions</td>
<td>.5687</td>
<td>.8689</td>
<td>.9109</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The leader would give me encouragement if I was hesitant to</td>
<td>.6272</td>
<td>.9164</td>
<td>.9089</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The leader would take advantage of me if given the opportunity</td>
<td>.4980</td>
<td>.8561</td>
<td>.9134</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would enjoy working for this leader</td>
<td>.7304</td>
<td>.8561</td>
<td>.9049</td>
<td>.9104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (Cont.)

**Item-Total Correlations and Alphas if Item Deleted for LSS Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item-Total Correlation</td>
<td>Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</td>
<td>Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</td>
<td>Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If I wanted to participate in the Decision-making process, I would be encouraged to do so</td>
<td>.7161</td>
<td>.9059</td>
<td>.8083</td>
<td>.8550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The leader is not pleasing to me</td>
<td>.6858</td>
<td>.9068</td>
<td>.6941</td>
<td>.8595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would be hesitant to approach this Leader for help</td>
<td>.5498</td>
<td>.9120</td>
<td>.5521</td>
<td>.8662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The leader is friendly</td>
<td>.6678</td>
<td>.9074</td>
<td>.8073</td>
<td>.8535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates reverse scored items
participative leadership, still within acceptable range for reliability. Items 4, 7, and 12 were negatively scored.

To determine the alpha reliability coefficients for the Task Satisfaction Scale, participants read four task scenarios of leaders who held the titles of day care superintendent and environmental/chemical specialist, exhibiting either directive or participative leadership styles. The tasks explained by the leaders in the written excerpts included explaining how to prepare a new day care agenda and how to clean up and document a hazardous material spill or leak, respectively (See Appendices H, I, J, and K). Participants were asked to read the first scenario and complete the TSS. The participants followed this procedure with the three remaining scenarios.

Based on the results of the participants' responses, Item 1, "The task sounded challenging to me" was deleted from this 9-item Likert-type scale. Reliabilities were increased for the TSS as follows: .75 to .79 for the directive, in-role (day care) scenario, .85 to .91 for the participative, in-role (day care) scenario, .71 to .78 for the directive out-of-role (environmental specialist)
scenario, and .85 to .89 for the participative, out-of-role (environmental specialist) scenario (See Tables 7 and 8).

Method

Design

An experimental multivariate 2x2 within-subjects factorial design was used to test the proposed hypotheses. The independent variables were: 1) leadership style, and 2) sex-role deviation. The first independent variable was qualitative, consisting of two levels (directive and participative). Directive leadership style was defined as the leader proposing a strategy for completion of task using forceful and direct planning, seeking no input from the subordinates (Bass, 1974; Eagly & Johnson, 1991). In directive leadership, the leader was the sole decision-maker. Participative leadership style was embodied by the leader asking subordinates for input in designing a strategy for completion of a task, encouraging subordinates to participate in decision-making processes, and delegating portions of the task to subordinates while facilitating movement toward goal attainment (Bass, 1990; Berlew & Heller, 1983; Sargent & Miller, 1971; Stogdill, 1974).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Care Agenda</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The task sounded challenging to me</td>
<td>.0417</td>
<td>.7943</td>
<td>.1051</td>
<td>.9063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would like to be given responsibility for a portion of the task</td>
<td>.2748</td>
<td>.7591</td>
<td>.6605</td>
<td>.8315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3. I feel that I would not be able to do a good job on the task</td>
<td>.3458</td>
<td>.7495</td>
<td>.7452</td>
<td>.8224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4. I would have reservations about explaining the task to my group</td>
<td>.3614</td>
<td>.7465</td>
<td>.4548</td>
<td>.8529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. If I were to work on the task, I would not have the freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td>.5796</td>
<td>.7128</td>
<td>.7520</td>
<td>.8193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6. I feel like I've been forced to work on this task</td>
<td>.4653</td>
<td>.7315</td>
<td>.6921</td>
<td>.8277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would volunteer to work on the task</td>
<td>.5883</td>
<td>.7100</td>
<td>.6585</td>
<td>.8332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would be able to use my talents when working on this task</td>
<td>.6192</td>
<td>.7053</td>
<td>.7947</td>
<td>.8173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would enjoy the task more because I would feel that I was able to make decisions about how to design the process</td>
<td>.6984</td>
<td>.6867</td>
<td>.7673</td>
<td>.8219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates reverse scored items
Table 8

**Item-Total Correlations and Alphas if Item Deleted of TSS for Leadership Style Out-Role Situation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazardous Material Training</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The task sounded challenging to me</td>
<td>-0.1306</td>
<td>0.7812</td>
<td>0.1261</td>
<td>0.8863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would like to be given responsibility for a portion of the task</td>
<td>0.6413</td>
<td>0.5318</td>
<td>0.6595</td>
<td>0.8253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3. I feel that I would not be able to do a good job on the task</td>
<td>0.4310</td>
<td>0.6744</td>
<td>0.5806</td>
<td>0.8323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4. I would have reservations about explaining the task to my group</td>
<td>0.2589</td>
<td>0.7057</td>
<td>0.4060</td>
<td>0.8512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. If I were to work on the task, I would not have the freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td>0.3780</td>
<td>0.6849</td>
<td>0.7404</td>
<td>0.8154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6. I feel like I've been forced to work on this task</td>
<td>0.4085</td>
<td>0.6798</td>
<td>0.7141</td>
<td>0.8198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would volunteer to work on the task</td>
<td>0.5927</td>
<td>0.6457</td>
<td>0.6760</td>
<td>0.8233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would be able to use my talents when working on this task</td>
<td>0.5124</td>
<td>0.6592</td>
<td>0.7061</td>
<td>0.8195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would enjoy the task more because I would feel that I was able to make decisions about how to design the process</td>
<td>0.5056</td>
<td>0.6593</td>
<td>0.7101</td>
<td>0.8207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates reverse scored items
The second independent variable, sex-role deviation, was also qualitative, consisting of two levels (in-role and out-of-role). In-role situations were operationally defined by the leader guiding a work group through a task which was directly related to the leader's occupation and expected sex-role (i.e. a task which was perceived to be performed more by women than men). Out-of-role situations were defined by the leader explaining a task which was directly related to the leader's occupation but not congruent with sex-role expectations (i.e. a task which was perceived to be performed more by men than women). As stated earlier, it was decided that the occupational title of day care superintendent and the task of designing a new day care agenda was to be considered the in-role condition. The occupational title of environmental/safety specialist and the task of creating a training program regarding the proper procedures for handling a hazardous material spill was judged to be an out-of-role situation.

Three dependent variables were evaluated in this study. The first dependent variable (DV), leader effectiveness, was defined as the extent to which participants believed the
leader to have been effective in communicating the task clearly, the extent to which participants perceived the leader as having been able to gain commitment from the subordinates, and the extent to which the leader incorporated the talents of group members. This DV was measured by the LES. The second DV, satisfaction with the leader, was defined as the extent to which participants perceived the leader to provide positive feedback, encouragement, and support for group members in their endeavor. This DV was measured by the LSS. Leader satisfaction was also defined as the extent that participants would like to work with the leader on the task.

The third DV, task satisfaction, was defined as the extent to which the participants felt they would like to be included in the task, the extent to which the participants expressed confidence in completing the task, and the extent to which the participants believed they would enjoy working on the task. The TSS was used to measure this DV.

Participants

Participants were a voluntary sample of 128 college students (64 females and 64 males) who were recruited from
undergraduate psychology classes at a southern California university. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 55 years of age. Because work experience and participant interaction with work leaders were deemed important factors in recognizing aspects of leadership, the demographic was requested. Only those participants who had at least six months of full-time (40 hours per week) or one year part-time (20 hours per week) work experience were included in the sample. All participants reported having worked at least one year and the work experience of the sample ranged from one year to 35 years, with the mean of work experience being 9.25 years.

Materials and Scoring

Based on the results of the pilot questionnaire, four video vignettes were created for the main experiment, with each vignette having a duration of 3 to 4 minutes. Each video vignette consisted of a different actor (female) who explained a task using directive or participative styles of leadership. The leader acted in accordance with in-role and out-of-role factors as determined by nature of the task. Four actors played the role of leader in each vignette,
yielding a total of 16 video sequences. There were two confederates (one male and one female), acting as subordinates in each video presentation. The subordinates were heard but not seen (See Appendix C for video scripts).

In addition to the videos, three measurement scales were utilized to measure participant perceptions of each dependent variable. Leadership effectiveness was measured on a 10-item, 7-point Likert scale. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher for the purpose of this study (See Appendix C). The scores ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) for each item. The total score sums ranged from 10 to 70, with higher scores indicating greater perceptions of leader effectiveness. The LES yielded reliability alphas of .79 for directive leadership in in-role conditions and .83 for participative leadership style in in-role conditions. Reliabilities for leadership style in out-of-role conditions on the LES yielded alpha coefficients of .79 and .85 for directive and participative leadership styles, respectively.

A modified version of the Survey of Perceived Supervisory Support Scale (SPSS), originally developed by
Kottke and Sharafinski (1988), was revised to assess participants' satisfaction with the leader (See Appendix D). The revised scale was named the Leader Satisfaction Scale (LSS). Originally, the SPSS was developed to assess subordinates' perceptions of supervisory support. Eleven items were modified and incorporated into the LSS to accommodate the situation, as the participant/observers were not acting in a subordinate capacity. The original SPSS scale reported a reliability alpha coefficient of .98 (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Possible responses to each item of the LSS ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) and total scores ranged from 11 to 77, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the leader. The Leader Satisfaction Scale yielded alphas of .94 for directive style and .72 for participative style in the in-role condition. In out-of-role conditions, the reliability alpha for both directive and participative leadership style was .93.

A task satisfaction scale (TSS) was developed by the researcher to determine participants' satisfaction with and willingness to work on the task (See Appendix E). The scale
consisted of 8 items, presented on a 7-point scale, and the scores ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Total scores ranged from 8 to 56, with higher scores indicating greater degrees of participant satisfaction with the task. Reliabilities obtained for the TSS for directive and participative leadership style exhibited in in-role conditions were .84 and .82, respectively. Exhibitions of leadership style in out-of-role conditions yielded reliability alphas of .82 for directive style and .84 for participative leadership style.

Procedure

Participants were first informed about the nature of the study. Video vignettes were presented in 16 sequences. Each sequence consisted of four scenarios. The scenarios were directive leadership style in in-role conditions, directive leadership style in out-of role conditions, participative leadership style in in-role conditions, and participative leadership style in out-of-role conditions. The order of the video scenarios was counterbalanced by actor, leadership style, and sex-role deviation, with equal number of participants (4 females and 4 males) viewing each
sequence. The counterbalancing technique was designed so that each actor would be viewed first, second, third, and fourth an equal number of times for the duration of the testing. At the conclusion of each 3 to 4 minute video scenario, participants were asked to complete the Leadership Effectiveness Scale, the Leader Satisfaction Scale, and the Task Satisfaction Scale. At the conclusion of the experiment, participants were provided with a debriefing statement and they were thanked for their participation.

Results

A 2 X 2 repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance was performed on participant/observer perceptions on three dependent variables: Leader effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and satisfaction for the task. Independent variables were leadership style (directive and participative) and sex-role deviation (in-role and out-of-role).

SPSS MANOVA was used to conduct the analyses. Because of the sampling scheme employed, there were no missing data on a total N of 128. Assumptions were met for linearity in all conditions and there were no significant outliers.
Assumptions for normality were met in the directive leadership style condition. Skewness was present in the participative leadership condition. Skewness for leader effectiveness in in-role conditions was -1.28. For leader satisfaction in in-role conditions, skewness was -1.58. Skewness for leader effectiveness in out-of-role conditions was -1.26, and -1.00 for leader satisfaction in out-of-role conditions.

Prior to running the main analyses, a test for actor effect was conducted using SPSS ANOVA. There were no significant differences between actors in the participative leadership style conditions in either in-role and out-of-role. Similarly, there were no significant differences between actors in the directive leadership style, in-role conditions on the three dependent variables. A significant difference between actors was present for leadership effectiveness when the leader/actor was exhibiting directive leadership style in out-of-role conditions, $F(3,124) = 3.593, p = .016$. Actor 1 scored significantly lower than Actors 3 and 4. Further examination of leader effectiveness across all actors in all treatment conditions indicated that
the leader who scored lowest in the directive condition scored lowest in all other conditions as well. Similarly, the leader who scored highest in the directive conditions also scored highest in all other conditions. In fact, the rank order of the four leaders remained constant across the four different treatment conditions.

Hypothesis 1 posited that observers would perceive the leader as more effective when exhibiting participative leadership style than directive. A multivariate analysis of variance revealed support for that prediction, $F(1,127) = 544.158$, $p < .01$. There was a strong association between leadership style and perceptions of leader effectiveness, $\eta^2 = .81$. Leaders who exhibited participative leadership style were perceived as more effective (mean for participative style = 60.21) than leaders who exhibited directive leadership style (mean for directive style = 38.31).

In hypothesis 2, it was predicted that observers/participants would report higher satisfaction for leaders who lead using participative leadership styles relative to directive styles. This hypothesis was confirmed, $F(1,127) = 527.11$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .80$. Participants indicated
greater satisfaction for the leader when the leader exhibited participative leadership style (mean participative score = 65.25) over directive (mean directive score = 34.63).

In hypothesis 3, it was predicted that observers would report a higher degree of satisfaction for task when the leader led using participative style than directive style. A significant main effect for leadership style on satisfaction with the task was revealed, $F(1,127) = 343.85$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .73$. Participants reported greater satisfaction for the task when the leader exhibited participative leadership style (mean participative score = 45.32) over directive style (mean directive score = 27.84).

Sex-role deviation was also a significant contributor to observer perceptions of leader effectiveness. As stated in hypothesis 4, it was predicted that the leader who lead within sex-role expectations would be perceived as more effective than the leader who deviated from sex-role expectations. The role of the leader was a significant determinant of leader effectiveness, $F(1,127) = 16.08$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$. Specifically, the leader was perceived to be
more effective when acting within sex-role expectations (in-role mean = 50.50) than when deviating from sex-role expectations (out-of-role mean = 48.02).

With regard to sex-role deviation on perceptions of leader satisfaction, hypothesis 5 stated that observers would report greater satisfaction for leaders who acted according to sex-role expectations rather than deviating from sex-role expectations. This hypothesis was supported, $F(1, 127) = 20.00, p < .01, \eta^2 = .14$. Participants reported greater satisfaction for the leader when the leader was explaining a task which was considered to be within sex-role expectations (mean in-role score = 51.65) than deviating from sex-role expectations (mean out-of-role score = 8.23).

In hypothesis 6, it was predicted that sex-role deviation would have a significant effect on participant perceptions of satisfaction for the task. Specifically, observers would report greater satisfaction for the task when the leader was acting according to expected sex-roles rather than deviating from expected sex-roles. This was supported, $F(1, 127) = 19.77, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$. Participants reported greater task satisfaction when leaders acted within
sex-role expectations (mean for in-role = 37.81) than deviating from sex-role expectations (mean for out-of-role = 35.35).

With regard to interaction effects, it was hypothesized that there would be an ordinal interaction between leadership style and sex-role deviation on leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction. This hypothesis was not supported for leader effectiveness, $F(1, 127) = .762, p = .84$, satisfaction with leader, $F(1, 127) = .723, p = .397$, or satisfaction with task, $F(1, 127) = .433, p = .512$.

Gender Effects

The effects of leadership style and sex-role deviation of leaders on participant perceptions of leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction by gender were also examined using tests of mixed effects. With regard to leadership style on leadership effectiveness, participant gender was not significant, $F(1, 126) = .013, p = .911$. The mean scores of male and female participants on leader effectiveness by style and sex-role deviation were not significantly different.
There was no significant difference by gender in perceptions of leader effectiveness by sex-role deviation, $F(1,126) = 1.512, p = .221$. The scores of male and female participants on leader effectiveness did not significantly differ.

The effects of gender on leader satisfaction by leadership style was not significant, $F(1,126) = .010, p = .919$. Similarly, the effects of sex-role deviation on leader satisfaction by gender was not significant, $F(1,126) = .162, p = .688$. There were no significant differences in perceptions of leader satisfaction by gender as a result of sex-role deviation.

With regard to leadership style on satisfaction with task, participant gender was not significant, $F(1,126) = .297, p = .586$. There was no significant gender difference in perceptions of task satisfaction by sex-role deviation, $F(1,126) = 1.586, p = .210$. The scores of male and female participants on task satisfaction did not differ significantly.
Discussion

The results strongly suggest that as hypothesized, leaders were perceived to be more effective when they exhibited participative styles of leadership over directive styles. Although participants in this study were serving in an observer capacity rather than subordinate capacity, the results were consistent with Maier (1965) and Kraitem (1981). Maier (1965) and Kraitem (1981) found subordinates preferred participative leadership over directive if the style was consultative in nature, and if subordinates were seeking personal growth, if they were highly interested in the task, or if they were looking for opportunities for becoming more creative.

Participants favored leaders and perceived the leaders to be more supportive when the leader exhibited participative leadership styles over directive styles. This finding was congruent with the findings in the study performed by Beehr and Gupta (1987) that showed that participative leadership style was related to more positive attitudes and greater satisfaction with the leader.

Further, it was hypothesized that participants would
perceive greater task satisfaction when the leader explained the task using participative leadership style. This hypothesis was supported as observers perceived the task to be more satisfying when the leader presented the task using participative styles over directive styles. Similar to the results of Wilkinson and Wagner (1993), participants perceived the task to be more satisfying when the prevalent style of leaders was participative.

Sex-role deviation was also a significant factor in participants' perceptions of leader satisfaction, though the effect size was more modest than for leader style. The hypotheses that predicted that participant/observers would perceive the leader to be more effective when the actor behaved according to sex-role expectations and not deviating from sex-role expectations was supported. Participants indicated that they perceived the leader to be more effective, and they reported greater satisfaction with the leader when acting according to sex-role expectations. When the leader explained a task and held a title that was not congruent with sex-role expectations (i.e. developing a training program relating to hazardous material spill
cleanup procedures), the leader was not perceived as being as effective as when explaining a task that was aligned with sex-role expectations (i.e. explaining how to set up a day care agenda). This finding was congruent with Isaacs's (1981) finding in that there was no bias in the way college students judged the works of women when the field is traditionally reserved for women. Similarly, participants reported greater satisfaction for the leader when she was acting in a capacity congruent with sex-role expectations. In contrast, when the leader deviated from sex-role expectations by means of occupational title held and task content, devaluation was evident. This result is in support of Schein's (1973) finding that when women deviate from societal sex-role expectations, they may experience devaluation in terms of subordinate reactions to leader satisfaction.

Significant effects for sex-role deviation on task satisfaction were found. Specifically, subordinates perceived the task to be more satisfying when the leader presented a task which was aligned with perceptions of sex-role expectations. Again, this finding is consistent
with Petty and Bruning (1980), who found that consideration/participative behaviors correlated positively with subordinate satisfaction with supervision and work satisfaction in all job classifications.

An ordinal interaction between leadership style and sex-role deviation on leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction was predicted, but not found. There was no interaction between style and sex-role deviation. Participative leadership style in both in-role and out-of role conditions was preferred over directive leadership style. The difference between participative leadership style and directive style in the in-role condition was approximately the same as that in the out-role condition.

There were no significant differences in participants by gender in the ratings of the leaders in terms of effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and satisfaction with the task. This outcome contradicted some of the previous findings in the literature. Results of earlier studies suggested that men and women sometimes consider in-role and out-of-role behaviors differently,
suggesting that the same female (or male) behavior may be considered out-of-role by observers who are of one sex, but considered as in-role by observers of the other sex (Bond, 1981). In the present study, both men and women rated the leaders consistently in each condition, suggesting similar perceptions of leader effectiveness and satisfaction with leader and task across participants. Participative leadership style exhibited in in-role conditions was favored across all dependent variables, followed by participative leadership style exhibited in sex-role deviation conditions. In directive conditions, in-role scenarios yielded greater favorability than out-of-role conditions across the three dependent variables.

There has been very little leadership research conducted that has incorporated the use of videotaped vignettes. Videos have been used in research relating to leader emergence (Geis, Boston & Hoffman, 1985; Offerman, 1986) and subordinate reactions to leadership style. Prior to this study, there weren't any studies that examined the effects of sex-role deviation and leadership behaviors of female leaders incorporated into a video presentation.
Sex-role deviation studies have relied on the use of written excerpts (Bond, 1981; Jones et al., 1961) and self-reports (Beehr & Gupta, 1987; Gillespie, 1980; Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993). The decision to incorporate videotaped scenarios in lieu of written excerpts provided realism to the study.

There were several advantages to video-based testing. By utilizing video presentations, "active" and visible components of leadership behaviors may have depicted detailed behavioral incidents in more detail. A second advantage of using video vignettes was that by watching an actual scenario, the participant was exposed to the types of behaviors actually encountered on the job (Weekley & Jones, 1997). Written scenarios may not convey fully components of leadership behaviors. Written statements may also have characteristics of "passivity," where much is left to the reader's interpretation.

What differentiates the present study from prior research is that it focused solely on perceptions of leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction and task satisfaction based on leadership styles (behavioral and through dialogue), and how these styles were perceived when women
were in traditional and non-traditional occupations, communicating tasks which were either aligned with or deviating from sex-role expectations. Based on the results of the task and occupational title pilot study, there was an empirical basis for the choices of occupational title and task for both in-role and out-of-role conditions.

Statistics indicate that there are increasing numbers of women entering managerial and leadership positions over the past several decades (Solomon, 1995), yet the "glass ceiling" effects have been evident in both positions and pay within organizations (Frieze, Olson, & Good, 1990). The glass ceiling is a term which was coined in the early 1980s that describes the invisible barriers women come in contact with when trying to move up the corporate ladder. In many cases, these barriers would be encountered whether or not the woman was considered skilled, capable, or effective (Chaffins, Forbes, Fuqua & Cangemi, 1995). The findings in the present study showed that women in leadership positions are perceived as effective (based on mean ratings), and participants reported satisfaction with the leader when participative leadership styles were employed.
Another differential aspect of the present study was related to leader-subordinate relationships. Leader-subordinate relationships can be quite complex. The behaviors of the leader to subordinate may vary depending on personalities (Fiedler, 1964), shared work experiences (Wayne, Liden & Sparrowe, 1994) and organizational dynamics (Lott & Maluso, 1995). As a result of these relationships, it may be difficult for a subordinate who is operating directly under the leader's supervision to keep his/her feelings at bay. In other words, if a subordinate does not "click" with his or her leader, those negative feelings might affect his/her perception of that leader's effectiveness. Also, if the subordinate has a strong personal relationship with the leader, then those positive feelings may carry over into the evaluation of that leader, (i.e. a halo effect) where the leader is perceived as being effective just by the fact that he/she is liked by the subordinate. The present study incorporated the use of participants/observers rather than actual subordinates as it was believed that the participants would remain largely neutral, as they had no established relationship with the
leader, thereby reducing relationship bias.

The results of this study may be difficult to generalize to organizations. However, if one is just entering a new career position, the first impression received by the observer, and the reactions and attributions made by the new subordinate toward the leader might be useful to understand and recognize. Leaders who are in fields that are not in accordance with societal sex-role expectations might find the results in this study to be of value as they modify leadership training modules to "fit" the needs of the subordinate.

How can this study contribute to the field of Industrial/Organizational psychology and organizational development? Based on the results of this study, organizations might be motivated to incorporate or modify existing leadership training sessions to promote improvements in productivity and employee satisfaction. For example, an organization might modify leadership training to educate personnel as to the effects of participative leadership style and the conditions whereby the exhibition of participative style of leadership might be more effective
than directive in promoting greater employee satisfaction and task satisfaction.

A second contribution to the field is the knowledge that would be gained as a result of the study's outcomes. For many women, performing in a "man's world" may seem intimidating, to say the least. Women may be hesitant to take a directive or participative stance for fear of undesirable consequences or harmful responses from subordinates (Bond, 1981; Goldberg, 1968). Results of this study could prove to be beneficial for our understanding of what subordinates respond to in decision-making situations. Furthermore, if the neutral participants in this study indicate preference of one style of leadership over another then organizations might find that knowledge to be advantageous when recruiting applicants for leadership positions. They may be able to attract individuals for leadership positions who would help to foster and enhance their corporate culture.

The ultimate goal of this study was to provide information which would further educate men and women, leaders and subordinates, and top executives about good
leadership as seen by employees. The author believes that leadership effectiveness knows no gender, only skills and abilities. Furthermore, it is hoped that this study may probe to be a determinant of how women can be successful in positions of influence, despite discrimination, biases, and stereotyping. It is also hoped that this study will provide additional evidence that women can be perceived as capable of being effective in leadership positions even in male-dominated fields.

Future Research Implications. Implications for future research might include examining reactions to leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction of female leaders based on differences in leader ethnicity. In addition, it may be useful to run the same procedure using both women and men as actors/leaders to determine if perceptions differ by gender in the same conditions. It might also be useful to examine perceptions of observers when the subordinates are manipulated in terms of gender make-up. Lastly, future research might include manipulating the responses or feedback of the subordinates to the leader to examine the perceivers reactions as to leader
effectiveness.

Another component which could be added would be to include additional tasks and occupations so that the observer would be able to rate the leader in several in-role and out-of-role scenarios. In addition, it would be wise to distribute an Attitudes Toward Women, and/or Attitudes Toward Women Managers scale to assess participants' attitudes as they relate to perceptions of female leaders in varying leadership situations.
Footnote

¹Three hundred twenty-one (120 males and 201 females) participated in the study. These demographics reflect those of the sampling pool. First, 20 participants were removed because of missing data. In addition, 173 were also randomly removed to yield equal n.
APPENDIX A

Scale of Perceived Gender-Specific Tasks and Occupations from Pilot I

Please indicate your perception of the gender-oriented nature of the task by circling the number which corresponds to your perceptions. Simply stated, do you see the characteristics of the task as being masculine, feminine, or neutral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = very masculine</th>
<th>2 = somewhat masculine</th>
<th>3 = neutral</th>
<th>4 = somewhat feminine</th>
<th>5 = very feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explaining procedure for handling a bank deposit:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementing an evacuation procedure from blueprints:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Explain how to verify tax documents against receipts:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Setting up a diet regimen:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Planning a field trip for first and second-graders:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Describe procedure for handling parole violation:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teaching people how to use a fire extinguisher:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Planning a day care program:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Preparing a shipment for shipping:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching students to hook up an IV drip:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Starting up a neighborhood watch program:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Explaining how to inventory and place orders:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Describing how to prep a dental patient:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Developing a new market strategy:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teaching defensive driving:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Explaining how to phrase questions in structured interviews:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Establishing campus rules:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Revising a business's insurance policy:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Recruiting campaign personnel:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Planning an investment strategy with a customer:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Determining media to be used to promote an expansion team in the National Football league:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Discussing loan options with an applicant:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Implementing a standard operating procedures for employees working for the DMV:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Planning assignments for forklift drivers:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Explaining the procedure for handling a hazardous material spill or leak:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your perception of the gender-oriented nature of each position by circling the number which corresponds to your perceptions. Simply stated, do you see the position as being masculine, feminine, or neutral?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietitian:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care Superintendent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurse:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Manager:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Manager:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Manager:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Underwriter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbroker:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse Manager:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Teller:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Manager:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygienist:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Safety Superintendent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Principal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Specialist:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Consultant:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Consultant:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Scale of Perceived Leadership-Specific Tasks and Occupations from Pilot I

Please indicate your perception of the leadership required to perform the task by circling the number which corresponds to your perceptions. Simply stated, do you see the characteristics of the task as requiring little to no leadership, or some to a great deal of leadership.

1 = no leadership  2 = little leadership  3 = neutral  4 = some leadership  5 = great deal of leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explaining procedure for handling a bank deposit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementing an evacuation procedure from blueprints:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Explain how to verify tax documents against receipts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Setting up a diet regimen:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Planning a field trip for first and second-graders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Describe procedure for handling parole violation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teaching people how to use a fire extinguisher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Planning a day care program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Preparing a shipment for shipping:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching students to hook up an IV drip:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Starting up a neighborhood watch program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Explaining how to inventory and place orders:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Describing how to prep a dental patient:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Developing a new market strategy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teaching defensive driving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Explaining how to phrase questions in structured interviews:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Establishing campus rules:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Revising a business's insurance policy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Recruiting campaign personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Planning an investment strategy with a customer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Determining media to be used to promote an expansion team in the National Football league:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Discussing loan options with an applicant:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Implementing a standard operating procedures for employees working for the DMV:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Planning assignments for forklift drivers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Explaining the procedure for handling a hazardous material spill or leak:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B (cont)

Scale of Perceived Leadership-Specific Tasks and Occupations from Pilot 1

Please indicate your perception of the leadership required of these occupations by circling the number which corresponds to your perceptions. Simply stated, do you see the occupation as requiring little to no leadership, or some to a great deal of leadership.

1 = no leadership  2 = little leadership  3 = neutral  4 = some leadership  5 = great deal of leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dietitian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parole Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Day care Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Registered Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Purchasing Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sales Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Human Resource Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Insurance Underwriter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stockbroker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Loan Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Warehouse Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Bank Teller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Auditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Elementary School Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Firefighter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Transportation Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Police Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dental Hygienist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Driver Safety Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. High School Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Politician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Public Relations Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Management Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Environmental Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Leader Effectiveness Scale (LES)

Based on the scenario you have just read, think about what it would be like to become a member of the task team portrayed. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these statements using the following scale:

1=Strongly Disagree (SD)
2=Disagree
3=Somewhat disagree
4=Undecided
5=Somewhat agree
6=Agree
7=Strongly Agree (SA)

1. The leader explained the task clearly
2. The leader had problems gaining commitment from subordinates
3. The leader encouraged the group to ask questions
4. The leader imposed strict specific guidelines
5. The leader was not approachable
6. The leader implemented suggestions made by the group
7. The leader made use of the subordinates' individual talents
8. Subordinates were given a choice about their assignments
9. The leader provided positive feedback
10. I believe the leader was effective
APPENDIX D

Task Satisfaction Scale (TSS)

Based on the scenario you have just read, think about what it would be like to become a member of the task team portrayed. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these statements using the following scale:

1=Strongly Disagree (SD)
2=Disagree
3=Somewhat disagree
4=Undecided
5=Somewhat agree
6=Agree
7=Strongly Agree (SA)

1. The task sounded challenging to me
2. I would like to be given responsibility for a portion of the task
3. I feel that I would not be able to do a good job on the task
4. I would have reservations about explaining the task to my group
5. If I were to work on the task, I would not have the freedom to use my own judgment
6. I feel like I've been forced to work on this task
7. I would volunteer to work on the task
8. I would be able to use my talents when working on this task
9. I would enjoy the task more because I would feel that I was able to make decisions about how to design the process
APPENDIX E

Leader Satisfaction Scale (LSS)

Based on the scenario you have just read, think about what it would be like to become a member of the task team portrayed. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these statements using the following scale:

1=Strongly Disagree (SD)
2=Disagree
3=Somewhat disagree
4=Undecided
5=Somewhat agree
6=Agree
7=Strongly Agree (SA)

1. The leader would consider my goals and values
2. I would not be allowed to share my ideas
3. The leader would listen to my concerns
4. I would probably not be able to count on the leader for help when I have a problem
5. The leader would take an interest in my well-being
6. The leader would take my best interests into account if she made a decision that would affect me
7. The leader would not care about my opinions
8. The leader would give me encouragement if I was hesitant to perform the task
9. The leader would take advantage of me if given the opportunity
10. I would enjoy working for this leader
11. If I wanted to participate in the decision-making process, I would be encouraged to do so
12. The leader is not pleasing to me
13. I would be hesitant to approach this leader for help
14. The leader is friendly
Leader D has been given the responsibility for explaining a task to a group of subordinates who are on a special task force. The goal of the leader is to explain the task so that the task force can proceed to implement the process with their subordinates. The leader has already made the decision as to how the task will be implemented.

Leader D conducts the meeting in a seminar-like fashion. Leader D stands before the group and begins the meeting by saying, "I am here today to let you know about a process you will be implementing in your respective departments. Here is what I expect to cover in the next 15 minutes. You'll be expected to train your people in these procedures."

After explaining each procedure, the leader tells each task force member exactly what he or she will be responsible for. When questions are asked of the leader, the leader answers them directly and immediately resumes explaining the next procedure of the task. Suggestions made by the group are sometimes noted on a flipchart. If the task is difficult to understand, the leader repeats the procedure methodically and shows the group specifically how it is to be done. The leader performs the task him/herself.

There is little dialogue and discussion in this meeting other than the leader going over each phase of the task. The leader assigns the work based on the subordinates' talents or expertise.

The meeting concludes with the leader telling the group what he/she has decided and lets the group members know that they will have
the responsibility for carrying out the task. Leader D establishes time
guidelines by stating, "I need you to work on Phase 1 of the project and
report to me by 5:00 p.m. as to how it is working in your department. I
will also need a report of the people in your department who are not
complying with these procedures by Monday of next week." The leader then
gathers up the presentation materials and exits the room.
Leader P has been given the responsibility for explaining a task to a group of subordinates who are on a task force. The leader's goal is to explain the task so that the group can proceed to implement the process with their subordinates. The leader has an idea as to how he/she would like to structure the task but has opted to leave the decision in the hands of the task force.

Leader P conducts the meeting in an open forum fashion by stating, "Today, I would like to get your input about implementing a task. We have the responsibility for learning the task well enough to implement it in each of our departments. I'm open to any ideas and suggestions as to the outline of the task process."

Leader P goes over each phase of the procedure, fielding questions as they come up. Before moving to the next phase, the leader asks the group members what they think of the procedure. If subordinates make suggestions, the suggestions are noted on a flipchart and are immediately discussed by the task force, with the leader facilitating the discussion. The leader responds to every question or idea with phrases such as, "Good point," or "How do you think we can get this accomplished?" If the idea will be operationally impossible to implement, the leader lets the members know why and asks for more suggestions.

Leader P outlines each assignment on the chart and asks the group who would like to be responsible for each specific duty. If no one
volunteers, the leader assigns the work based on expertise, then reassures the members that he/she will be available to assist them if they run into any difficulties. If the task is difficult to understand, the leader has a group member demonstrate the task to the group members until all have had a chance to practice. The meeting concludes with the leader thanking the task force for their time and their ideas. The leader chats with the group for a few minutes before leaving the room.
APPENDIX H

Video Scenario

DAY CARE SUPERINTENDENT "DIRECTIVE"

The leader is standing at the front of the room.

Props: Blackboard, day care agenda manual, marker pens

Leader: "Good morning. My name is ______ and as you know, I am the superintendent of the ChildWorld Day care Centers in southern California. Each of you have been designated to open several new day care centers. I am here today to describe a new agenda I've developed that I want you to implement at your respective day care centers. I will spend the next few minutes outlining the new activities that you should be performing with your children. I expect you to take this information back to your assistant directors and proceed immediately with the implementation."

(The leader opens the manual and turns to the chalkboard containing various learning and playtime activities).

Leader: "I have listed the activities to be implemented by each of you on this chart. These activities can be found in your manuals on pages 10-30. The manual is divided into sections. There is a section showing the various equipment needed for every activity listed here. (Leader points to the blackboard) This manual has been approved by the California Day care Association and the association members want us to provide them with a formal copy of our daily agenda for a 30-day period. There is one guideline you must follow for the association directors.
APPENDIX H (Cont.)

There must be an equal balance between learning activities and playtime activities."

Subordinate #1: "I have a question about the activities."

Leader: "Okay, what is your question?"

Subordinate #1: "Would it be possible to implement the learning activities in the morning and save the playtime activities for the afternoon?"

Leader (shaking head as if to say no): "I want you to alternate the learning activities with the physical playtime activities. I feel it would be better for the children to have a mixed selection. For example, you should spend a half hour implementing the number learning activities that are illustrated in the manual, then the next half hour should be spent with a physical, indoor or outdoor playtime activity, much like what is outlined here" (Leader points to the playtime activities on the flipchart).

Leader: "I'm going to make assignments based on your areas of expertise so, Shawn, I want you to design the learning activities. Your teaching experience will come in handy. Geri, you have a background in physical education so I want you to implement the physical activities at each day care facility. Make sure that each facility has the correct allotment of playground equipment. The day care association is requiring a formal written agenda from each day care. Since we are under a time constraint for developing an agenda, I need to have your formal written agendas completed by the end of the month."
Subordinate #2: "Does the manual contain all of the pertinent information we will need to prepare the agendas?"

Leader: "I have given you all a template to follow and it is on page 4 of your manuals. This template makes it easy to document your daily activities. Fill out the template outline and make sure I have it by the end of the month. Do any of you foresee any problems in getting this to me within that time guideline?"

Subordinates: (In unison), "No"

Leader: "Okay then, if there are any further questions, you can come to my office."
The leader is standing at the front of the room.

Props: Blackboard, day care agenda manual, marker pens

Leader: "Good morning. I appreciate your time today. My name is ______ and I am the superintendent of the ChildWorld Day care Centers in southern California. Each of you has been designated to open several new day care centers. I am here today to get your input about creating a new agenda to be implemented at your respective day care centers. I will spend the next few minutes describing the guidelines for the activities and then I will ask you for some ideas."

(The leader opens the manual and turns to the chalkboard containing various learning and playtime activities).

Leader: "I have listed some of the activities you can choose from to incorporate into your agendas. These activities can be found in your manuals on pages 10-30. The manual is divided into sections. There is a section showing the various equipment needed for every activity listed here. This manual has been approved by the California Day care Association and the association members want each of us to provide them with a formal copy of our daily agenda for a 30-day period. There is one guideline we must follow for the association directors, there must be an equal balance between learning activities and playtime activities."

Subordinate #1: "I have a question about the activities."

Leader: "Sure, what can I help you with?"
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Subordinate #1: "Would it be possible to implement the learning activities in the morning and save the playtime activities for the afternoon?"

Leader (thinking for a moment): "That's an interesting idea. How would you suggest setting it up?"

Subordinate #1: "Well, in my experience, the children are fresher and more alert in the morning so they would learn more. In the afternoon, they need an outlet for their pent-up energy and I feel that physical activities would help us expend that energy."

Leader: "Hmm, good point. What do you think, Geri, about Shawn's idea?"

Subordinate #2: "I think Shawn brought up some good points, but my children get squirrely when they are sitting for long periods of time. I would like to experiment with the learning and playtime activities for a few days to see how it goes."

Leader: "You know, it is up to you as to how you would like to set the agenda. You may try out whatever agenda you want, but just ensure that you have an equal balance of activities. Would that be agreeable to you both?"

Subordinates 1 & 2: "Yeah, okay by me"

Leader: "I would like to delegate some of the workload. Shawn, I know that you have a great deal of teaching experience. Would you be willing to visit each day care center for this upcoming week to help the others with the agenda for the learning activities?"

Subordinate #1: "Yeah, I could work that out with my schedule."
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Leader: "Geri, with your background in physical education, I would like to put you in charge of designating people who can inventory the playground equipment. We need to make sure we have the correct allotment of playground equipment."

"We are under a bit of a time constraint in developing these agendas. I am going to have to ask that you get your completed formal agendas to me by the end of the month."

Subordinate #2: "Does the manual contain all of the pertinent information we will need to prepare the agendas?"

Leader: "I'm glad you brought that up. Yes, there is a sample outline you can follow and it is on page 4 of your manuals. It has been my experience that if you fill this out every day, it is much easier than trying to remember everything you did for the week.

I would appreciate it if you could write out a weekly agenda for the next four weeks and get them to me by the end of the month. Do you foresee any obstacles that would prevent you from meeting this time guideline?"

(Leader pauses, taking a look at everyone in the room)

Subordinates: (In unison) "No"

Leader: "That would be greatly appreciated. Again, I thank you for your time today. I'll be happy to talk to all of you individually if you'd like to discuss any concerns or other ideas."
APPENDIX J

Video Scenario

ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST "DIRECTIVE"

Props: Hazardous material response guide, lectern, and wall chart.
Scene: The leader walks into the meeting and stands at the lectern.

Leader: "Good morning. My name is _______ and I am the company environmental/safety specialist. Each of you have been designated to train the employees at your facilities in hazardous material cleanup. I am here today to describe the training and documentation requirements required by the Environmental Protection Agency. I want you to implement this training at your facilities. I will spend the next few minutes explaining the containment phase of hazardous material spills or leaks that you should be reviewing with your employees. I will expect you to know the method well enough to train the people in your respective departments. I want you to proceed immediately."

The leader opens the emergency response guidebook)

Leader: "I have listed the four steps or procedures you need to cover during a hazardous material spill on this chart. These steps can be found in your guidebooks on pages T-8. The manual is divided into sections. There is a section showing the various cleanup supplies needed for containing every type of hazardous substance. This response guidebook has been approved by the EPA and the agency wants us to provide them with a formal copy of our training roster for a 30-day period. There is one guideline you must follow for the EPA directors. You must ensure that every person who handles hazardous material at your
facilities knows the process for each phase of the training.

**Subordinate #1:** "I have a question about the training"

**Leader:** "Okay, what is your question?"

**Subordinate #1:** Would it be possible to perform this training off-site, perhaps at a local park?

**Leader:** (shaking head as if to say no): "I want you to train your people at your facilities. I feel it would be better to train your employees at work. You should spend a half hour after everyone's lunch to review a step in the process. After their last break, you should take another half hour and go over the second step. You need to proceed like this until you've covered all four steps."

**Leader:** "I am going to make assignments based on your areas of expertise. Chris, since you've had experience using the guidebook, I want you to go to each facility and cover the major points of the book with everyone. Pat, you have inventoried before so I want you to inventory every facility. Make sure that each spill cabinet has the correct allotment of cleanup materials. The EPA is requiring a formal written training roster from each facility. Since we are under a time constraint for developing a roster and training your employees, I need to have your formal training rosters completed by the end of the month."

**Subordinate #2:** "Does the guidebook contain all of the pertinent information we will need to prepare the training roster?"

**Leader:** "There is a sample roster on page 18 in the guidebook. This roster outline makes it easy to document your daily training
progression. Fill out the roster and make sure I have it by the end of the month. Do any of you foresee any problems in getting this to me within that time guideline?"

Subordinates (In unison): "No"

Leader: "Okay then, if there are any further questions, you can come to my office."
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Video Scenario

ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST "PARTICIPATIVE"

Props: Hazardous material response guide, lectern, and wall chart.

Scene: The leader walks into the meeting and stands at the lectern.

Leader: "Hello, everyone. I appreciate your time today. My name is _______ and I am the environmental/safety specialist for the company. Each of you has been designated to train the employees at your facilities in hazardous material cleanup. I am here today to get your ideas and input about creating a training program and completing documentation required by the Environmental Protection Agency. I will be spending the next few minutes reviewing the containment phase of hazardous material spills or leaks. Then I will be asking for your input.

(The leader opens the emergency response guidebook).

Leader: "I have listed the four steps or procedures you should cover during a hazardous material spill on this chart. If you open your guidebooks, you can find these steps on pages 1-8. The manual is divided into sections. There is a section showing the various cleanup supplies needed for every type of hazardous substance. This response guidebook has been approved by the EPA. The agency wants us to provide them with a formal copy of our training roster for a 30-day period. There is one guideline we must follow for the EPA directors. We must ensure that every person who handles hazardous material at our facilities knows the process for each phase of the training."
Subordinate #1: "I have a question about the training."

Leader: "Sure, what can I help you with?"

Subordinate #1: "Would it be possible to perform this training off-site, perhaps at a local park?"

Leader (thinking for a moment): "That's an interesting idea. How would you suggest setting that up?"

Subordinate #1: "Well, I think it would be more enjoyable for my group if we could meet outside of the facility. I could bring the manuals and equipment to the park or to another site agreed upon by my subordinates. In my experience, my employees tend to enjoy the training more when they are away from the work environment, plus they are not distracted by the phones."

Leader: "Good idea, Pat. Chris, what do you think about Pat's idea?"

Subordinate #2: "I think Pat brought up some good points. I would like to get with my employees to see how they would like to the training to be implemented.

Leader (nodding): "You know, it is up to you as to how you would like to set up the training. You may try out whatever program you want, but just ensure that you have an equal balance of activities. Would that be agreeable to you both?"

Group: "Yes, Okay."

Leader: "Now, I would like to delegate some of the workload. Chris, I know that you have had a lot of experience using the guidebook. Would
you be willing to visit each facility to cover the major points of the
book with everyone?"

Subordinate #2: "Sure."

Leader: "Pat, with your background in inventory control, I would like to
put you in charge of designating people who can inventory the hazardous
spill cabinets. We need to make sure that each cabinet has the correct
allotment of cleanup materials."

"The EPA is requiring us to provide them with a formal written training
roster from each facility by the end of the month. Since we are under a
time constraint for developing a roster and training our employees, I am
going to ask that you get your completed rosters to me by the end of the
month."

Subordinate #1: "Does the guidebook contain all of the pertinent
information we will need to prepare the training roster?"

Leader: "I'm glad you brought that up. Yes, there is a sample roster and
it is on page 18 in the guidebook. This roster makes it easy to document
your daily training progression. I would appreciate it if you could fill
out the rosters as you go and get them in to me by the end of the month.
Do you foresee any obstacles that would prevent you from meeting this
time guideline?" (Leader pauses, taking a look at everyone in the
room)

Subordinates #1 & 2 (In unison): "Nope"

Leader: "That would be greatly appreciated. Again, I want to thank you
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for your time today. I'll be happy to talk to all of you individually if you'd like to discuss any concerns or other ideas.
APPENDIX L

Informed Consent

Student Perceptions of Gender and Leadership Characteristics of Occupational Positions and Tasks

The study in which you are about to participate is designed to examine gender and leadership characteristics of occupational positions and tasks. The study is being conducted by Kathie Pelletier, under the supervision of Dr. Jan Kottke, Professor of Psychology. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Human Subjects Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino. The university requires that you give your consent before participating in this study.

In this study, you will be asked to view four videotaped scenarios portraying task force meetings. After each video, you will be asked to fill out three short questionnaires dealing with occupational positions and tasks. The entire process should take no longer than 45 minutes to complete. Upon completion of the questionnaires, you may turn them in directly to Kathie Pelletier or the designated experimenter. All of your responses will be held in the strictest of confidence by the researcher. Your name will not be reported with your responses. All data will be reported in group form only. You may receive results of this study upon completion of the Spring quarter of 1998.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary. Participants are free to withdraw their participation at any time during this study without penalty. When you complete the task, you will receive a debriefing statement describing the study in more detail. Extra credit may be received at the instructor's discretion. In order to ensure the validity of the study, we ask that you not discuss this study with other students. If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Jan Kottke at 909-880-5585.

By placing a check in the space provided below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand the nature and purpose of the study, and I freely consent to participate. I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Place check here _______  Today's date: ____________
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Debriefing Statement

The Effects of Leadership Style and Sex-Role Deviation of Female Leaders on Perceptions of Leader Effectiveness, Leader Satisfaction, and Task Satisfaction

The purpose of this study was to gain insight as to student perceptions of leader effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and task satisfaction based on the leadership styles of women when women hold traditional and non-traditional occupational positions. This study served as the research project for a graduate student's thesis.

Group-level results of this study can be obtained at the end of the Spring Quarter of 1998 (no individual data will be reported). If you would like more information regarding this study, please feel free contact Dr. Jan Kottke at 909-880-5585.

Once again, we ask that you not discuss this study with anyone. I want to thank you for your participation in filling out the questionnaires.

Kathie Pelletier/MSIO graduate student
APPENDIX N

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Gender (M or F)________

Age_______

Work Experience _______ years _______ months (approx)

Full-time (40 hours/week) place a check if applicable_______

Part-time (20 hours/week) place a check if applicable_______

Hours per week if less than 20_______

Nature of occupation or job title______________________________
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