

ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARCHETYPES CONFRONT LEADERSHIP THEORY: TESTING THE LINKAGE BETWEEN MASCULINITY/FEMININITY AND TASK/RELATIONSHIP APPROACHES

Carolyn B. Mueller, Stetson University
John Rushing, Barry University
Betty Thorne, Stetson University

This paper describes a test of the hypothesis that the Masculinity/Femininity cultural dimension may be understood as the theoretical base for the Style Leadership approaches explored at The Ohio State University, the University of Michigan, and developed by Blake and Mouton and followers (Rushing & Mueller, 2005). Using Hofstede's Values Survey and Northouse's Style Questionnaire, the authors examined hypothesized correlations between Masculinity and Task and between Femininity and Relationship. Unexpectedly, the results did not support the hypothesized relationships between Masculinity and Task and Femininity and Relationship. Results and conclusions are discussed and further research is suggested.

BACKGROUND

Hofstede has persuasively argued that his dimensions of national culture are in some sense archetypes of an anthropological nature (Hofstede, 1998: 10-11). Here we suggest that the Masculinity/Femininity dimension may provide an underlying theoretical base for Style approaches that have been so popular in the U.S. leadership literature. This perspective is consistent with one in which Expectancy Theory is viewed as the theoretical base for Path-Goal Leadership approaches. This perspective may provide useful insights into understanding the theoretical base of the Style approaches and the implementation of those models in leadership practice.

American leadership literature has evolved over the last century. Initial thought reflected the trait or "great man" approaches, which essentially claimed that hereditary factors accounted for leadership. That is, sons of kings made kings and sons of bakers make bakers (Lippitt, 2002: 6). Although this approach lost favor in the mid-20th Century, there has been a resurgence of interest as reflected in Lord, DeVader and Alliger (1986) and Kirkpatrick and Lock (1991). This is also reflected in research on visionary and charismatic leadership by Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Zaleznik (1977).

The trait approach was gradually supplanted by skills approaches, reviewed by Bass (1990). Northouse (2004) states that the impetus for research on skills originated in 1955 with the classic *Harvard Business Review* article by Robert Katz. Like the trait approach, interest waned for a time and, in a similar manner, there has been renewed interest by researchers (e.g., Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000; Yammarino, 2000) in the late 20th Century.

In the 1940's, studies originating at The Ohio State University described an approach based upon differences in style. About the same time, studies of small group leadership were undertaken at the University of Michigan. Although different terms were used to define main concepts, it is questionable that there were substantive differences. Some professors have reasoned that the different terms had less to do with real differences between findings of the two studies and more to do with the desire to differentiate products for the purpose of publication and commercialization. The record is clear on one thing, the authors of the different approaches, most notably Blake and Mouton, published and profited from their approaches (Northouse, 2004).

Currently, Littrell (2004) and a global group of colleagues are collaborating in an area of cross-cultural research using the Schwartz Value Survey and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII to try to determine the relationship of values and explicit leadership behavior preferences across cultures. In a similar vein, a group of professors at the University of Florida recently published a study of the validity of consideration/initiating structure in leadership research (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004). So there remains a scholarly interest in the Style approach down to the present.

STYLE APPROACHES

While a number of researchers worked on Style approach studies, three primary approaches are best known and most widely accepted – The Ohio State studies, the University of Michigan studies, and the studies of Blake and various research associates including Mouton and McCauley, all instrumental in developing the Leadership Grid.

The Ohio State Studies

A small group of researchers including Stogdill, Shartle, and Hemphill explored the behavioral indicators of effective leadership in the 1940's (Stogdill, 1948, 1950). Employees were asked to fill out a questionnaire indicating how many times their supervisor exhibited certain behaviors. The original questionnaire was constructed from a list of 1,800 items. From this master list of items, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), a more focused questionnaire of 150 questions, was developed (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

Different behaviors were studied over time and, ultimately, two primary factors were identified: consideration and initiating structure. Consideration was defined as the degree to which a leader shows concern and respect for followers, looks out for their welfare, and expresses appreciation and support (Bass, 1990). Initiating structure was defined as the degree to which a leader defines and organizes his role and the roles of followers, is oriented toward goal attainment, and establishes well-defined patterns and channels of communication (Fleishman, 1957).

University of Michigan Studies

At about the same time the researchers at The Ohio State University were developing the LBDQ, researchers at the University of Michigan were exploring leadership behaviors in the context of small group performance (Likert, 1961, 1967). The University of Michigan researchers also isolated two primary dimensions: employee orientation and production orientation.

According to Northouse, "Employee orientation is very similar to the cluster of behaviors identified in the Ohio State studies as consideration" (2004: 68). That is, employee orientation is described as leadership behavior with a strong human relations emphasis. Leaders take an interest in workers as human beings, value their individuality, and give special attention to their personal needs. Production orientation is described as leadership behaviors that emphasize production and technical aspects. Employees are viewed instrumentally, as a means for production (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). Again, Northouse states, "Production orientation parallels the initiating structure cluster found in [T]he Ohio State studies" (2004: 68).

One interesting difference between the studies initially was that the Michigan State researchers conceptualized the two factors as opposite ends of a single continuum rather than two separate factors. Ultimately, they reconceptualized the two factors as two independent leadership orientations (Kahn, 1956). We shall return to this important issue in our discussion of Masculinity/Femininity.

Blake and Mouton Leadership Grid

The Leadership Grid, previously labeled the Managerial Grid, first appeared in the early 1960's and may be the best known model of managerial behavior. Since its introduction it has gone through many evolutions (Blake & McCauley, 1991; Blake & Mouton, 1964, 1978, 1985). The grid is a two-by-two matrix formed from two key factors: concern for production and concern for people.

Concern for production is described as leader concern for achieving organizational tasks. Concern for production extends to concern for process, activities, policy decisions, development of new products or services, and distributing work; that is, measurables and deliverables. Concern for people is transparent in that it refers to leader concern for people, their working conditions, compensation, and organizational commitment and is related to trust building and promoting good social relations (Blake & Mouton, 1964). The Leadership Grid then conceptualizes concern for production and concern for people in a two-by-two matrix model. The quadrants have

been named and renamed over time as different co-authors and researchers became involved. Northouse summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the Style approach as follows:

The Style approach has several strengths and weaknesses. On the positive side, it has broadened the scope of leadership research to include the study of the behaviors of leaders rather than only their personal traits or characteristics. Second, it is a reliable approach because it is supported by a wide range of studies. Third, the style approach is valuable because it underscores the importance of the two core dimensions of leadership behavior, task and relationship. Fourth, it has heuristic value in that it provides us with a broad conceptual map that is useful in gaining an understanding of our own leadership behaviors.

On the negative side, researchers have not been able to associate behaviors of leaders (task and relationship) with outcomes such as morale, job satisfaction, and productivity. In addition, researchers from the Style approach have not been able to identify a universal set of leadership behaviors that would consistently result in effective leadership. Last, the Style approach implies, but fails to support fully, the idea that the most effective leadership style is high-high style (i.e., high task and high relationship) (2004: 83-84).

HOFSTEDE'S MASCULINITY/FEMININITY DIMENSION

Although the Style approach provides a valuable framework for assessing leadership in a broad way, it has lacked a theoretical base upon which to build answers to the "why" question. That is, the Style approach has had descriptive power and some prescriptive power but has lacked expletive power. There has been a lack of ability to explain the causality related to Style approaches. Here we suggest that Hofstede's (1998) work-related values research might provide some much needed assistance.

Persuasively arguing that his dimensions are in some sense archetypes of an anthropological nature, Hofstede asserts, "Each of the five dimensions reflects a basic and enduring anthropological fact about a national society: that society's specific answer to a general problem with which any human society has to cope" (1998: 10-11). In the case of his Masculinity/Femininity dimension, Hofstede argues that "the fundamental problem behind the emergence of this dimension must be the duality of female versus male, nature's number two law (after the duality of life and death), which governs procreation and thus the perpetuation of a society" (1980: 262). Marcia Guttentag and Paul Secord (1983) explored aspects of the duality, the foundational importance of gender, in the book, *Too Many Women?*

This may not be big news for those familiar with the book, *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* (Gray, 1992). As simplistic as it sounds, despite one's gender, most can relate to the differences between men's "report" talk and women's "rapport" talk (Tannen, 1990). At an anecdotal level we are all familiar with the "battle of the sexes." At the global level we are familiar with culture differences in the way the sexes relate to one another. One has but to look at the role of women in Iraq and other mid-Eastern countries versus the U.S. to see how striking the differences may be.

However, Hofstede asserts that the poles on this dimension are neither limited to simple role differences nor to the difference between "femininity" and "feminism." For example, the legal position of women and their access to jobs depend primarily on the level of economic development of their respective countries. And, Hofstede remarked that Masculinity/Femininity differences are sometimes hidden behind other influences. For example, a country's level of individualism also plays a role, and the sharing of power in society in general, including that of women, depends largely on Hofstede's dimension of Power Distance. (Hofstede, 1998).

The Masculinity/Femininity dimension, basically opposing ego goals to social goals, was found in a factor analysis of work goals across subsidiaries of a large multinational corporation, and was derived from answers to 14 "work goals" questions scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The country scores were constructed via a stratified mean across seven occupational groups resulting in two factors (Hofstede, 1998).

Hofstede initially described one of his four dimensions as Social/Ego, which stresses the opposing goals of concern for people to goals that enhance ego but do not imply a concern for others. Hofstede later reversed the poles in the Social/Ego factor and renamed the dimension Masculinity/Femininity. In response to criticism of this choice of labels, Hofstede (1998) responded that he felt the newer term captured the underlying anthropological nature of the dichotomy better than did the original term.

When questioned as to whether Masculinity/Femininity is one dimension or two, Hofstede (1998) responded that the issue is a matter of level of analysis. He saw the Masculinity/Femininity dimension as a societal-level, national cultural dimension with masculinity and femininity as polar elements and androgyny falling between the poles. Similarly, in her work on psychological androgyny, Sandra Bem (1974) posits that masculinity is a dimension and femininity is a dimension, but that androgyny is a result of being high in both elements. While Bem developed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) for use at the individual level, Hofstede developed his instrument for measuring dimensions at the national cultural level.

ANALYTIC FRAMEWORKS

To put this study in context, it is appropriate to understand the analytic frameworks of both Geert Hofstede and Sandra Bem. It is readily apparent and not a little surprising that the frameworks bear striking similarities. To understand this, we review Hofstede's framework, Bem's framework, and then the commonalities and divergences of the two.

Hofstede's Framework

Geert Hofstede described the Mental Programs Paradigm in his classic, *Cultures Consequences*, published in 1980, where he originally identified four dimensions of culture: 1) individualism versus collectivism, 2) power distance, 3) uncertainty avoidance, and 4) masculinity versus femininity (originally titled Social/Ego, discussed earlier.)

After defining culture as "the collective programming of the mind, which distinguishes members of one group from members of another group," he described three categories of human mental programs. The first is the biological or universal set of programs. All humans communicate, eat, sleep, eliminate waste, and seek to propagate the species. Humans laugh and cry. These programs are universal and largely below the conscious mind. The second group of programs is the sociological or cultural set. We learn and pass on to following generations our language, values, beliefs, and attitudes. We accept and use our language without question; we understand what it means to be "good" or "bad." Again, these programs are largely below our level of consciousness. The final set of programs is psychological. These are the individual, idiosyncratic programs that distinguish us from members of our group, and many of these programs are also below our level of consciousness.

Taken together, these three sets of mental programs largely establish patterns of collective and individual human behavior. The behavior of present interest is masculine versus feminine behavior. This behavior is influenced by biology and by national culture as well as by individual psychology.

Bem's Framework

Sandra Bem (1993) describes her framework in terms of three lenses: gender polarization, androcentrism, and biological essentialism. She writes, "These three gender lenses provide the foundation for a theory of how biology, culture, and the individual psyche all interact in historical context to systemically reproduce male power" (1993: viii).

Bem reached this stage of theory development in an emergent fashion over a 20-year time period from the 1970's to 1990's. In the 1970's, Bem focused on androgyny which, to her, seemed to challenge the traditional categories of masculine and feminine. That is, traditionally there was one dimension with masculine and feminine as poles and androgyny in the middle. However, Bem postulated that masculine and feminine were two separate dimensions, and that an individual could be both very masculine and very feminine, a situation that she defined as

androgynous. By the 1980's, she came to feel that the concept of androgyny focused so much on an individual being both masculine and feminine that it obscured the idea that masculine and feminine were cultural constructs. In her view, this situation reproduced the gender polarization that androgyny seeks to contest. From this point, she next moved to the concept of gender schematicity. This allowed her to recognize masculinity and femininity as constructions of a cultural schema and to argue that schema polarized gender. Ultimately Bem theorized the concept of the gender-polarizing lens.

Intersections and Bifurcations

Although Bem's (1993) theory is more narrowly focused to only the masculinity/femininity dimension, the parallel with Hofstede's mental programs paradigm is apparent. Both frameworks recognize the influence of biology, culture, and psychology.

However, Bem is U.S. educated and apparently more insular than Hofstede' who is European educated and arguably more cross-culturally aware. This is apparent when Bem generalizes that all cultures are and historically always have been androcentric, failing to recognize that many cultures are "feminine" (e.g., Finland, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland.) Bem also places greater emphasis upon historical context than does Hofstede.

Likewise, Bem's theory is value laden in that she negatively characterizes androcentric cultures as oppressive. Others would argue that culture is simply what it is. A society is masculine or feminine, has a present or future time focus, and is accepting of ambiguity or not. That does not make any of the cultures with varying characteristics good or bad, oppressive or supportive. Hofstede, on the other hand, is not judgmental of differing countries' cultural values. For example, he argues that the quality of life concept itself is culturally constrained.

ONE DIMENSION OR TWO?

We now return to the issue of whether the Style approaches represent one dimension or two and how that issue relates to the Masculinity/Femininity dimension that Hofstede identified. Responding to the issue of whether this dimension should remain as a single entity or be divided into two separate, distinctive dimensions, Hofstede suggests the issue is a matter of level of analysis. At the individual level, a person may be more masculine, more feminine, androgynous, or neutral (a typical two-by-two matrix). However, at the ecological or national level, the number of factors normally gets smaller than at the individual level. To quote Hofstede,

An individual can be both masculine and feminine at the same time, but what I found is that a country culture is either predominantly one or predominantly the other. When one moves to a higher level of analysis, the number of factors found normally gets smaller: At the country-level of analysis, 'more people with masculine values' is statistically so strongly correlated with 'fewer people with feminine values' that this becomes one single dimension (1998: 19-20).

Thus, we would expect that task/relationship, concern for production/concern for people and consideration/initiating structure (i.e., Style), would produce a two-by-two matrix at the individual level of analysis, but would resolve itself to a bipolar single dimension at the ecological level. Based on the discussion above, the following propositions are offered as both testable and logically consistent:

- P1:** There will be a stronger correlation between Masculinity and Task orientation than between Femininity and Task orientation.
- P2:** There will be a higher correlation between Femininity and Relationship orientation than between Masculinity and Relationship orientation.

METHODOLOGY

If our propositions are correct, that is, if Masculinity versus Femininity is a rational theoretical base for the different but similar Style approaches to leadership, then certain predicted statistical correlations should exist. This

process for validating our propositions is consistent with Hofstede's approach to validating his work-related values dimensions.

If, as we propose, Hofstede's Masculinity/Femininity dimension does provide a theoretical base for the Style approaches, then strong correlations between the Style scores for national culture and the Masculinity/Femininity scores for national culture are expected. We suggest that this is appropriately framed as goals that stress concern for people versus goals that stress concern for results (i.e., task.) With this in mind, we have developed an instrument (see Appendix 1) to measure a combined Style component and the Masculinity/Femininity component.

The Questionnaire

The Style portion of the questionnaire is designed to measure two major types of leadership behaviors: task and relationship. This first part of the questionnaire is scored by summing the responses to odd-numbered items to determine the task score. Summing the responses to the even-numbered items determines the relationship score.

The Masculinity/Femininity portion of the questionnaire is from Hofstede's 1971 standardized IBM survey (see Hofstede, 1980). Hofstede later refined the original survey into the *Values Survey Module 1982*, and again with the *Values Survey Module 1994 (VSM 94)* (see Hofstede, 2001: 56-58, 467-468). It is interesting to note that there are several significant differences among these surveys. For example, statistical analysis strongly suggested that only four of the original 14 questions are required to determine the Masculinity/Femininity dimension, as reflected in the *VSM 94*. Hofstede provides quite explicit directions for statistically determining the masculinity index.

The final portion of the survey used in this study consists of six questions designed to gather demographic information such as gender, age, experience, employment type and subject major.

The Sample

The sample (n = 61) consisted of students from two Florida-based private universities who were enrolled in an undergraduate degree completion program. Females comprised 57.4 percent of the sample. Approximately two-thirds of the subjects were under the age of 40, and 55 percent had at least eleven years of work experience. Approximately one-third of the students were employed by government, and nearly half of the subjects were employed in the business sector. The remainder was employed in education and other fields. Table 1 reflects the above demographic profile of the subjects in more detail.

Table 1. Sample Demographics

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Female	35	57.4
Male	26	42.6
Total	61	100.0
Experience		
Under 5	7	11.5
5-10	20	32.8
11-20	18	29.5
Over 20	16	26.2
Total	61	100.0
Employment		
Business	29	47.5
Government	20	32.8
Education	5	8.2
Other	7	11.5
Total	61	100.0

Age		
20-29	24	39.3
30-39	17	27.9
40-49	15	24.6
50-59	4	6.6
60+	1	1.6
Total	61	100.0

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data for this study was analyzed using SPSS Version 13. The first part of the survey, the Style portion, was scored by summing the responses to odd-numbered items to determine the task score (TScore). Summing the responses to the even-numbered items determined the Relationship score (RScore). The masculinity and femininity scores were derived in a similar manner with the sum of the odd items in the second part of the questionnaire as the Masculinity score (MASscore), and the sum of the even numbered items as the Femininity score (FEMscore). Findings for each proposition includes a table of correlations and is followed by an interpretation of the output.

Proposition One

Proposition One states that there will be a higher correlation between Masculinity and Task orientation than between Femininity and Task orientation. A Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated (see Table 2) for the relationship between subjects' Masculinity Score (MASscore) and Task orientation score (TScore). An extremely weak, not significant, correlation was found ($r = 0.124, p = 0.34 > 0.05$). Based on our sample, we cannot conclude that one's masculinity score and task score are related.

Similarly, a Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated (see Table 2) for the relationship between subjects' Femininity Score (FEMscore) and Task orientation score (TScore). Again, an extremely weak correlation, not significant, was found ($r = 0.162, p = 0.212 > 0.05$). Based on our sample, it appears that one's femininity score and task score are not related.

From Table 2, it is clear that for our sample the Masculinity and Task orientation correlation (0.124) was not higher than the Femininity and Task orientation (0.162) as hypothesized.

Table 2. Pearson's Correlation Coefficients for Proposition One

		Correlations		
		MASscore	FEMscore	TScore
MASscore	Pearson Correlation	1	.843**	.124
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.340
	N	61	61	61
FEMscore	Pearson Correlation	.843**	1	.162
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.212
	N	61	61	61
TScore	Pearson Correlation	.124	.162	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.340	.212	
	N	61	61	61

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Proposition Two

For Proposition Two, that there will be a higher correlation between Femininity and Relationship orientation than between Masculinity and Relationship orientation, a Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated (see Table 3) for the relationship between a subject's Femininity Score (FEMscore) and Relationship score (Rscore). A moderate correlation that was significant was found ($r = 0.378$, $p = 0.003$), indicating a significant relationship between the two variables. Those respondents with higher femininity scores tend to also score high on the relationship variable.

A Pearson's correlation coefficient was then calculated (see Table 3) for the relationship between a subject's Masculinity Score (MASscore) and Relationship score (Rscore). A weak correlation that was significant was found ($r = 0.280$, $p = 0.029$) indicating a significant relationship between the two variables. Those respondents with higher masculinity scores tend to also score high on the relationship variable.

Table 3. Pearson's Correlation Coefficients for Proposition Two

		Correlations		
		MASscore	FEMscore	RScore
MASscore	Pearson Correlation	1	.843**	.280*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.029
	N	61	61	61
FEMscore	Pearson Correlation	.843**	1	.378**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.003
	N	61	61	61
RScore	Pearson Correlation	.280*	.378**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.029	.003	
	N	61	61	61

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In this case, Proposition Two is supported in that the correlation between Femininity and Relationship orientation (0.378) was higher than the correlation between Masculinity and Relationship. At best, the correlation between Femininity and Relationship is moderate, but the correlation between Masculinity and Relationship is weak.

Outliers

Three respondents appear to be outliers in scatter plots of Masculinity or Femininity with either Task or Relationship. When these subjects are removed from the analysis, the correlations shown in Table 4 were obtained.

Weak correlation between Masculinity and Task Orientation was calculated ($r = 0.286$) and found to be significant ($p = 0.03$). The correlation between Femininity and Task Orientation was found to be moderate ($r = 0.318$) and significant ($p = 0.015$). However, removing the three possible outliers does not provide support for Proposition One based on our data. Regarding Proposition Two, correlations between Masculinity and Relationship orientation as well as between Femininity and Relationship orientation did not vary significantly with the removal of the possible outliers.

Table 4. Revised Pearson’s Correlation Coefficients

		Correlations			
		TScore	RScore	MASscore	FEMscore
TScore	Pearson Correlation	1	.599**	.286*	.318*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.030	.015
	N	58	58	58	58
RScore	Pearson Correlation	.599**	1	.246	.384**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.063	.003
	N	58	58	58	58
MASscore	Pearson Correlation	.286*	.246	1	.769**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.063		.000
	N	58	58	58	58
FEMscore	Pearson Correlation	.318*	.384**	.769**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.003	.000	
	N	58	58	58	58

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Analysis by Sub-Sample

The results shown above are for the entire sample of 61 subjects. Since there was some concern that the two populations for the separate universities might be statistically different, statistical analysis was also conducted for each school separately.

For School A, Proposition One was not supported by analysis of this data. For Proposition Two, the correlation between Femininity and Relationship (0.308) is higher than the correlation between Masculinity and Relationship (0.130). However, neither correlation was found significant at either 0.01 level or 0.05 level (respective *p*-values = 0.081 and 0.472).

For School B, Proposition One was not supported by results from data analysis. For Proposition Two, the correlation between Femininity and Relationship (0.391) is higher than the correlation between Masculinity and Relationship (0.380). Both correlations were found significant at the 0.05 level (respective *p*-values = 0.040 and 0.046).

CONCLUSION

Over time, various leadership theories have predominated in the United States. The 1940's studies originating at The Ohio State University described an approach based upon differences in style and, about the same time, studies of small group leadership were undertaken at the University of Michigan. These studies and their successors ultimately lead to the development of the Style approach to leadership theory that has remained popular down to the present time. However, an important criticism of the Style approach to leadership has been the lack of a theoretical base. Here we suggested that Hofstede’s Masculinity/Femininity dimension provides an underlying theoretical base for Style approaches that have been popular for so long in the U.S. leadership literature.

We tested the correlations between the dimensions of task and relationship, concern for production and concern for people, consideration versus initiating structure, and Masculinity versus Femininity. We proposed in this initial study that Hofstede's Masculinity/Femininity dimension provides a theoretical base for the Style approach to leadership. However, results do not support the proposition that there are significant correlations between Masculinity or Femininity and Task orientation. However, significant although moderate correlation was found for the Femininity and Relationship orientation, and a moderately weak correlation was found between Masculinity and

Relationship orientation. Therefore, no support was found for Proposition One, but some significant support was found for Proposition Two.

These unexpected results suggest further research is required using a larger, more random population to rule out that the results of this study were in some way an artifact of the student populations used from the two participating universities. For example, one of this study's authors and faculty member at School B realized, after data had been collected, that all individuals who completed surveys had taken an upper-level class on Leadership Development. Almost all students in that class rated high in both Task and Relationship behavior at the end of the semester, consistent with their in-class training that supports the position that exhibiting both behaviors is both possible and desirable. Another explanation might be that the outcomes could be idiosyncratic to U.S. leadership models, suggesting a more universal, non-U.S. sample might provide different results. Finally, future studies have yet to explore whether the Task relationship factors are one or two dimensions.

Another limitation of this study may be using undergraduate students as subjects. While it is not unusual to use graduate students for subjects in business research, we posit that the more mature degree-completion students with several years of work experience who participated in this study are very likely appropriate representatives of culture in the workplace versus younger, more traditional undergraduate students. In any case, we do not suggest that results based on the sample population in this study are generalizable to the general population.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M., 1990. *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Application (3rd ed.)*, New York: Free Press.
- Bem, S., 1974. The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny, *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 42: 155-162.
- Bem, S., 1993. *The Lenses of Gender*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bennis, W.G., & Nanus, B., 1985. *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Blake, R.R., & McCanse, A.A., 1991. *Leadership Dilemmas-Grid Solutions*, Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S., 1964. *The Managerial Grid*, Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S., 1978. *The New Managerial Grid*, Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J. S., 1985. *The Managerial Grid III*, Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Bowers, D.G., & Seashore, S.E., 1966. Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four Factor Theory of Leadership, *Administrative Science Quarterly*: 238-263.
- Fleishman, E.A., 1957. The Leader Opinion Questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (eds.) *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement* (pp. 103-119). Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research.
- Guttentag, M., & Secord, P.F., 1983. *Too Many Women? The Sex Ratio Question*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gray, J., 1992. *Men are from Mars: Women are from Venus*, New York, NY: Harper-Collins.
- Hemphill, J.K., & Coons, A.E., 1957. Development of Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill & E.E. Coons (eds.), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*, Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Hofstede, G., 1998. *Masculinity and Femininity: The Taboo Dimension of National Culture*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hofstede, G., 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.R. & Ilies, R., 2004. The Forgotten Ones? The Validity of Consideration and Initiating Structure in Leadership Research, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (1): 36-51.
- Kahn, R.L., 1956. The Prediction of Productivity, *Journal of Social Issues*, 12: 41-49.
- Katz, R.L., 1955. Skills of an Effective Administrator, *Harvard Business Review*, January-February.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A., 1991. Leadership: Do Traits Matter? *The Executive*, 5: 48-60.
- Likert, R., 1961. *New Patterns of Management*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R., 1967. *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lippitt, M.B., 2002. *The Leadership Spectrum*, Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Littrell, R., 2004. E-mail correspondence among authors and Littrell regarding research projects.
- Lord, R.G., DeVader, C.L., & Alliger, G.M., 1986. A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Personality Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 402-410.
- Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Harding, F.D., Owen Jacobs, T., & Fleishman, E.A., 2000. Leadership Skills for a Changing World: Solving Complex Social Problems, *Leadership Quarterly*, II (1): 11-35.
- Northouse, P.G., 2004. *Leadership Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.), Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks.
- Rushing, J., & Mueller, C.B., 2005. Task versus Relationship and Masculinity versus Femininity: One Dimension or Two?, *Proceedings of the Academy of International Business-SE (USA)*: 288-295.
- Stogdill, R.M., 1948. Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of Literature, *Journal of Psychology*, 25: 35-71.
- Stogdill, R.M., 1950. Leadership, Membership and Organization, *Psychological Bulletin*, 47: 1-14.
- Tannen, D., 1990. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*, New York: Morrow.
- Yammarino, F.J., 2000. Leadership Skills: Introducing and Overview, *Leadership Quarterly*, II (1): 5-9.
- Zaleznik, A., 1977, May-June. Managers and Leaders: Are they Different?, *Harvard Business Review*, 55: 67-78.

STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Style Section

Instructions: Read each item carefully and think about how often you engage in the described behavior. Indicate your response to each item by circling one of the five numbers to the right of each number.

Key: 1= Never 2= Seldom 3= Occasionally 4= Often 5= Always

1. Tells group members what they are supposed to do.
2. Acts friendly with members of the group.
3. Sets standards of performance for group members.
4. Helps others feel comfortable in the group.
5. Makes suggestions about how to solve problems.
6. Responds favorably to suggestions made by others.
7. Makes his or her perspective clear to others.
8. Treats others fairly.
9. Develops a plan of action for the group.
10. Behaves in a predictable manner toward group members.
11. Defines role responsibilities for each group member.
12. Communicates actively with group members.
13. Clarifies his or her own role within the group.
14. Shows concern for the personal well-being of others.
15. Provides a plan for how the work is to be done.
16. Shows flexibility in making decisions.
17. Provides criteria for what is expected of the group.
18. Discloses thoughts and feeling to group members.
19. Encourages group members to do quality work.
20. Helps group members get along.

Masculinity/Femininity Questionnaire

Instructions: Please think of an ideal job, disregarding your present job, if you have one. In choosing an ideal job, how important is it to you to ... (please circle one answer in each line across):

**Key: 1= of utmost importance, 2= very important, 3= of moderate importance
4= of little importance, 5= of very little or no importance**

- A5 have challenging work to do – work from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment?
- A6 live in an area desirable to you and your family?
- A7 have an opportunity for high earnings?
- A8 work with people who cooperate well with one another?
- A9 have training opportunities (to improve your skills or to learn new skills)?
- A10 have good fringe benefits?
- A11 get the recognition you deserve when you do a good job?
- A12 have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)?
- A13 have considerable freedom to adopt your own approach to the job?
- A14 have the security that you will be able to work for your company as long as you want to?
- A15 have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs?
- A16 have a good working relationship with your manager?
- A17 fully use your skills and abilities on the job?
- A18 have a job which leaves you sufficient time for your personal or family life?