

followers; many cult leaders have been highly charismatic, using their powerful influence to indoctrinate followers into a highly authoritarian social structure that they alone control (Raubolt, 2003).

Frequently, the phrases that embody the charismatic leader's vision enter the language as enduring monuments. Consider Martin Luther King's '*I have a dream ...*'; Churchill's '*We shall never surrender*'; Trudeau's call for a '*Just society*'; Gandhi's vision of an India free of British rule ('*Quit India!*'); Hitler's appeal to past and future German glory ('*Germany awake!*'); and John F. Kennedy's call to patriotism ('*Ask not what your country can do for you ...*').

How do such leaders come to wield such power over their followers? How are they capable of appealing to their followers on a raw emotional level? House (1977) argues that the charismatic leader is typified by a specific set of characteristics:

1. An extremely high level of self-confidence.
2. An extremely high level of dominance. Such leaders seem to have a strong need to influence others, which drives them to acquire the persuasive skills they need to do so.
3. An apparently strong conviction in the moral righteousness of their beliefs. The charismatic leader often provides a role model and a value system for the followers that sometimes endure long after the leader's death. For example, Gandhi continues to be respected and admired, and his teachings are followed by millions of Indians and non-Indians alike. However, some charismatic leaders may not have such convictions but are capable of acting as though they do. Certainly, there have been charismatic religious leaders who were later shown to be manipulators using their charisma for their own ends.

In addition, personal characteristics such as charm, originality and speech fluency are important attributes that encourage devotion from followers (Sashkin, 1977).

Yet, charisma does not reside solely in the leader; it depends on the relationship between a leader who possesses charismatic qualities and a situation in which people are more likely to be influenced by charisma (Klein & House, 1998). The charismatic leader often emerges in a time of stress, and he or she usually epitomizes the deeply held feelings of the followers. As the situation changes, the charismatic leader may lose his or her appeal; once the stress is lifted, the public can quickly throw off its fascination for the leader.

**KEY POINT:** Transformational leaders not only lead, but also inspire others to work towards what otherwise might seem to be impossible goals. High self-confidence, dominance and conviction are characteristics often associated with such leadership.

## Gender and leadership

Until very recently, the rule of nations has with few exceptions been the prerogative of males. For sure, there have been some notable women rulers throughout history – think of Cleopatra, Catherine the Great, and Queen Elizabeth I and Queen Victoria – who ran their empires with vigour and skill, but their powers came to them through their bloodline. Until only very recently in human history, the top elected roles in national governments – president or prime minister – have been filled by men. The first woman in the world to become an elected national leader was Sirimavo Bandaranaike, who became the prime minister of Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) in 1960. Then in 1966, Indira Gandhi, daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru (India's first prime minister), became the first (and so far, only) female prime minister of that nation. In 1969, Golda Meir became the first (and so far, only) female prime minister of Israel. In 1979, Margaret Thatcher became the United Kingdom's first (and so far, only) female prime minister. In 1993, Kim Campbell became Canada's first (and so far, only) female prime minister (although her government survived only a few months). In 2006, Michelle Bachelet became the first female president of Chile.

However, by 2012, a record number of women were serving as elected national leaders, among them such notables as Angela Merkel of Germany and Dilma Rousseff of Brazil, although the number subsequently dipped slightly in 2013 (Table 12.2).

**Table 12.2** Female national leaders, 2013

Country	Leader
Germany	Chancellor Angela Merkel
Liberia	President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf
Argentina	President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner
Bangladesh	Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina Wajed
Iceland	Prime Minister Jóhanna Sigurdardóttir
Lithuania	President Dalia Grybauskaitė
Costa Rica	President Laura Chinchilla
Trinidad and Tobago	Prime Minister Kamla Persad-Bissessar
Slovakia	Prime Minister Iveta Radicová
Brazil	President Dilma Rousseff
Kosovo	President Atifete Jahjaga
Thailand	Prime Minister Yingluck Shinawatra
Denmark	Prime Minister Helle Thorning-Schmidt
Jamaica	Prime Minister Portia Simpson Miller
Malawi	President Joyce Banda
South Korea	President Park Geun-hye
Slovenia	Prime Minister Alenka Bratusek
Cyprus (North)	Prime Minister Sibel Siber

Yet, progress towards gender equality in the political domain remains slow, as the data in Table 12.3 attest.

**Table 12.3** Percentage of women in national parliaments in 2012

Rank	Country	Total seats	Women	% Women
1	Rwanda	80	45	56.3
2	Andorra	28	14	50.0
3	Cuba	586	265	45.2
4	Sweden	349	156	44.7
11	Norway	169	67	39.6
24	Germany	620	204	32.9
27	New Zealand	121	39	32.2
34	Switzerland	200	57	28.5
37	Afghanistan	249	69	27.7
38	France	577	155	26.9
47	Australia	150	37	24.7
47	Canada	308	76	24.7
60	United Kingdom	650	145	2.3
66	China	2978	635	21.3
82	United States	430	73	17.0
110	India	545	60	11.0
123	Brazil	513	44	8.6
144	Yemen	301	1	0.3
145	Saudi Arabia	52	0	0.0

These are partial results of a 2012 survey of the percentage of women in 190 national bodies of government. Canada ranks 47th, while the United Kingdom comes in at 60th, and the United States at 82nd. Only in twenty-three

countries do women hold more than one-third of the parliamentary seats, but this at least is an improvement over the results of a similar survey carried out by the Inter-Parliamentary Union in 2003, when the corresponding figure was only nine countries.

For historical reasons, women have had difficulty achieving positions of power (see Chapter 13), and the gender-role stereotypes that associate power uniquely with men may lead to women not being given the opportunity to exercise power, and even to them being perceived as having less power than they actually do (Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989). It also appears that men are more likely than are women to use expert and legitimate power, whereas women are more prone to use referent power, which relies on gaining admiration and respect from subordinates. This means that women often develop different strategies than men to influence others, and when they do employ reward or coercive power, something not typically expected from women, such approaches may not be effective (Carli, 1999). Some women may also feel that the exercise of legitimate power is incompatible with femininity and thus avoid situations and positions that involve such power.

Women continue to face a number of obstacles to becoming leaders in mixed-gender groups. In such situations, men are quicker to try to take over the leadership role, even when they are clearly less qualified than the women with whom they are working (Mezulis et al., 2004). Indeed, men and women alike are inclined to look towards males rather than females for leadership in mixed-gender groups (Eagly & Karau, 1991). This should not be too surprising given that most contemporary adults have grown up in patriarchal societies where the father has been invested with the traditional ultimate authority in the family. There is perhaps, above all else, the expectation held by many men and women that women are not ‘suited’ to leadership, and as a result we often hear about a **glass ceiling** that prevents women from rising up to the top of an organizational structure. Gender stereotypes describe men as capable of being tough, assertive, brave and commanding respect, while stereotypes of women emphasize not only gentleness but weakness, fickleness and submissiveness. And not only is it more difficult for women to assume leadership positions in mixed-sex groups; when they do, they are scrutinized more carefully. Ironically, female subordinates of female leaders in mixed-sex groups have been found to be more negative towards these leaders than are male subordinates of the same leaders (Eagly & Karau, 1991). In other words, the successful woman has to struggle against the negative attitudes of both sexes.

These gender stereotypes, combined with the socially inferior position of women in most societies around the world, present even more trouble for female leaders: they are not likely to receive the same treatment as male leaders from other people (both male and female) of equal or greater stature in the power hierarchy. Their viewpoints are less likely to be given attention in meetings and they are more likely to be interrupted when speaking, even by other women. Koenig et al. (2011) described this situation in terms of cultural mismatch between the perceived demands of the leadership role and the stereotypes of women. While assertiveness, competitiveness, and ‘getting things done’ are qualities more likely to be associated with men than with women, the ‘female’ qualities of compassion, maintaining social harmony and being nice to others are seen as being at odds with what is required in a good leader. Thus stereotypical male traits fit better with cultural perceptions of what is required in leadership than do stereotypical female traits. Indeed, the ‘masculinity’ of the cultural stereotype of leadership is a strong effect found across a wide range of social contexts (Koenig et al., 2011), and this makes it more difficult for women to move into leadership roles because they do not appear to have what it takes. Does this mean that women should try to take on a masculine leadership style – appearing tough, decisive, aggressive? The irony is that, when they do, the negative evaluation of their leadership is likely to be even greater (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992), and because they are now seen to be lacking in terms of the compassion and ‘niceness’ expected of women, they are often disliked by people they work with (Rudman & Glick, 1999, 2001). Thus, women are discouraged from presenting as either too masculine or feminine. Moreover, women who do succeed in leadership positions by assuming a masculine style may experience a conflict between that role and their ‘femininity’. Men do not experience such conflicts.

Yet despite the history of discrimination, women are moving more and more into leadership roles in government and industry, and, as noted above, are becoming an increasingly significant force at the highest levels of world leadership (Adler, 1999a). Indeed, globalization of industry and communication networks may require leadership that differs significantly from other forms of leadership. Rather than leading a single group

or society, the global leader has to deal with the differing goals, expectations and cultural values of many groups and societies. It has been argued that the ‘feminine’ qualities often associated with female leaders, such as greater interpersonal sensitivity and concern and a desire to compromise rather than dominate, are needed to meet many of the challenges posed by positions of global leadership (Adler, 1999b).

It is interesting to note that, in modern times, women are more likely to be made leaders during times of crisis in an organization. This phenomenon is referred to as a **glass cliff** (Bruckmüller & Branscombe, 2010) in contradistinction to the glass ceiling mentioned earlier. When promoted to leadership in such circumstances, the risks of failure, of falling over the cliff, are high because the organization is in trouble, and thus the leader is left vulnerable to blame for future difficulties should she not be able to right the ship. Ryan & Haslam (2005) report that their study of the top hundred companies on the London Stock Exchange revealed that women were more likely to be appointed to executive boards when the company had been performing consistently poorly during the preceding period. They followed up this analysis with laboratory research and found that when participants considered an organization that had been performing poorly, they recommended a female leader more often than when considering an organization that was performing well.

Why should women leadership candidates be evaluated more positively when there is a crisis than when things are going well? Experimental studies of the glass cliff suggest that this choice has as much or more to do with perceptions about men and leadership as it does about women and their leadership abilities. That is, women appear capable of bringing something to the leadership role – compassion, interpersonal sensitivity – that men, according to stereotype, lack, and since the ‘male’ approach is not working, the organization turns in desperation to a different, ‘feminine’ approach (Bruckmüller & Branscombe, 2010).

It appears that men and women may typically view a leadership role somewhat differently: Rink et al. (2012) conducted a study with 146 Dutch business students as participants. They were asked to imagine being employed by a large company that was going through a financial crisis, and further to imagine that they had been asked to take a top leadership position with the task of solving the crisis. There were three experimental conditions: In the control condition, participants were told that both social and financial resources were available: management had decided to provide additional funds and employees had approved the appointment. In the no-social-resources condition, it was indicated that while management would provide additional funds, employees disapproved of the appointment. In the no-financial-resources condition, it was stated that management would not provide additional funds, but that employees had approved the appointment. There was a strong gender difference; men evaluated the position lacking in financial resources as the most negative, while women evaluated the position without social resources as the most negative.

A second study provided insight into those findings. It was found that women were reluctant to take on a difficult leadership position without social resources because they anticipated difficulties in being accepted by the group, whereas men were reluctant to take a position with limited financial resources because of anticipation that they would not be able to succeed in the task. Women considered that in order to have any likelihood of succeeding in the task, it was important to be accepted as the leader, whereas men believed that acceptance by employees would come as they demonstrated their ability to carry out the assigned task.

**But do men and women actually lead differently?** After many years of research into the relationship of gender to leadership, all that can confidently be concluded is that the appearance of gender differences in leadership is determined by the situation in which the leadership occurs (Butterfield & Grinnell, 1999). For example, in one study (Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999), women more often than men adopted an interpersonally oriented leadership style when working in female-dominated industries (childhood education, nursing, hairdressing), while no such differences between men and women were found in male-dominated industries (academia, information technology, automotive industry, forestry). Nonetheless, in male-dominated industries, women who adopted an interpersonal leadership style reported greater stress and poorer mental health than did those who did not. Conversely, in those same male-dominated industries, men who chose an interpersonal style actually reported better mental health than did males who did not. Thus, the effects of gender on leadership style and the ultimate consequences for the leader depend on situational variables – not just on gender. As a result, men are often more effective in positions defined in masculine terms (for example, in