Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Gender Differences and Managerial Style

The fact that adult men and women are psychologically different is something much less discussed than the extent to which these differences are genetically determined or caused by differences in the socialization of individuals. Furthermore, such differences frequently do not match differences in gender roles (i.e., differences in what society expects about the psychological qualities and behaviour of men and women). This mismatch between expected and real behavioural differences are especially important in the managerial environment, where feminine traits have often been seen incompatible with “good manager” features (Schein, 1973).

Studies that have surveyed the description and evaluation of managers’ leadership by their peers, bosses, subordinates and the managers themselves have found that there are qualitatively differences in the way men and women lead. Paradoxically they found neither significant nor consistent differences in the aggregate effectiveness of their leadership.
In a meta-analysis of a large number of previous studies, Eagly and Johnson (1990) reported that women tend to manage in a more participative and democratic way, while male managers are more directive and autocratic. They found no evidence of differences between managers of both sexes in their reliance on interpersonal relationships or task definition for their leadership styles. Nevertheless, women seems to score higher in “transformational” style, which involves more intense interpersonal interactions to give individualized mentoring to subordinates, to serve them as managerial model and to be proactive at stimulating workers’ interest in the job. Men scored higher in “Management by Default” and “laissez-faire” styles, suggesting that male managers tend to delegate more and be less proactive in supervision tasks. In an analogous study, Eagly, Karau and Makhijani (1995) found that men and women do not generally differ in their organizational effectiveness.

In a more recent work, Kabacoff (1998) matched 900 pairs of managers from different sexes, working at similar positions within the same firm, and analysed several dimensions of their managing styles and their organisational effectiveness. His results cast doubts about the more democratic leadership style of women, although the proxies used to measure it are rather indirect. This study also depicts women rating higher in both interpersonal and
task oriented styles, while male managers seem more concerned about “vision-creation”.

During the last 30 years, the roles of men and women in the workforce, and to a lesser extent in the home, have changed dramatically (Roehling & Moen, 2003). The change was supported by the Women’s movement, which successfully advocated for the equal opportunity of women in the workplace (Friedan, 1963), and by the steady decline in the earning power of men’s wages, making women’s employment a necessity for many families in the 1970s (Mishel, Bernstein, & Schmitt, 2001; Wilkie, 1991).

Some experts indicates that equality in top management positions between men and women, will not balance out for another 20-30 years (Crampton & Mishra, 1999). Research relating to working women is vast; however, research specifically targeting women managers is lacking. Considering the growing trend of women in management, empirical research relating to women managers, especially those with dependent children, is an area worthy of continued research.

Research has shown that traditional stereotypes of women and men are predominate in both work settings and non-work settings with upper level managerial positions characterized generally in masculine terms (Heilman, 2001; Schein, 2001). In this respect, men and women are thought to differ in terms of agentic
and communal traits with men being aggressive, independent and
decisive, whereas women are characterized as helpful and
cconcerned about others (Heilman, 2001).

**Managerial Aspirations**

According to the American Heritage Dictionary, aspiration is
defined as 1.) a strong desire for high achievement or 2.) An object
of this desire. Thus, according to this definition, an aspiration is
either the desire to achieve an end state or the end state itself
(goal). Scientific interpretations have encompassed elements of
these two definitions of aspiration. The concept of aspiration has
been referred to as an expectation or goal (Lewin, 1956). Thus, the
intention to pursue the goal and the attitude toward the goal
appear to comprise an individual’s aspirations. The concept of
aspiration as it relates to occupations and more specifically to
careers in management, has been conceptualized and
operationalized in various manners in the empirical research that
exists to date.

In their effort to understand the potential correlates of
management aspirations, researchers have conceptualized and
measured management aspirations differently (Goffee & Scase,
1992; Judge et al., 1995; Martin, Price, Bies, & Powers, 1987;
Rynes et al., 1988; Sloan, 1993; Steiner & Farr, 1986).
Conceptually, management aspirations have been labeled career
aspirations of managers (Goffee & Scase, 1992), senior manager or 
CEO aspirations (Sloan, 1993), ambition for a managerial position 
(Judge et al., 1995; Van Vianen, 1999), advancement aspirations 
(Tremblay & Roger, 1993), managerial aspirations (Rynes et al., 
1988), promotion aspirations (Stout et al., 1988), career goals 
(Steiner & Farr, 1986), and intention to manage (Van Vianen & 
Keizer, 1996). While management aspirations in these studies have 
been conceived of as either an end state (e.g. position) or the desire 
to achieve an end state (e.g. ambition), the conceptualizations and 
definitions are as different as the studies in which they are 
employed.

In terms of measurement, management aspirations has been 
measured primarily as single items asking respondents to indicate 
a hierarchical level on a checklist to which they ultimately aspire 
(Judge et al., 1995), to indicate whether they would like to move 
into a management position (Martin et al., 1987; Rynes et al., 
1988), to mark an occupational category (Jacobs et al., 1991), or to 
answer a question such as “Have you attained the highest position 
to which you aspire?”(Goffee & Scase, 1992; Wentling, 1996).

Two-item measures of management aspirations include a 
combination of items asking respondents (1) to indicate their 
preferences for moving into a position in management and (2) to 
rate the importance of such a move (Sloan, 1993; Steiner & Farr,
1986; Stout et al., 1988; Tremblay & Roger, 1993). Finally, two studies used five and six-item scales to measure ambition for a managerial position (Van Vianen, 1999) and intention to assume a managerial job (Van Vianen & Keizer, 1996), respectively. These studies used the same or similar items such as, “I want to fulfill a management position in the near future”, “I have said to my relatives that I want to get promotion”, and “Management is a special challenge to me”.

Studies of management aspirations have primarily used cross-sectional surveys, although some researchers have performed experiments (Martin et al., 1987) or employed case study methodology including face-to-face interviews (Sloan, 1993; Wentling, 1996). While the studies of management aspirations have used working adults as the sample population, only a handful have specifically used managers as the population of interest (Goffee & Scase, 1992; Judge et al., 1995; Sloan, 1993; Tremblay & Roger, 1993; Wentling, 1996).

Finally, while prior studies do include adult populations in their samples, only a few of them include managers in their populations of interest, and of those, the levels of management have been defined differently. In this manner, the aspirations of managers and professionals to positions in senior management have not been isolated from management aspirations in general.
Gender Differences on Managerial Aspirations

Evolving organizational structures have affected the managerial competencies needed to compete successfully (Allred et al., 1996), as well as the nature of managerial career paths and career management strategies. For example, senior managers in nontraditional organizations must possess strong collaborative skills to work with their more empowered subordinates. These changes in managerial competencies and careers are reflected in the theoretical developments and empirical research in the careers literature.

The body of career development and decision-making literature has grown tremendously in the past two decades. However, management aspirations, a very specific topic housed within the domain of career development and decision-making, has garnered relatively little theoretical and empirical attention. Career support, a form of social support, both on and off the job, may serve to enable or constrain the relationship between one’s desire to become a senior manager and his or her intentions to pursue such a position. Social support from individuals at work and at home has been shown to benefit career-focused individuals (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000).

Finally, women are underrepresented in senior management positions (Andrew, Coderre, & Denis, 1990) and fewer women than
men are promoted to positions in senior management (Hede & Ralston, 1993). Evidence exists which suggests that women have lower aspirations for advancement than men (Greenhaus et al., 1997) and women managers aspire to lower managerial positions (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1993).

Because women and men hold similar values regarding advancement and promotion (Rowe & Snizek, 1995), additional factors related to gender must account for differences in aspirations. This research explored the relationships between gender and various lifestyle and work factors such as advancement opportunities, off-job involvement and career support as potentially influencing an individual’s aspirations to positions in senior management.

**Managerial Leadership**

Planning, organizing, leading and controlling/coordinating are four major functions associated with traditional views of management (McNamara, 1999). In order to be an effective member of an organization, one need to be able to emphasize different skills at different times (McNamara).

It is important to realize that effective leadership is imperative for molding a group of people into a team and shaping the team into a force that serves as a competitive business advantage (Kotelnikov, 2005). In this regard, the literature supports various
explanations for behavioral and leadership style differences or similarities between women and men in leadership positions.

**Gender Differences on Managerial Leadership**

Gender differences in motivational orientation have been deemed to be important mediating factors in fashioning differential leadership styles. Some researchers have examined the relationship between the evaluation of leadership effectiveness and gender-mediated differences in leadership style. Masculine and feminine styles can be understood in terms of the content of stereotypes of masculinity and femininity. Factor-analytic studies of people’s stereotypes about men and women (e.g., Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Eagly & Steffen, 1984) have shown that popular beliefs about male and female behavior can be summarized, following Bakan (1966), in terms of differences on two dimensions: the agentic and the communal. Women are expected to display high levels of communal (social) qualities, including needs for affiliation, lack of self-centeredness, concern with others, spontaneity, playfulness, and emotional expressiveness. These qualities reflect a more social orientation, openness to experiencing stimuli, especially feelings, and a direct connection to other people. Men are expected to have high levels of agentic (instrumental) attributes, including being independent,
masterful, assertive, and instrumentally competent. These qualities reflect a tendency to promote the self, especially self-confidence.

When applied to leadership, gender role stereotypes suggest that female-stereotypical forms of leadership are interpersonally oriented and collaborative, whereas male-stereotypical forms of leadership are task oriented and dominating (nvCann & Siegfried, 1990). These findings are consistent with the reasoning that the gender role congruency of female leaders’ behavior influences the degree to which they experience role conflict and violate other people’s expectations about their behavior (e.g., Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Jago & Vroom, 1982; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Powell, 1990; Terborg, 1977; Watson, 1988). To the extent that women exhibit a masculine style, they amplify their role conflict and increase the chances of receiving unfairly negative evaluations. Eagly and Johnson’s (1990) meta-analysis showed that the tendency to devalue female leaders was larger when women behaved autocratically than when they behaved in accord with any other style.

Gender role congruency has different ramifications for the evaluation of male leaders’ behaviors because male leaders do not face a basic role conflict analogous to the conflict that female leaders face in their dual status as women and leaders. Expectations about behavior that is appropriate for a leader
coincide largely with beliefs about the behavior that is appropriate for men, as numerous social scientists have maintained (e.g., Bass, 1990; Eagly et al., 1992; Kruse & Wintemantel, 1986; O’Leary, 1974). Whereas the details of female leaders’ behaviors may be scrutinized because of their role conflict, male leaders are not ordinarily constrained by the attitudinal bias of their coworkers. Hence, men are freer to carry out leadership in a variety of masculine or feminine styles without encountering negative reactions because their leadership is ordinarily perceived as legitimate. Assuming a generally satisfactory level of competence, a broader range of behaviors whether those behaviors are congruent or diverge from the male gender role, are more likely to be tolerated in male leaders.

In summary, because the male gender role legitimizes leadership in men, male leaders may be freer to diverge from stereotypes of masculinity. Female leaders are relatively constrained in the behaviors that will be perceived as effective because of the conflict they face as women and leaders.

Ridgeway (2001) proposed that sex differences in influence and leadership occur because people presume that men are more competent and legitimate as leaders than are women. Her argument was based on the existence of gender stereotypes which contain beliefs associating greater overall competence with men
more than women in addition to ascribing each sex particular skills. She asserted that in mixed sex contexts or contexts culturally associated with men, women’s efforts to assert authority would create resistance and dislike and, therefore, reduce their effectiveness as leaders. However, in situations that were culturally associated with women, they would not encounter resistance to their assertion of authority because gender status gives women a slight advantage in those situations.

From the perspective of social role theory of sex differences and similarities (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000), Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) argued that sex differences and similarities vary with social contexts. They asserted that the managers and the leaders occupy roles defined by their specific position in a hierarchy and also function under constraints of their gender roles. These authors argued that gender roles have different implications for the behavior of female and male leaders because not only to do their roles have different content (ascribing concern for others to women; ascribing assertiveness and decisiveness to men) but there is often inconsistency between the predominantly communal qualities that perceivers associate with women and the predominantly agentic qualities that they think are required to succeed as a leader.
Eagly and Johnson (1990) found both the presence and absence of differences between the sexes in different settings in their meta-analysis of studies comparing leadership styles of women and men. In organizational settings, female and male leaders did not differ which was in contrast to the gender stereotypic expectation that women lead in an interpersonally oriented style and men lead in a task oriented style. However, in laboratory experiments and assessment studies gender stereotypic expectations prevailed. In these studies, contextual dimensions and leader power were likely omitted in scenarios, which allowed respondents to rely on gender stereotypes when judging another’s behavior (Ragins, 1991; Vecchio, 2002). Additionally in each setting, there was a tendency for women to adopt a more democratic or participative style and a less autocratic or directive style than men.

From a feminist perspective, leadership is enacted within a gendered context (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001). This means contexts exist on a continuum ranging from male dominated, hierarchical, power-expressive to transformational contexts stressing empowerment of followers. The sex composition of the group, task characteristics, and shifting standards of acceptable behavior are variations of context that form a setting which is more or less congenial to women and affect what is and is
not effective for women operating in a particular context (Yoder, 2001).

Leadership styles can be thought of on a continuum with one end being highly masculinized and the other end represented by transformational leadership. On the masculinized end, agentic leader behavior is valued. The group is mostly composed of male followers who are task oriented. It generally appears as a hierarchical organization that identifies leadership in terms of dominance and resistance to unwanted demands of others (Yoder, 2001). Transformational leadership, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of the leader's vision in giving direction and meaning to followers; stresses influence, not power; empowerment of self and others; valuing group outcomes and cohesiveness; and satisfaction and development of individuals as indicators of leader effectiveness rather than emphasis on only task performance (Yoder).

To summarize, no one leader style has proven to be best in all contexts (Larson, Hunt, & Osburn, 1976; Nystrom, 1978; Schriesheim, 1982). Studies have shown that gender role stereotypes affect leader behaviors in different contexts and also affect the acceptability of those behaviors, especially those of women, as they are perceived by others. Using a measure of transformational leadership in the current research appears to be appropriate for measuring leadership practices for women.
**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of the study is to find out the gender differences in managerial aspirations, managerial potentials and leadership roles among physical education and non-physical education students.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of the study is to find out the gender differences in managerial aspirations, potential and leadership roles among physical education and non-physical education students. Therefore, the following three questions will be answered:

1. Is there a difference between men and women physical education and non physical education students on managerial aspirations?

2. Is there a difference between men and women physical education and non physical education students on managerial potential?

3. Is there a difference between men and women physical education and non physical education students on leadership role?

**Hypotheses**

The following research hypotheses were developed from the proposed model of managerial factors and tested at .05 level of significance.
1. There would be significant difference between the men and women students irrespective of the course/degree on managerial potentials, managerial aspirations and leadership.

2. There would be significant difference between physical education and non physical education students irrespective of gender on managerial potentials, managerial aspirations and leadership.

3. There would be significant difference between the men and women physical education and non physical education students on managerial potentials, managerial aspirations and leadership.

**Delimitations**

1. To achieve the purpose of the study, a total of two hundred and forty participants were selected randomly as subjects. The physical education students studying Final year M.P.Ed were selected from the physical education colleges in Tamilnadu and Non-physical education students were studying final year management students from the affiliated colleges of Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli were selected.

2. The age of the subjects ranged from 21 to 25 years.

3. The selected participants were divided into four groups according to their gender and course. Each group consisted of 60 subjects.
Physical Education Students

Group I - Men (n=60)

Group II - Women (n=60)

Non-physical Education Students

Group I - Men (n=60)

Group II - Women (n=60)

4. The following variables were selected for this study.

Managerial Aspiration – Managerial Aspiration Scale (MAS)

Managerial Potential

a. Self-assurance – Self Description Inventory (SDI)

b. Decisiveness – Self Description Inventory (SDI)

c. Need for power – Self Description Inventory (SDI)

d. Need for achievement – Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ)

e. Need for affiliation – Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ)

f. Need for autonomy – Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ)

g. Need for dominance – Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ)

h. Tolerance for ambiguity – MacDonald’s AT-20.

Leadership role – Leadership Scale
Limitations

There are several limitations of this study.

1. This study is aimed at professional sports and its results may not be generalizable to amateur sports. Professional sports have their own characteristics and deal with different consumer needs. Therefore, the conceptual model of managerial factors affecting identification with a professional team may not be applicable to an amateur team.

2. Another limitation derives from the sampling technique. A further limitation is contributed by survey research. This limitation is related to whether the questions to be answered are clear and not misleading, and to whether subjects in this study thoughtfully and honestly completed the survey questionnaire (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

3. The limitation is that the random sampling method could not be used in this study. Thus, the results are less exact than those based on random sampling techniques (McMillan, 2000).

4. The results from samples of students may raise concerns about limited generalization. The students participating in the study may have unique characteristics compared to other populations, which may limit the generalization of the results.
5. This study is not a true experimental design. Thus causal relationship cannot be verified. The results should be treated with caution. There is possibility that the results are caused by other variables.

6. All the data collected are based on self-reports. Thus, the accuracy of the data may be contaminated by social desired bias.

**Definition of the Operational Terms**

**Managerial Aspiration**

Managerial aspiration is defined here as an individual’s desire and intention to move into a management position in an organization, and is conceptualized as a dual-faceted construct with attitudinal and behavioral components (Dunnette, 1971).

**Managerial Leadership**

The ability to influence people toward the attainment of goals (Laios et al, 2003).

**Self-assurance**

Self-assurance refers to "the extent to which an individual perceives himself/herself to be effective in dealing with the problems that confront him/her" (Ghlselli 1971 p. 57).
Decisiveness

Decisiveness refers to "determination to act now, with dispatch, not delaying due to over-cautiousness, to deal with problems now, not later when the problems may have increased in size and complexity" (Ghiselli 1971 p. 61).

Need for power

Need for power refers to the need to direct and exert influence over others (McClelland Burnham, 1976).

Need for achievement

Need for achievement is "the desire to do something better or more efficiently than it has been done before" (McClelland Burnham 1976 p. 100).

Need for affiliation

Need for affiliation, which is the desire to be closer to people and to be liked, makes a manager more sensitive to the needs of subordinates.

Need for autonomy

Need for autonomy refers to the desire to be self-directing and self-governing (Harrel Alport 1979).
**Need for dominance**

Need for dominance is the need to be in control over others and comprises aggressiveness, confidence, persistence and independence (Harlan & Weiss, 1981).

**Tolerance for ambiguity**

Tolerance for ambiguity, defined as a "willingness to accept a state of affairs capable of alternate interpretations, or of alternate outcomes" (English & English, 1958 p. 24).

**Significance of the Study**

1. Findings of this study may shed some light on our understanding of trust in leadership as well as the outcomes of such trust in athletic teams. However, those findings should be taken with caution.

2. Although articles have been published offering propositions as to which managerial factors may influence gender difference, none have empirically tested the relationship between managerial characteristics and gender difference. This study proposes a conceptual model based on previous literature and an empirical study to test if the managerial factors can influence gender.

3. The findings of this research should contribute to the literature on managerial style, and should also lead to further
research in assessing how a team’s managerial factors may affect managerial benefits on gender.

4. To coaches, information from this research should provide empirical support for marketing plans, management decisions, and marketing strategies to enhance team identification and enhance a performance.

5. Finally, it is the researcher’s hope and expectation that the instrument used in this study and its results should be useful to current managers and coaches of various teams in stimulating their critical thinking and contributing to improved managerial decision-making and better marketing plans that would ensure a bright future for the sport industry.

**Organization of the Thesis**

Chapter I reviews the specific aims of this research. Additionally, the hypotheses are presented, with a brief discussion of what they mean and some of the literature that supports their inclusion. These hypotheses will be discussed throughout the dissertation, including methodology in how to test them, results of their analysis, and a discussion on what the findings mean.

In order to gain a greater awareness of this area, a review of the evolution of the gender-difference myths on managerial aspirations, potential and leadership will be provided in Chapter II. In addition, role of gender on managerial and leadership styles will
be discussed. Numerous obstacles that men and women encounter as managers, and as leaders, will be reviewed highlighting gender role stereotyping research. A discussion of leader behavior including sex differences, similarities and contextual effects, along with a discussion of women’s leadership effectiveness will conclude Chapter II.

The methodology and measures utilized to answer the current research questions will be outlined in Chapter III. It reviews the conceptual model. Beginning the chapter is a figure that models the various concepts and proposed links among these ideas. Each concept is discussed in the context of previous publications. This is done in order to better understand some of the background behind the inclusion of that particular idea in this research.

In Chapter IV, the results of the research will be presented.

Finally in Chapter V, a discussion of the results, conclusions, and future research recommendations will be offered.